

S M O K I N G

A N D

T O B A C C O

C O N T R O L

M O N O G R A P H

11

State and Local Legislative Action To Reduce Tobacco Use

Cover For Comp
Purposes Only
Blue: 2745
Red: 221

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES
Public Health Service
National Institutes of Health
National Cancer Institute

Note, when citing this monograph in other works, please use the following format:

National Cancer Institute. *State and Local Legislative Action to Reduce Tobacco Use*.
Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11. Bethesda, MD: U.S.
Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health,
National Cancer Institute, NIH Pub. No. 00-4804, August 2000.

SMOKING
AND
TOBACCO
CONTROL

MONOGRAPH



State and Local Legislative Action to Reduce Tobacco Use

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES
Public Health Service
National Institutes of Health
National Cancer Institute

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monographs Issued to Date

Strategies to Control Tobacco Use in the United States: a blueprint for public health action in the 1990's. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 1. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute. NIH Publication No. 92-3316, December 1991.

Smokeless Tobacco or Health: An international perspective. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 2. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health. NIH Publication No. 92-3461, September 1992.

Major Local Tobacco Control Ordinances in the United States. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 3. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health. NIH Publication No. 93-3532, May 1993.

Respiratory Health Effects of Passive Smoking: Lung cancer and other disorders. The Report of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 4. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, NIH Publication No. 93-3605, August 1993

Tobacco and the Clinician. Interventions for Medical and Dental Practice. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 5. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health. NIH Publication No. 94-3693, January 1994.

Community-based Interventions for Smokers: The COMMIT Field Experience. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 6. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health. NIH Publication No. 95-4028, August 1995.

The FTC Cigarette Test Method for Determining Tar, Nicotine, and Carbon Monoxide Yields of U.S. Cigarettes. Report of the NCI Expert Committee. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 7. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health. NIH Publication No. 96-4028, August 1996.

Changes in Cigarette Related Disease Risks and Their Implication for Prevention and Control. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 8. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health. NIH Publication No. 97-4213, February 1997.

Cigars. Health Effects and Trends. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 9. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health. NIH Publication No. 98-4302, February 1998.

Health Effects of Exposure to Environmental Tobacco Smoke. The Report of the California Environmental Protection Agency. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 10. Bethesda, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute. NIH Publication No. 99-4645, August 1999.

Preface

This monograph is the eleventh volume in the Smoking and Tobacco Control series released by the National Cancer Institute (NCI). The National Association of County and City Health Officials (NACCHO) and the National Association of Local Boards of Health (NALBOH) are working with NCI in disseminating findings from this important publication.

NACCHO is a nonprofit membership organization that serves all of the nearly 3,000 local public health agencies (LPHAs) in the nation's cities, counties, townships, and districts. The organization provides local health departments with education, information, research, and technical assistance on a variety of topics. It also facilitates partnerships among local, state, and federal agencies in order to promote and strengthen public health.

NALBOH is an organization that represents the interests of local boards of health and assists those boards in assuring the health of the community. NALBOH enhances and supports all 3,200 local health boards across the country by providing linkages, networks, education, and training. It is also committed to promoting health and effective public health policy at all levels of government and also to strengthening the ability of health boards to develop tobacco control policy efforts.

NACCHO and NALBOH constituents have unique roles in tobacco prevention and control. They often represent the local government infrastructure, and as such, they can play leadership roles in local policy development, implementation, and enforcement.

For years, tobacco control legislation enacted at the city and county levels were much more stringent than those enacted at the federal or state level. However, few local communities were involved in implementing and managing actual public health programs to reduce tobacco use. This was seen primarily as a national or state responsibility. Fortunately, local communities have become more involved in recent years. This trend has been supported mainly by LPHAs, and both NACCHO and NALBOH have helped local communities become more involved in the development of public health policy.

LPHAs tend to partner with a wide variety of organizations, including state health agencies, hospitals, local governments, nonprofit and voluntary groups, universities, businesses, community health centers, faith organizations, and insurers. Because of their connections with local organizations, LPHAs often have the connections needed to convene coalitions around health issues. In addition, they have direct and daily interaction with community members.

About 20 percent of LPHAs are “safety net” providers of primary care services for underserved populations. An even greater number of LPHAs provide a variety of clinical preventive services, such as adult and child immunizations and blood pressure screening. Because of their role in ensuring community health, LPHAs are considered a source of local expertise on health issues. Their credibility regarding tobacco and other health and prevention issues is high, and they can therefore play a strong role in educating both the general public and local policy makers about tobacco control issues.


Coupled with broad-based grassroots support and effective advocacy efforts, the public education provided by LPHAs is a critical element of successful local tobacco control policy initiatives. According to past experiences of communities throughout the United States, grassroots advocacy and strong community support have shown themselves to be cornerstones of successful tobacco control policy initiatives. Local health board members are ideal allies for grassroots tobacco control coalitions working on local policy initiatives; they act as the community’s voice and its avenue to set local policy pertaining to the community environment. Because of their role in policy making, local health boards are in a unique position to promote or enact strong and effective clean indoor air, youth access and outdoor advertising regulations in their localities.

Both NACCHO and NALBOH believe this monograph represents a valuable tool for those local public health professionals working on tobacco control issues—issues that are of vital importance to local public health practitioners because of their capability to help reduce tobacco use in their communities. This monograph discusses state and local policies and regulations designed to reduce tobacco use among both adults and adolescents, and it provides a snapshot of the progress that has been made by LPHAs and local boards of health. Some of the findings contained in this volume also raise serious concerns about policy trends that may be detrimental to the goal of reducing tobacco use at the local level.

Of particular concern to NACCHO and NALBOH constituencies has been the significant increase in state laws that preempt local jurisdictions from enacting stronger, more comprehensive laws. The tobacco companies have promoted statewide preemptive legislation as a means of stripping local health authorities of their ability to enact local tobacco control regulations. In order to conceal the source of this political effort, the tobacco industry tends to interfere by using front groups and trade associations to oppose local tobacco control policies.

In the mid-1980s, faced with an increasing number of effective, local anti-tobacco ordinances, the tobacco industry quickly realized that preemption was the most effective method for countering local tobacco control policies. By 1998, a total of 30 states had enacted some form of legislation that precluded local jurisdictions in those states from enacting more stringent laws. These preemptive laws included 14 that preempted some or all clean indoor air ordinances, 22 that preempted some or all youth access ordinances, and 17 that preempted some or all tobacco advertising and pro-

Cumulative Number of Local Tobacco-Control Ordinances Preempted by State Laws by Year Preemptive Law Became Effective—United States, 1982-1998



motion ordinances (see figure above). By comparison, only three states had any form of preemption legislation on the books just 10 years earlier. Only one state, Maine, has ever successfully overturned preemption in a state law once it was enacted, and that law was limited to ordinances restricting tobacco displays.

There is also concern about the significant drop-off in the number of clear indoor air ordinances enacted during the latter part of the 1990s. To be sure, some of the drop-off can be attributed to industry success in convincing state legislators to enact preemptive state laws. In addition, local jurisdictions have enacted ordinances covering single issues like youth access or advertising and promotion, to the detriment of clean indoor air concerns. While each of these issues is important, a significant body of research clearly demonstrates the broader public health importance of clean indoor air legislation. Not only does such legislation protect nonsmokers from a documented health risk, but research clearly shows that smoke-free public places, especially workplaces, provide a more supportive environment for smokers to quit. Even the tobacco industry's own internal research has shown this. For example, a Philip Morris study that followed some 25,000 smokers over time found that those working in a smoke-free work environment experienced an 84 percent higher quit rate than those facing no or minimal smoking restrictions.

In light of findings like these, a considerable value can be placed on the compilation of local and regional tobacco control ordinance information, such as that found in this monograph. It is for this reason that NACCHO and NALBOH have begun to expand their roles beyond the efforts to pro-

mote effective public health policy and education. Both organizations recently began collaborating with the American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation (ANRF)—a major provider of local ordinance information for this monograph.

In early 1999, NACCHO, NALBOH, and the ANRF joined together with the Office on Smoking and Health at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC-OSH) and with researchers from the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). The organizations began discussing how they could work together to improve surveillance and analysis of local tobacco control ordinances. Results thus far have been promising. The NACCHO and NALBOH ordinance solicitation effort has substantially expanded the coverage of ANRF's database. The effort has also provided an exciting opportunity to nurture relationships between local public health agencies, local boards of health, and the ANRF.

As local public health practitioners, we all need to begin to think comprehensively if the problem of tobacco use is to be solved. Weak ordinances and ordinances that only address one aspect of a problem will never prove to be as effective as more comprehensive ordinances designed to reach both adults and children. Working together with grassroots advocates and local board-of-health members, the tobacco industry's influence can be countered.

Stephanie B. C. Bailey, M.D., M.S.H.S.A.
NACCHO President

Vaughn Manlin Upshaw, Dr.Ph., Ed.D.
NALBOH President

Michael C. Caldwell, M.D., M.P.H.
**NACCHO Tobacco Prevention
and Control Committee**

John C. Saccenti, M.S., Ed.Spec., PROF. Dip.
NALBOH Tobacco Committee

Acknowledgements

State and Local Legislative Action to Reduce Tobacco Use was developed under the editorial direction of **Donald R. Shopland**, Coordinator, Smoking and Tobacco Control Program (STCP), National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland. The editors were **Robin Hobart**, M.P.P., M.P.H., Co-Director, American Nonsmokers' Rights (ANR) Foundation, Berkeley, California, and **David M. Burns**, M.D., Professor of Medicine, School of Medicine, University of California San Diego, San Diego, California. The managing editor was **Richard H. Amacher**, KBM Group, Inc., Silver Spring, Maryland.

This research was supported in part by funds provided by the Cigarette and Tobacco Surtax Fund of the State of California through the Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program of the University of California, Grant Number 6SP-0454.

Special recognition is due to **Mark Pertschuk** and **Walt Bilofsky**, Board Members, ANR Foundation, for creating the database of local tobacco control ordinances on which this volume is based, and to **Leonard Casey**, Director of Operations, for maintaining the database.

The editors and STCP staff members gratefully acknowledge the many researchers and authors who made this monograph possible. Attributions for each chapter are as follows:

Section I	The Role of Public Policy Change in Tobacco Control. Current State of the Science	Robin Hobart, M.P.P., M.P.H. Co-Director American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation Berkeley, CA
		Donald R. Shopland Coordinator Smoking and Tobacco Control Program (STCP) National Cancer Institute Bethesda, MD
		David Shields, Ph.D. Associate Director American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation Berkeley, CA

Section II

**State Laws and
Local Ordinances
to Reduce
Tobacco Use**

Cynthia Hallett, M.P.H.
Associate Director
American Nonsmokers'
Rights Foundation
Berkeley, CA

David M. Burns, M.D.
Professor of Medicine
School of Medicine
University of California
San Diego
San Diego, CA

Leonard Casey
Director of Operations
American Nonsmokers'
Rights Foundation
Berkeley, CA

Holly Senn, M.L.I.S.
Senior Policy Analyst
American Nonsmokers'
Rights Foundation
Berkeley, CA

Maggie Leighninger
Policy Analyst
American Nonsmokers'
Rights Foundation
Berkeley, CA

Robin Hobart, M.P.P., M.P.H.
Co-Director
American Nonsmokers'
Rights Foundation
Berkeley, CA

Kathryn B. Gower, B.A.
Statistical Assistant
Tobacco Control
Policies Project
University of California
San Diego
San Diego, CA

Cassandra E. Welch
Manager of State Government
Relations
American Lung Association
Government Relations Office
Washington, DC

Section III	Workplace Smoking Restrictions, Rules About Smoking in the Home, and Attitudes Toward Smoking Restrictions in Public Places.	Kathryn B. Gower, B.A. Statistical Assistant Tobacco Control Policies Project University of California San Diego San Diego, CA
	<i>National and State-Specific Estimates from the Current Population Survey</i>	David M. Burns, M.D. Professor of Medicine School of Medicine University of California San Diego San Diego, CA
		Thomas G. Shanks, M.P.H., M.S. Principal Statistician Tobacco Control Policies Project University of California San Diego San Diego, CA
		Jerry W. Vaughn, B.S. Programmer/Analyst Tobacco Control Policies Project University of California San Diego San Diego, CA
		Christy M. Anderson, B.S. Statistician Tobacco Control Policies Project University of California San Diego San Diego, CA
		Donald R. Shopland Coordinator Smoking and Tobacco Control Program (STCP) National Cancer Institute Bethesda, MD

Introduction

This volume is the third report released by the National Cancer Institute (NCI) focusing on trends in local tobacco-control ordinances. It is the second volume of its type to be included in the STCP monograph series, and it represents a significant departure in content from its predecessors in two important ways. The first report, published in 1989, focused exclusively on local clean indoor air laws—the predominant type of local tobacco control ordinance at that time. By 1993, when the second volume on the topic was published, communities had begun adopting ordinances designed to restrict youth access to tobacco products; therefore, the 1993 monograph reported on both clean indoor air and youth access provisions. The latest additions to the lexicon of local tobacco control ordinance development are restrictions on tobacco advertising and promotion. In keeping with these national trends, this current volume identifies, in matrix form, all known local tobacco control ordinances in the United States that have one or more of the following provisions—clean indoor air, youth access, or restrictions on tobacco advertising and promotion.

In addition to an expanded collection of information regarding local ordinances, this volume also contains detailed national and state estimates from NCI's Tobacco Use Supplement to the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) for 1992/93 and 1995/96. Data from the CPS are presented in considerable detail and include both national and state-specific data on three major areas: workplace smoking policies; rules about smoking in the home; and attitudes and support for smoking restrictions for various public settings—restaurants, hospitals, indoor work areas, bars/cocktail lounges, indoor sporting events, and indoor shopping malls.

The local ordinance information contained in this volume was developed for the National Cancer Institute by the American Nonsmokers' Rights (ANR) Foundation. The research was supported in part by funds provided by the Cigarette and Tobacco Surtax Fund of the State of California through the Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program of the University of California, Grant Number 6SP-0454. This publication covers ordinances adopted through December 1998. Given the lag time involved in identifying, collecting, and analyzing ordinances, data for 1998 will most certainly reflect an undercount of the total number of local tobacco control ordinances adopted that year.

The ANR Foundation has maintained a database of local tobacco-control ordinance provisions since 1985. The database is a unique resource for public health advocates and researchers; to date it is the only national comprehensive collection of local ordinances maintained for any public health issue. The database contains both ordinances adopted by local municipal and county bodies, and regulations adopted by local boards of health.

Staff members of the ANR Foundation identify, track, and collect ordinance information in a variety of ways. Information specialists monitor electronic and print media sources for news clips. Useful sources include newsgroups, e-mail list servers, public health journals and newsletters, tobacco industry journals, and smokers' rights newsletters—the Tobacco Institute's annual legislative report on local ordinances has always been a particularly rich source of information.

The Foundation also solicits ordinance information through the use of biannual mailings sent to individuals and organizations in all 50 states. Those surveyed include local and state nonsmokers' rights groups, local and state health departments, county health officers and local boards of health, voluntary health agencies, and state/county associations and city leagues.

All of the collected ordinance information is analyzed using a standard evaluation instrument before being included in the ANR database.

MONOGRAPH ORGANIZATION This monograph is divided into four major sections. Section I presents a discussion of the background, effects, and industry responses to local tobacco control ordinance development in the United States.

Section II presents local ordinance data taken from the ANR Foundation's database. The data are broken down into three major categories—clean indoor air ordinances, youth access restrictions, and tobacco advertising and promotion restrictions. For each category, this section includes a summary table of the total number of ordinances for each state, and one or more listings of the individual ordinances presented by state and community. The summary tables present only those states that have local communities with applicable ordinances.

This section also includes five maps prepared by the Tobacco Control Policies Project at the University of California, San Diego. The maps are designed to give a visual overview of certain state laws and local ordinances, allowing for direct state-to-state comparisons of the levels of restriction required by law. Presenting the ordinances on a map also allows for the communities with strong tobacco control laws to stand out, especially if the state has weak or non-existent tobacco control laws.

The data used to create the maps were obtained from two sources. The state data were taken from *State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues (SLATI)*, American Lung Association, 1997 and are current through Dec 31, 1997. The local ordinance data were taken from the National Matrix of Local Ordinances, maintained by the ANR Foundation. The local ordinance data as presented in the maps are current through December 31, 1997.

The appendix to Section II presents four tables summarizing information on state tobacco control laws. The tables cover state laws that restrict smoking in public places; age restrictions for the sale of tobacco products; state laws that restrict tobacco sales through vending machines; and state restrictions on the distribution of tobacco product samples. The state data in these tables were taken from the 1998 SLATI report.

Section III presents nine tables containing a variety of state-specific and national estimates from NCI's Tobacco Use Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS) for the survey periods 1992/93 and 1995/96. Data are presented in both tabular form and in 24 state maps designed to present shifting public opinion in a more visual and comprehensive format.

Section IV concludes the monograph with four model ordinances designed to help local jurisdictions enact effective clean indoor air, youth access, and advertising restrictions.

Section I:

**The Role of Public Policy
Change in Tobacco Control.
Current State of the Science**

*Robin Hobart, Donald R. Shopland, David Shields,
Cynthia Hallett, David M. Burns*

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES IN SECTION I

List of Tables

Table 1	Health Effects Associated with Exposure to Environmental Tobacco Smoke (From California EPA Report)	13
Table 2	Percentage of Indoor Workers Covered by a Smoke-free Workplace Policy in 1993 and 1996 by State, and Relative Change (Percent) Between the Two Time Periods, Based on Current Population Survey—1992/93 and 1995/96	29
Table 3	Domestic Cigarette Advertising and Promotion Expenditures—1996 & 1997 (Thousands of Dollars)	43

List of Figures

Figure 1	Trends in 30-day Prevalence of Cigarette Smoking for Eighth, Tenth, and Twelfth Graders	14
Figure 2	Prevalence of Current Tobacco Use Among 9-12th Grade Students, by Type of Product and Gender—United States 1997	15
Figure 3	Local Ordinance Provisions Enacted Per Year: Youth Access/Clean Indoor Air/Advertising Restrictions	20
Figure 4	Public Support for Smoking Restrictions in Various Public Places—United States 1996	25
Figure 5	Tobacco Institute Advertisement	26
Figure 6	The 100% Smoke-free Restaurant Ordinance in Force in Beverly Hills did not Reduce Sales by 30% as the Tobacco Industry had Suggested; Rather, it had No Significant Effect on Sales	27
Figure 7a	Differences in Smoke-free Workplace Policy Coverage: Food Service Workers Compared to All Other Workers—CPS 1995/96	31
Figure 7b	Among Workers Reporting No Smoking is Allowed in their Work Area, Percent Reporting that Someone has Smoked in Their Work Area in the Past 2 Week—CPS 1995/96	31

Figure 8	Number of Communities Adopting Ordinances with Major Smoke-free Provisions33
Figure 9	Number of Communities Passing Major Youth Access Provisions by Year38
Figure 10	Number of Ordinances Containing Advertising Restrictions by Year42
Figure 11	Organizational Chart of Philip Morris, Inc. Front Groups in California50
Figure 12a	Cumulative Number of Local Tobacco-Control Ordinances Preempted by State Laws by Year Preemptive Law Became Effective—United States, 1982-199855
Figure 12b	Cumulative Number of States with Preemptive Clauses—United States, 1982-199855

THE PROBLEM

CLEAN INDOOR AIR

Tobacco smoke contains carcinogens, toxins, and irritants that cause disease risks proportionate to the intensity and duration of exposure. Exposure of nonsmokers to tobacco smoke in the general environment—particularly enclosed indoor environments—results in irritation and annoyance, causes lung cancer and heart disease in adults, and causes asthma, bronchitis, pneumonia, and chronic ear problems in children.

Concerns about environmental tobacco smoke (ETS) exposure were first raised by Surgeon General Jesse Steinfeld. In January 1971, the Surgeon General suggested that even low-dose exposure to a carcinogen as powerful as tobacco smoke was a potential public health risk for nonsmokers (Steinfeld, 1972). After more than 20 years of scientific inquiry, Dr. Steinfeld's warning has been extensively validated and documented, and there is no longer any doubt that exposure to ETS is a cause of death and disease among nonsmokers.

Early efforts to restrict exposure of nonsmokers to ETS were driven by the irritation and annoyance created by exposure to cigarette smoke. However, by the 1970s it was increasingly clear that ETS exposure also placed vulnerable individuals at increased risk. Infants and children of smoking parents were shown to be at increased risk of respiratory problems, and individuals with pre-existing heart and lung disease had functional impairment following exposure to ETS (U.S. DHEW, 1975 & 1979).

In the early 1980s, a concern was raised that ETS exposure could also cause serious illness in otherwise healthy adults. In 1981, three independent epidemiological studies on lung cancer in nonsmoking wives who lived with smoking husbands were published (Garfinkle, 1981; Hirayama, 1981; Trichopoulos *et al.*, 1981). Two of the studies observed an increased risk for lung cancers and demonstrated an increased risk with increased levels of smoking by the husband. In 1982, when Dr. C. Everett Koop issued his first report as U.S. Surgeon General (U.S. DHHS, 1982), an assessment of the then available scientific evidence on ETS was included. While the report did not find the evidence sufficiently compelling to conclude that a causal connection existed, it warned that involuntary smoking could indeed pose a carcinogenic risk to the nonsmoker and that individuals should avoid exposure to ambient tobacco smoke to the greatest extent possible (U.S. DHHS, 1982).

By 1986—the year Dr. Koop issued his report, *The Health Consequences of Involuntary Smoking*—the number of studies of ETS exposure and lung cancer had risen to 13. Any genuine controversy over whether ETS could cause disease in nonsmokers ended in 1986 with the publication of a review by the National Research Council (NRC, 1986) and the Surgeon General's

report on the health consequences of involuntary smoking (U.S. DHHS, 1986). The Surgeon General's report concluded the following:

"Involuntary smoking is a cause of disease, including lung cancer, in healthy nonsmokers.

The children of parents who smoke compared with the children of nonsmoking parents have an increased frequency of respiratory infections, increased respiratory symptoms, and slightly smaller rates of increase in lung function as the lung matures.

The simple separation of smokers and nonsmokers within the same air space may reduce, but does not eliminate, the exposure of nonsmokers to environmental tobacco smoke."

These two reports contributed to a surge in efforts to protect nonsmokers from the health effects of ETS through legislative and policy changes, and by far the most significant trend was toward the passage of local clean indoor air ordinances. By the fall of 1989, 397 ordinances limiting smoking in workplaces, restaurants, or other places had been enacted (Pertschuk and Shopland, 1989).

With the growing recognition that tobacco smoke poses a significant health threat to individuals other than the smoker, Congress and federal health and regulatory agencies were increasingly asked to take action to protect the public. The General Services Administration issued new rules protecting workers and visitors in all federal buildings, and in 1988 Congress banned smoking on all domestic airline flights with a duration of 6 hours or less, resulting in virtually smoke-free air travel for all but a fraction of 1 percent of all flights within the United States.

As the evidence linking ETS to adverse outcomes in nonsmokers increased, many businesses and employee groups began implementing smoking restrictions at their work sites. The Administrative Management Society Foundation, which has conducted a small, annual smoking policy survey since 1980, found that the number of companies with smoking policies increased from 16 percent in 1980 to 60 percent in 1988. By 1988, a quarter of the companies responding reported smoke-free facilities (Administrative Management Society, 1989; Gerlach *et al.*, 1997).

1992 Report of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

ETS and Lung Cancer

One of the more significant actions by a federal agency occurred in 1990, when the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) began a formal risk assessment to determine whether ETS meets the Carcinogen Risk Assessment guidelines for classifying a compound as carcinogenic. By the time the EPA issued its draft report, *Respiratory Health Effects of Passive Smoking: Lung Cancer and Other Disorders* in May 1992, findings from 26 case-control and 4 prospective cohort studies from 8 different countries comprised the available scientific evidence on ETS and lung cancer. All 4 cohort studies and 20 of the 26 case-control studies observed an elevated risk for lung cancer in never-smokers exposed to ETS (NCI, 1993b).

Many of these studies also showed a dose-response effect; that is, the greater the level of exposure, the greater the lung cancer risk. The overwhelming weight of the evidence permitted the EPA to conclude that ETS belongs in the category of compounds classified as Group A (known human) carcinogens, a category reserved for only the most toxic of compounds regulated by the EPA, such as radon, asbestos, and benzene (NCI, 1993b).

ETS and Children In addition to lung cancer, the EPA report examined the issue of ETS and respiratory diseases and disorders in children and concluded that ETS exposure was causally associated with (1) increased risk of lower respiratory tract infections such as bronchitis and pneumonia; (2) increased prevalence of middle-ear effusion; (3) a small but statistically significant reduction in lung function; and (4) decreased rate of lung growth (NCI, 1993b).

The report further estimated that ETS contributes to between 150,000 and 300,000 lower respiratory infections annually among infants less than 18 months of age, resulting in between 7,000 and 15,000 hospitalizations annually. Of equal importance, the EPA estimates that ETS is causally related to additional episodes and increased severity of pre-existing asthma in children and that it exacerbates symptoms in approximately 20 percent of the estimated 2 to 5 million asthmatic children annually. The EPA report leaves open the question of whether ETS is directly related to asthma incidence in children who have not previously exhibited the disease, terming the evidence “suggestive but not conclusive” (NCI, 1993b). Nonetheless, ETS from parents who smoke half a pack or more daily may contribute to up to 26,000 new cases of asthma annually.

In a 1998 ruling, which the EPA is appealing, North Carolina District Court Judge William L. Osteen vacated the EPA's classification of ETS as a known human carcinogen but did not invalidate any of the EPA's findings regarding the role of ETS in respiratory problems among children.

ETS and Coronary Heart Disease In early 1991, researchers at the University of California at San Francisco reviewed the existing studies on ETS and coronary heart disease (CHD) (Glantz and Parmley, 1991). After an examination of 13 epidemiological studies, the investigators concluded that ETS was causally associated with CHD in nonsmokers and that such exposure may be responsible for 10 times more deaths annually than those attributable to ETS-induced lung cancer. A meta-analysis of 19 studies available by 1997 (Law *et al.*, 1997) estimated a 23 percent increased risk of ischemic heart disease as a direct effect of a nonsmoker's ETS exposure from living with a spouse who smokes. More recently He *et al.* (1999) found almost identical results in their meta-analysis of 18 epidemiological (10 cohort and 8 case-control) studies that met pre-stated inclusion criteria. These investigators found an overall, statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) relative risk (RR) of 1.25 for coronary heart disease (CHD) among nonsmokers exposed to ETS. In the analysis, ETS was consistently associated with an increased risk of CHD in cohort studies (RR = 1.21), in case-control studies (RR = 1.51), in men (RR = 1.22), in women (RR = 1.24), in those exposed at home (RR = 1.17),

and those exposed at work (RR = 1.11). A significant dose-response relationship was identified for nonsmokers exposed to less than 20 cigarettes per day (RR = 1.23) compared to those exposed to 20 or greater per day (RR = 1.31). When the analysis was confined to the 10 studies that adjusted for other important heart disease risk factors, such as age, sex, blood pressure, body weight, and serum cholesterol, the overall relative risk was 1.26 ($p < 0.001$).

The California Environmental Protection Agency Report In September of 1997, the California Environmental Protection Agency released a comprehensive review of the total range of health effects associated with ETS; the report concluded that

“The epidemiological data, from prospective and case-control studies conducted in diverse populations, in males and females and in western and eastern countries, are supportive of a causal association between ETS exposure from spousal smoking and coronary heart disease (CHD) mortality in nonsmokers.”

The 1997 California EPA report also reviewed other health risks associated with smoking and concluded that ETS exposure was causally or suggestively associated with the diseases listed in Table 1.

The Australian National Health and Medical Research Council also reviewed the evidence on the health effects of passive smoking in 1997 and concluded, “The scientific evidence shows that passive smoking causes lower respiratory tract illness in children and lung cancer in adults and contributes to the symptoms of asthma in children. Passive smoking may also cause coronary heart disease in adults” (NHMRC, 1997). A similar review of all smoking related illness was conducted by the British Independent Scientific Committee on Smoking and Health (ISCOSH) in 1998, and the section on ETS exposure stated that ETS exposure is a cause of lung cancer, ischemic heart disease, serious respiratory illness and asthmatic attacks in children, sudden infant death syndrome, and middle ear disease in children (ISCOSH, 1998).

Multiple reviews conducted by medical and governmental organizations over the last 12 years leave no doubt that environmental tobacco smoke causes disease in nonsmokers and is particularly dangerous for children. Regulation of smoking in indoor environments clearly stands on a strong foundation of scientific support.

YOUTH TOBACCO USE Tobacco use trends among youth continue to be a problem in the United States. According to a study conducted by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), 70.2 percent of all high school students had used some form of tobacco in their lifetime and 42.7 percent reported they were currently using it at the time of the survey in 1997 (CDC, 1998).

Cigarettes Nearly 90 percent of all current adult smokers began smoking as children or adolescents (U.S. DHHS, 1994). Each day in the United States, approximately 6,000 youth try smoking for the first time and 3,000 become regular smokers (CDC, 1998a). Of these new smokers, between one-third

Table 1
Health Effects Associated with Exposure to Environmental Tobacco Smoke (From California EPA Report)

Effects Causally Associated with ETS Exposure

Developmental Effects

Fetal Growth: Low birthweight or small for gestational age
Sudden Infant Death Syndrome (SIDS)

Respiratory Effects

Acute lower respiratory tract infections in children
(*e.g.*, bronchitis and pneumonia)
Asthma induction and exacerbation in children
Chronic respiratory symptoms in children
Eye and nasal irritation in adults
Middle ear infections in children

Carcinogenic Effects

Lung Cancer
Nasal Sinus Cancer

Cardiovascular Effects

Heart disease mortality
Acute and chronic coronary heart disease morbidity

Effects with Suggestive Evidence of a Causal Association with ETS Exposure

Developmental Effects

Spontaneous abortion
Adverse impact on cognition and behavior

Respiratory Effects

Exacerbation of cystic fibrosis
Decreased pulmonary function


Carcinogenic Effects

Cervical cancer

(CDC, 1996b) and one-half (Thun *et al.*, 1995 & 1997) will die prematurely because of their smoking unless they quit.

The smoking rate among high school seniors decreased 11 percent from 1977 to 1991, but the rate increased each year from 1991 to 1997 before dipping again slightly in 1998. Despite an intense focus on youth access regulations during the 1990s, the daily smoking rate rose from 18.5 percent in 1991 to 22.4 percent in 1998 among high school seniors

Figure 1
Trends in 30-day Prevalence of Cigarette Smoking for Eighth, Tenth, and Twelfth Graders




Source: *The Monitoring the Future Study, The University of Michigan*

(Johnston, 1998). Smoking experimentation by younger students increased even more sharply. Over the same 7-year interval (1991-1998), the proportion of students reporting having smoked within 30 days of being surveyed rose by nearly 50 percent among 8th and 10th grade students (Figure 1; Johnston, 1998). Moreover, teen smoking rose in virtually every demographic group: urban and rural, males and females, all socioeconomic levels, those bound for college and those not, and among those in all major racial/ethnic groups.

The earlier a child begins to use tobacco, the less likely that he or she will be able to quit, and children are beginning to smoke at younger ages than ever before (Johnston, 1996). Young smokers often underestimate the harmful effects of their tobacco use and do not recognize that they quickly move from experimentation to addiction. In a National Institute on Drug Abuse study, 95 percent of daily smokers in high school predicted they would not be smoking 5 years hence, yet 75 percent were still smoking in follow-up studies 7 to 9 years later (Johnston *et al.*, 1987).

Smokeless Tobacco An increasingly severe problem is the use of smokeless tobacco (*i.e.*, moist snuff and chewing tobacco), especially among white male adolescents and young adults. By 1996, almost one in five male high school students in the United States reported smokeless tobacco use (CDC, 1996a; U.S. DHHS, 1998b). Local surveys typically reveal that 40 to 60 percent of

Figure 2
Prevalence of Current Tobacco Use* Among 9-12th Grade Students, by Type of Product and Gender—United States 1997



*Current Use = any use in one or more of the 30 days preceding the study
 Source: CDC, 1998b

young males have tried smokeless tobacco (Boyd *et al.*, 1987). First experimentation often occurs between ages 10 and 12 (Boyd and Glover, 1989).

The health risks of smokeless tobacco use include oral cancer and various other diseases of the mouth, gums, and throat (NCI, 1992). A Swedish study has suggested that smokeless tobacco use also increases the risk of heart disease and stroke (Bolinder *et al.*, 1994).

Cigars

Since 1993, cigar use has also risen dramatically, both in the general population and among youth (NCI, 1998). Between 1993 and 1998, cigar consumption in the United States increased by more than 50 percent, with consumption of large cigars increasing by more than 70 percent. A review of the health effects of cigar use published by the National Cancer Institute in 1998 concluded that cigars are associated with an increased mortality risk for a number of cancer sites, including cancer of the oral cavity, larynx, esophagus, and lung. It also concluded that regular cigar smokers are at an increased risk for coronary heart disease and chronic obstructive lung disease, especially if they inhale (NCI, 1998). A national survey conducted by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation found that 37 percent of male adolescents and 16 percent of female adolescents had smoked at least one cigar in the past year (CDC, 1997). In the 1997 CDC study, 31.2 percent of male high school students and 10.8 percent of female high school students reported smoking cigars on one or more of the 30 days preceding the survey (Figure 2; CDC, 1998b).

ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION Between 1970 and 1994, adult smoking dropped nearly 32 percent, a decline that posed a significant economic challenge to the tobacco industry. However, during the same period, expenditures for the advertisement and promotion of cigarettes increased more than 1,500 percent. The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) reports that in 1997, the major cigarette manufacturers reported an increase of \$522 million in advertising and promotional spending over the previous year (FTC, 1999). Total advertising and promotional expenses for the industry now exceed \$5.6 billion, an increase of 11 percent over 1996. While spending has remained slightly below the \$6.0 billion level reported in 1993, it has increased annually since 1987, except for the 1-year period between 1993 and 1994 when it declined. Though denied by tobacco industry representatives, evidence is overwhelming that much of their advertising is targeted at the youth market (Evans, 1995; Pierce *et al.*, 1991; U.S. DHHS, 1994). Clearly, the marketing strategies are working. Approximately 6,000 minors begin experimenting with cigarettes each day (U.S. DHHS, 1994).

Numerous studies have demonstrated the link between advertising and youth smoking initiation (U.S. DHHS, 1994). Tobacco marketing relies heavily on image advertising, a technique that is particularly effective with adolescents because of their heightened sensitivity to identity issues (IOM, 1994). Adolescents, in numbers disproportionate to those of adults, buy the most advertised brands of cigarettes (CDC, 1994). There is also evidence that restrictions on tobacco advertising and promotion can reduce youth smoking rates (Smee, 1993).

No one escapes the marketing efforts of the tobacco companies, but specific promotions and advertising campaigns aim at distinct market segments. In addition to youth, tobacco companies have designed campaigns to attract women (O'Keefe and Pollay, 1996), specific racial/ethnic groups (Moore *et al.*, 1996; Robinson *et al.*, 1992), blue-collar workers (Davis, 1987), and the gay/lesbian community (Goebel, 1994).

Advertising aimed at girls and young women typically links images of tall, thin, elegant, and attractive young women with cigarettes, particularly "slim" cigarettes. The result has been a significant uptake in smoking by teenage girls (O'Keefe and Pollay, 1996; Pierce *et al.*, 1994). This approach continues a half-century of cigarette marketing aimed at women, an approach that continues to take advantage of changing social roles (Brandt, 1996). The advertising, however, not only affects the consumer directly, it affects many groups indirectly as well. Girls and women, for example, are affected by the fact that the women's magazines that carry advertisements for tobacco products are less likely to carry articles that address the harmful effects of smoking (Warner *et al.*, 1992).

Surveys conducted in cities throughout the United States indicate that communities with large minority populations have many more tobacco and alcohol billboards than neighboring communities with fewer minority residents. In Baltimore, Maryland, for example, a survey revealed that 20 percent of the billboards in predominantly White communities advertised tobacco or alcohol, whereas 76 percent of the billboards in predominantly

African American neighborhoods advertised these products (Quinn, 1990). A study of tobacco advertising in Massachusetts found that the proportion of retail storefront advertising dedicated to tobacco advertising was greater in high-minority communities than in low-minority communities (MA TCP, 1998). The differences are especially pronounced when the communities surveyed are of differing socioeconomic status. Lower income communities have been shown to have a greater number of tobacco and alcohol ads than nearby, more affluent communities.

Advertising aimed at disadvantaged minority youth tends to emphasize such themes as glamour, sex, rebelliousness, social mobility, success, and escape. These themes, which have broad youth appeal in general, play especially to the social needs of disadvantaged youth (Robinson *et al.*, 1992). Moreover, many smaller minority-owned media—as well as business, civic, and cultural organizations within minority communities—are highly dependent on tobacco-industry revenue. As a result, many minority-owned magazines and newspapers are less likely to carry stories on the health effects of smoking or ETS (Tuckson, 1989), and many local minority leaders are reluctant to challenge the tobacco industry's influence in their communities (Robinson *et al.*, 1992). Strategies for dealing with tobacco influences in these communities need to take into account their specific economic, social, and cultural dynamics.

Lesbians and gays also face tobacco targeting. Wishing to avoid controversy that may alienate their more conservative customers, marketing to the gay community is often subtle or hidden in layers of meaning (Goebel, 1994). Ads often feature dual-level messages that can be understood in one way by heterosexuals, but in a different way by gay readers. A recent example is a Virginia Slims ad that features a heterosexual couple walking down a path with the woman glancing backward over her shoulder where another woman is walking. The caption: "If you always follow the straight and narrow, you'll never know what's around the corner."

BACKGROUND


HISTORY OF LOCAL TOBACCO CONTROL ORDINANCES The first local tobacco control ordinances were promoted by nonsmokers' rights activists who objected to breathing secondhand smoke (NCI, 1991). For many years, local tobacco control ordinances focused almost exclusively on clean indoor air; ordinances restricting youth access to tobacco and tobacco advertising and promotion were not passed in significant numbers until the 1990s. Until the late 1980s, local tobacco control ordinance development was largely a grass roots affair championed by local and state nonsmokers' rights groups, in some instances in partnership with local health departments or local voluntary health association units such as the American Cancer Society, American Heart Association, and American Lung Association (Bierer and Rigotti, 1992; Hanauer *et al.*, 1986; U.S. DHHS 1989).

The public health community began to get involved in policy development in the mid- to late 1980s, reflecting a philosophical shift from approaches that addressed individual behavior to more comprehensive approaches designed to change the environment and social norms (IOM, 1988). State tobacco excise tax programs passed by voters in California [Prop 99, 1988] and Massachusetts [Question One, 1992] encouraged and supported local policy development in their respective states. In 1991, the National Cancer Institute launched its 17-state American Stop Smoking Intervention Study (ASSIST) demonstration project; the framework of ASSIST emphasizes the importance of policy interventions to tobacco control (NCI, 1991). The Initiatives to Mobilize for the Prevention And Control of Tobacco Use (IMPACT) program, started by the Office on Smoking and Health in 1993, also endorses policy development as integral to the success of any tobacco control program.

The results of this change in focus, and the dramatically increased infrastructure and resources for tobacco control in the 1990s, have been mixed with regards to local ordinance development. Both California and Massachusetts experienced a virtual explosion in the number of local ordinances enacted following implementation of their respective dedicated state tobacco tax programs in the early 1990s. Several ASSIST states—most notably Minnesota, New Jersey, North Carolina (before preemption was adopted), and West Virginia—also experienced a marked increase in the rate of local ordinance enactment. Nonetheless, since the mid-1990s, the overall rate of local ordinance enactment has fallen off (Figure 3).

Advantages of Local Ordinance Development Local jurisdictions have been the innovators of and testing grounds for the development of effective tobacco control policies. The local level is where the strongest and most comprehensive tobacco control policies are enacted, and is where the greatest progress has been made (NCI, 1991; Samuels and Glantz, 1991;

Figure 3
Local Ordinance Provisions Enacted Per Year: Youth Access / Clean Indoor Air / Advertising Restrictions



Rigotti and Pashos, 1991). Local tobacco control ordinances enjoy the following advantages over federal and state legislation:

Ease of Enactment—Local legislation remains far easier to pass than state or federal tobacco control legislation (Moore *et al.*, 1994; Siegel *et al.*, 1997). Local elected officials are highly responsive and are more directly accountable to their constituents (Skolnik, 1995). In addition, the tobacco industry's influence and ability to control a legislative agenda is more powerful at the state and federal level than it is at the local level. Tobacco executives concede that their industry is relatively ineffective in preventing passage of strong tobacco control measures at the local level as compared to the state or federal levels (Flinn, 1991; Pertman, 1994; Pritchard, 1986).

A notable exception occurred in Maryland where, in 1995, the Maryland Occupational Safety and Health (MOSH) advisory board proposed sweeping new workplace smoking rules covering virtually all indoor workers in the state, including those working in bars and restaurants. A tobacco-industry-backed legal challenge successfully delayed implementation of the proposed MOSH regulation, and the Maryland state legislature quickly passed a state-wide law eliminating smoking for the vast majority of workers. However, the state law was not as stringent as the original MOSH proposal, as it exempted large segments of the hospitality industry. While the law eliminated smoking in restaurants without bars, those with bars could allow smoking and restrict it to the bar portion of the restaurant. Bars themselves were completely excluded from the legislation. Nonetheless, as a result of the 1995 Maryland state law, the percentage of indoor workers in Maryland employed in a smoke-free environment increased from 53 percent in 1993 to just over 84 percent in 1996—one of the highest rates of coverage in the nation.

Higher Level of Public Health Protections—Local ordinances are almost always stronger and more comprehensive than their corresponding state laws (U.S. DHHS, 1989; Siegel *et al.*, 1997). More than 110 local smoke-free ordinances had been passed in the United States before the first state law with smoke-free provisions was passed in Vermont in 1993.

Enforcement and Compliance—Local enforcement agencies are more accessible and are more likely to energetically enforce a law, compared to the often distant enforcement agencies for state or federal laws. City and county laws levy fines that go entirely to their own jurisdictions, whereas state fines may only share a percentage with the city or county. Research has also shown that employers' awareness of and support for local workplace ordinances tends to be high as well (Rigotti *et al.*, 1992 & 1994).

Community Education—Local ordinance development puts in motion an educational process of letters to the editor, press coverage, town hall meetings, and public hearings. Even if an ordinance fails to pass, the community will have been educated and informed on a variety of tobacco issues (Jacobson and Wasserman, 1997; Siegel *et al.*, 1997). More than one community has reported an increase in the number of voluntary smoke-free restaurant policies, even though a proposed ordinance has failed to pass

(e.g., La Crosse, WI; Oakland, CA). It is precisely this type of change in attitudes, knowledge, and social norms surrounding tobacco use that is the ultimate goal of tobacco control efforts to reduce death and disease caused by tobacco (U.S. DHHS, 1989; NCI, 1991).

Despite these advantages, some tobacco control advocates prefer state-level tobacco control laws, arguing that it is generally simpler and quicker to provide state-wide coverage than to enact protections one community at a time. However, by focusing on local ordinance development, two states—California and Massachusetts—have achieved public health protections for a significant proportion of their population in a relatively short period of time. There was an explosion of local smoke-free workplace ordinances in California beginning in 1990, and by 1993 nearly two-thirds (64.6 percent) of all indoor workers in California reported a smoke-free workplace (Patten *et al.*, 1995b). By early 1996 (and before Boston adopted a smoke-free ordinance in 1998), nearly 50 percent of the population in Massachusetts lived in communities covered by some kind of local restaurant ordinance (MA DOH, 1996).

HISTORY OF CLEAN INDOOR AIR LEGISLATION

The earliest laws restricting tobacco use (both local and state) were adopted as fire-safety measures and would not be considered tobacco control laws by today's standards (U.S. DHHS, 1989; Jacobson and Wasserman, 1997). The first modern tobacco control laws designed with the purpose of protecting nonsmokers from secondhand smoke appeared in the early 1970s (U.S. DHHS, 1986). In 1975, Minnesota became the first state to pass a comprehensive state Clean Indoor Air Act restricting smoking in public places, restaurants, and public and private workplaces. While the earliest clean indoor air laws were passed largely at the state level, progress began shifting to the local level by the early 1980s (NCI, 1991; Bierer and Rigotti, 1992). In 1977, Berkeley, California enacted the first modern local tobacco control ordinance limiting smoking in restaurants and other public places. Similar ordinances continued to pass during the late 1970s and early 1980s. These early ordinances typically restricted, but did not eliminate, smoking in public places, workplaces, and restaurants.

The 1986 Surgeon General's report on the health consequences of involuntary smoking greatly accelerated the passage of early tobacco control ordinances. By 1988, nearly 400 local ordinances had been enacted to restrict smoking throughout the United States (Pertschuk and Shopland, 1989).

In 1990, the Environmental Protection Agency released its draft *Risk Assessment on Environmental Tobacco Smoke (ETS)*, classifying ETS as a Group A carcinogen. Following this report, jurisdictions increasingly moved to adopt ordinances eliminating smoking in indoor environments, rather than restricting smoking to specified areas. In 1990, Lodi, California introduced an ordinance completely eliminating smoking in restaurants. Other cities and counties soon followed suit. Smoke-free ordinances either eliminate smoking in enclosed areas, or restrict it to enclosed rooms that are separately ventilated and directly exhausted to the outside to prevent the recirculation of ETS into smoke-free areas.

In keeping with the ever-growing body of evidence implicating ETS as a serious health hazard, the adoption of more restrictive clean indoor air ordinances has increased over time. For example, in 1984, there were no local ordinances completely eliminating smoking in restaurants or workplaces. In 1987, only one ordinance banned smoking in restaurants, while none did so in workplaces. In contrast, by December of 1998, 227 ordinances completely eliminated smoking in restaurants, 209 in workplaces, and of these, 155 eliminated smoking in both. Although the majority of these smoke-free ordinances have passed in California and Massachusetts, smoke-free ordinances have also been passed by local jurisdictions in Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Texas, and West Virginia.

Studies in both workplace and restaurant settings confirm that only those policies that require establishments to be 100 percent smoke-free (as opposed to requiring only partial restrictions) adequately protect nonsmokers from exposure to ETS (Patten *et al.*, 1995b; Brauer and Mannetje, 1998).

Despite continued high levels of support for restrictions on smoking in enclosed places, local clean indoor air ordinance development has fallen off sharply, following a record 180 new local clean indoor air ordinances adopted in 1993 (Figure 3).

Effects of Clean Indoor Air Ordinances The effects of clean indoor air ordinances are apparent in a variety of ways. With the passage of clean indoor air ordinances, the general health of the community improves and social norms about tobacco use change, all with no undue economic impact on the local business community.

Public Health Benefits—First and foremost, clean indoor air ordinances provide protection against exposure to environmental tobacco smoke (ETS), a known human carcinogen. The presence of a strong workplace ordinance significantly reduces nonsmokers' reported exposure to ETS in their workplace (Pierce *et al.*, 1994a). Between 1990 and 1993, the percentage of California workers reporting smoke-free workplaces increased from 35 to 64.6 percent (Patten *et al.*, 1995b). This increase was a direct result of local smoke-free ordinance development in California, where over 100 smoke-free workplace ordinances were enacted (MacDonald and Glantz, 1997). This trend has continued beyond 1993; data from the 1995/96 Current Population Survey show that 76 percent of California workers were employed in smoke-free environments by that time.

The health benefits gained through the implementation of clean indoor air policies are significant. A recent study of San Francisco bar employees found demonstrable improvements in their health status after California began implementing AB13, a statewide ban on smoking in bars and restaurants (Eisner *et al.*, 1998). Fifty-nine percent of bartenders reporting respiratory problems before the restrictions were implemented reported a reduction in symptoms 4 to 8 weeks after the ban took effect.

Not only do smoke-free policies protect against exposure to ETS, they also have a secondary benefit of decreasing smoking prevalence and con-

sumption. Studies of workplaces in California found that individuals in smoke-free workplaces had a lower smoking prevalence, and that continuing smokers in smoke-free workplaces had a lower consumption rate than individuals working where smoking was permitted (Woodruff *et al.*, 1993; Patten *et al.*, 1995a). Clean indoor air policies also offer promising results in reducing youth tobacco consumption rates (Wasserman *et al.*, 1991; Ohsfeldt *et al.*, 1998).

Studies conducted by the tobacco industry go even farther in their assessment of the impact of smoke-free workplace policies on the smoking behavior and consumption patterns of smokers. For example, in 1987 Philip Morris began tracking between 22,581 and 28,003 smokers from its Product Opinion Lab (POL) database in order to estimate the impact of workplace restrictions on industry sales (Philip Morris, Inc., 1992a). Major findings from this previously secret industry report are revealing:

“Total prohibition of smoking in the workplace strongly effects [sic] industry volume. Smokers facing these restrictions consume 11%-15% less than average and quit at a rate that is 84% higher than average.


Milder workplace restrictions, such as smoking only in designated areas, have much less impact on quitting rates and very little effect on consumption.”

Impact on Social Norms—For the past decade, major opinion polls have consistently shown that the public supports policies designed to reduce their ETS exposure in enclosed public places and workplaces (U.S. DHHS, 1986 & 1989; NCI, 1991; IOM, 1994). In fact, public support for smoking restrictions has consistently been ahead of enacted legislation (NCI, 1991), evidence that the tobacco industry’s well-funded opposition to smoking restrictions has had the desired effect on lawmakers.

Data from NCI’s Tobacco Use Supplement to the Current Population Survey clearly demonstrate the level of public support for restricting smoking in settings open to the public. The fraction of the adult population who think most public facilities should be smoke-free increased between 1993 and 1996, while the fraction who think smoking should be allowed in all areas remained extremely small, the only exception being bars and cocktail lounges. The data for 1996 are shown in Figure 4; more detailed information can be found in Section III, Table 8.

Economic Impact—The economic impact of smoke-free restaurant ordinances has been a subject of intense debate. The tobacco industry claims that smoke-free restaurant ordinances will lead to a marked decrease in business, usually of 20 to 30 percent. To date, however, all credible scientific studies of smoke-free restaurant ordinances have found no evidence of a negative economic impact. In fact, some studies, notably Hyland *et al.* (1999), found that taxable sales from eating and drinking establishments in New York City were up 2.1 percent compared with sales 2 years before the city’s smoke-free law took effect. In the rest of the state, in contrast, taxable sales from eating and drinking establishments declined 3.8 percent.

Figure 4
Public Support for Smoking Restrictions in Various Public Places—United States



Since 1993, numerous economic impact reports have been published indicating no negative impact on restaurant sales due to smoke-free ordinances (Bartosch and Pope, 1999; Hyland *et al.*, 1999; Goldstein and Sobel, 1998; Sciacca and Ratliff, 1998; Glantz and Smith, 1997; Cummings, 1997; CDC, 1995; Glantz and Smith, 1994; Maroney *et al.*, 1994). These studies have examined the impact of ordinances by reviewing sales tax data to determine the economic impact of smoke-free ordinances on businesses throughout the United States, including Arizona, California, Massachusetts, New York, North Carolina, and Texas. The claim that smoke-free restaurant ordinances are particularly harmful to communities dependent on tourism was recently examined and refuted in a study of tourism-related revenues in six cities and three states (Glantz and Charlesworth, 1999).

The tobacco industry has sponsored a score of economic impact surveys alleging severe losses of revenues as a result of smoke-free ordinances (KPMG, 1998; InContext, 1996; Price Waterhouse, 1993; Laventhol and Horwath, 1990). These analyses, which have been aggressively disseminated to elected officials and businesses, tend to rely on business owners' perceptions of the impact of smoke-free ordinances or predictions of future impact, or they look at a limited, non-random selection of data. This methodology is inherently subjective and does not accurately reflect the real impact of smoke-free restaurant ordinances on sales.

For example, pro-tobacco front groups surveyed restaurants in Beverly Hills, California, asking owners what they thought they had lost in sales, without substantiating claims by checking sales tax revenues. The survey's finding of a 30 percent perceived loss in business was used widely by the Tobacco Institute to oppose local ordinances in other jurisdictions

(Consumer Reports, May 1994). Figure 5 shows an ad typical of those run by the Tobacco Institute. But contrary to tobacco industry claims of a 30 percent reduction in sales, UCSF researchers found no such decline during the period the ordinance was in effect and found no increase in sales following its repeal 4 months later (Glantz and Smith, 1994). In fact, the actual impact of the Beverly Hills ordinance was a 2.4 percent gain in revenue during the time the smoke-free provisions were in effect (Figure 6).

There are several key components to review when evaluating an economic impact study. First, it should always rely on objective data such as sales tax receipts, which are an unbiased, accurate measure of revenue loss or gain. Studies should also include information about sales for several years before and after the implementation of a smoke-free ordinance to help identify underlying trends in sales each year. It is also important to look at comparisons—e.g. to compare restaurant sales with total retail sales or to restaurant sales in comparable cities. These comparisons help to identify general economic trends and do not look at the impact of an ordinance in a vacuum.

Impact on Tobacco Industry Sales—The tobacco industry has expressed considerable public concern over the claimed negative impacts of tobacco

Figure 5
Tobacco Institute Advertisement

What if they passed a law that took away 30% of your business?

What happens if your state legislature or city council bans smoking in restaurants?

You'll lose business. Maybe as much as 30 percent of your business, according to restaurant owners who have experienced such bans. Before a smoking ban was repealed in Beverly Hills, restaurants were expecting to lose a total of \$12 million in 1987 as a result.

Here's the real news, though. In a recent Gallup poll almost 20 percent of the U.S. population said they would not visit

a restaurant that prohibits smoking. Can you risk closing your doors to 20 percent of your customers?

The Tobacco Institute can help you make sure this never happens.

Write us and we'll send you information on how other restaurant groups have fought smoking bans. We'll help you develop ways to accommodate all your customers—smokers and non-smokers alike. And we'll help you ensure that your voice is heard when government takes up the issue.


The Tobacco Institute
1875 I Street Northwest
Washington, DC 20008

control regulations on other businesses and on the restaurant industry in particular. However, internal industry documents show that their real concerns lie with the regulations' effects on their own profit margins. A workplace smoking policy study conducted by Philip Morris, Inc. (1992a—the same study cited on page 24) clearly demonstrates that smoking restrictions represent both short- and long-term threats to the industry's bottom line. Two conclusions contained in that document are particularly noteworthy:


"From 1989 to 1991, the industry lost an estimated incremental 1.7% (9.5 billion units) due to increasing workplace restrictions. If these trends continue, the industry will lose an additional 1.3% to 1.9% (8.4 to 11.4 billion units) from 1991 to 1996.

If smoking were banned in all workplaces, the industry's average consumption would decline 8.7%-10.1% from 1991 levels and the quitting rate would increase 74%."

Yet another Philip Morris report found that smokers were facing more and more restrictive policies in the workplace and noted "that smokers who face 'designated areas' type restrictions are four times more likely to face

Figure 6

The 100% Smoke-free Restaurant Ordinance in Force in Beverly Hills did not Reduce Sales by 30% (Dashed Line with “TI [Tobacco Industry] Claim”), as the Tobacco Industry had Suggested; Rather, it had No Significant Effect on Sales



Note: Period of smoke-free ordinance is indicated by the solid triangles.
Source: Glantz and Smith, 1994.

total prohibition the following year as those facing no restrictions” (Philip Morris, Inc., 1992b). Clearly the trend of smoke-free workplaces has major ramifications for the economic viability of the tobacco industry.

Implementation and Enforcement Local clean indoor air laws are considered to be largely self-enforcing, that is, enforcement is not activated unless and until a complaint is made. Studies of local clean indoor ordinances in Massachusetts found that the workplace smoking restrictions were generally popular with business owners (Rigotti *et al.*, 1992 & 1994). A 3-year study of workplaces in California found that compliance with smoke-free policies was nearly 90 percent (Patten *et al.*, 1995a & b). In addition to the enforcement activities of receiving and responding to complaints, compliance is improved when implementation includes ongoing efforts to educate and inform business owners about the requirements of the ordinance (Rigotti *et al.*, 1992 & 1994; Pierce *et al.*, 1994a).

Workplace Smoking Policy Trends During the past decade, the prevalence of voluntary workplace smoking policies has increased, as has the restrictiveness of those policies (U.S. DHHS, 1989; Gerlach *et al.*, 1997). However, this trend is not evenly distributed. Larger employers are more likely to adopt a smoking policy than smaller employers (fewer than 100 employees), and workplaces in the manufacturing and processing industries are less likely to have a smoking policy (BNA, 1991; U.S. DHHS, 1989; Fielding and

Piserchia, 1989). The presence of a local clean indoor air ordinance greatly increases the probability that a workplace will adopt a workplace smoking policy (Pierce *et al.*, 1994a; Rigotti *et al.*, 1992 & 1994).

In a 1997 report of national workplace smoking policies based on the 1992/93 CPS Tobacco Use Supplement, 86.1 percent of indoor workers reported that their workplace had an official policy that restricted smoking in some way (Gerlach *et al.*, 1997). Almost half (46 percent) reported their workplace was smoke-free, which the authors defined as having an official policy that did not permit smoking in either the common or public areas of their workplace (*e.g.*, cafeteria or restrooms), or in work areas. There were significant differences based on gender, age, ethnicity, smoking status, and occupation of the worker. The prevalence of smoke-free policies was much lower among younger, less skilled and/or educated workers, and among those employed in the service, hospitality, and blue-collar industries. More women than men reported smoke-free policies; African Americans reported working for employers who had established a policy, but were less likely than Whites and Asian/Pacific Islanders to work under a smoke-free policy. Current smokers were also less likely than former and never-smokers to report that their workplace had a smoking policy.

Table 3 in Section III presents data from the Current Population Survey showing that the percentage of the national indoor workforce now covered by a smoke-free policy has increased significantly between 1992/93 and 1995/96. That increase is only the most recent step in a trend that has been going on for more than 10 years. Only 3 percent of workers reported being employed in a smoke-free environment in 1986 (Gerlach *et al.*, 1997). CPS data show that by 1992/93, just under 47 percent of workers were covered by such a policy, and by 1995/96, that percentage had increased to 64 percent—nearly two-thirds of all indoor workers. The 1995/96 figure represents a 37 percent increase in only 3 years. These positive trends reflect actions imposed by state and local jurisdictions through legislative requirements (including regulations) as well as independent actions taken by employers out of concerns for the health of their employees.

Geographic Variation in Coverage—Considerable geographic variation exists in the prevalence of workers covered by a smoke-free worksite policy, and the fraction of workers covered by such policies has increased between 1992/93 and 1995/96. In 1992/93, only 18 states reported that 50 percent or more of their indoor workforce was covered by a smoke-free policy, but by 1995/96 only three states—Arkansas, Kentucky, and Nevada—were reporting rates below 50 percent. No state reported a rate of 70 percent or higher coverage in 1992/93, but 13 now report having reached that level. Table 2 presents each state's rate of smoke-free coverage for workers in 1992/93 compared to its 1995/96 rate and lists the relative change between the two time periods. Table 4 in Section III presents additional information, including differences by strength of policy and by smoking status of respondent for each state and for the District of Columbia.

In terms of absolute coverage, the five states with the highest percentage of workers covered by a smoke-free policy by 1996 were Utah (83.7 percent), Maryland (83.2 percent), Vermont (78.9 percent), California (76.1

Table 2

Percentage of Indoor Workers Covered by a Smoke-free* Workplace Policy in 1993 and 1996 by State, and Relative Change (Percent) Between the Two Time Periods, Based on Current Population Survey—1992/93 and 1995/96

State	% of workers covered in 1993	% of workers covered in 1996	Relative change %
Alabama	39.0	55.4	42.0
Alaska	58.7	69.9	19.0
Arizona	56.8	65.1	14.5
Arkansas	32.5	48.0	47.6
California	58.4	76.1	30.2
Colorado	53.5	71.5	33.7
Connecticut	48.3	67.3	39.4
Delaware	50.3	66.0	31.2
District of Columbia	51.9	74.7	43.9
Florida	53.6	66.5	24.1
Georgia	47.4	56.7	19.8
Hawaii	47.1	61.3	30.0
Idaho	59.5	70.9	19.1
Illinois	40.0	60.8	52.0
Indiana	35.1	51.3	46.1
Iowa	45.1	62.2	38.0
Kansas	49.4	63.2	27.8
Kentucky	28.6	49.3	72.2
Louisiana	39.3	56.6	43.9
Maine	55.7	73.4	31.7
Maryland	52.9	83.2	57.2
Massachusetts	48.7	71.1	45.8
Michigan	39.6	53.1	34.3
Minnesota	54.5	67.9	24.5
Mississippi	40.3	54.2	34.5
Missouri	39.1	58.5	49.7
Montana	43.7	58.8	34.6
Nebraska	44.4	63.6	43.3
Nevada	33.8	40.5	19.8
New Hampshire	53.3	72.9	36.7
New Jersey	46.3	68.0	46.7
New Mexico	55.3	65.5	18.5
New York	42.7	64.6	51.1
North Carolina	31.0	54.7	76.5
North Dakota	47.5	61.0	28.4

*Smoke-free = smoking not permitted in public and common areas of the worksite or in work areas. Data based on CPS Tobacco Use Supplement conducted in September 1992, January 1993, and May 1993; September 1995, January 1996, and May 1996.

Table 2 (continued)

State	% of workers covered in 1993	% of workers covered in 1996	Relative change %
Ohio	37.9	56.6	49.5
Oklahoma	41.5	58.0	39.6
Oregon	59.9	66.9	11.6
Pennsylvania	42.2	59.9	42.0
Rhode Island	44.9	69.6	55.1
South Carolina	37.7	58.8	55.9
South Dakota	43.8	62.3	42.4
Tennessee	36.2	53.5	47.8
Texas	51.2	64.8	26.7
Utah	65.4	83.7	28.0
Vermont	58.7	78.9	34.4
Virginia	43.8	62.6	43.0
West Virginia	38.6	58.9	52.6
Washington	68.3	73.2	7.2
Wisconsin	43.8	62.0	41.7
Wyoming	48.4	61.2	26.6

*Smoke-free = smoking not permitted in public and common areas of the worksite or in work areas. Data based on CPS Tobacco Use Supplement conducted in September 1992, January 1993, and May 1993; September 1995, January 1996, and May 1996.

percent), and the District of Columbia (74.7 percent). The five lowest were Nevada (40.5 percent), Arkansas (48.0 percent), Kentucky (49.3 percent), Indiana (51.3 percent), and Michigan (53.1 percent).

The states that experienced the greatest rate of change in the percentage of workers employed in smoke-free worksites between 1993 and 1996 were North Carolina (+76.5 percent) and Kentucky (+72.2 percent); no other state experienced a relative increase of 60 percent or higher. Nonetheless, both North Carolina and Kentucky are still significantly below the national mean in terms of worker protection from ETS.

Restaurant Workers—Unfortunately, not all occupational groups have benefited equally from implementation of smoke-free workplace policies. Food service workers rank last among the Census Bureau’s list of major occupational groups in terms of worksite smoking policy coverage (Figure 7a and 7b). Furthermore, it appears that the gap between food service workers and all other workers is widening. While the majority of smoke-free restaurant policies are adopted under the rubric of protecting patrons, the fact that restaurants and bars serve as workplaces for millions of workers often goes unmentioned. Not only do food service workers enjoy fewer protections against ETS, they are also exposed to higher levels of ETS compared with other indoor workers. Siegel (1993) found that food service workers were exposed to levels of ETS in restaurants that were up to 2 times higher than those found in offices; ETS levels in bars were between 3.9 and 6 times

Figure 7a

Differences in Smoke-free Workplace Policy Coverage: Food Service Workers Compared to All Other Workers—CPS 1995/96





Figure 7b

Among Workers Reporting No Smoking is Allowed in Their Work Area, Percent Reporting that Someone has Smoked in Their Work Area in the Past 2 Weeks—CPS 1995/96



higher than those in offices. Even when workers report that their employer prohibits smoking in the employee work areas, significantly more food service workers than other workers report non-compliance with the policy (Figure 7a and 7b).

Federal Regulation: The Occupational Safety and Health Administration In 1994, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) began the process of promulgating a workplace smoking standard. The agency held public hearings in 1994 and 1995 and is currently reviewing testimony and finalizing a workplace smoking standard. The current proposed rule would require employers to either eliminate workplace smoking entirely or restrict it to designated smoking areas that are either outdoors or fully enclosed and separately ventilated, with the air directly exhausted to the outside.


If adopted, OSHA workplace smoking regulations may preempt many state and local workplace smoking ordinances. In 1992, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the federal Occupational Safety and Health Act preempted an Illinois law that made specific requirements of employees at hazardous waste sites, stating that the law overlapped with OSHA's standards (Glantz, 1997; 29 CFR 1910.120). It is likely that a similar ruling would be made regarding local and state smoke-free workplace laws should OSHA promulgate a standard regulating smoking in the workplace. Glantz (1997) raises several issues that require further study, including whether or not a single national standard would be enforced locally; whether there are mechanisms that would eliminate preemption of local and state workplace smoking control ordinances from the OSHA rule; and whether the rule could be designed to overrule existing statewide legislation that preempts local clean indoor ordinance development.

The tobacco industry has, on occasion, informed local jurisdictions that they are preempted from enacting local workplace smoking ordinances under current OSHA regulations. However, this assertion has been rejected by OSHA staff (Capreol, 1993; Frodyma, 1998).

Findings: Clean Indoor Air Ordinances There are 846 local clean indoor air ordinances listed in this publication, covering a total population of 88 million (see Section II, Summary Table 1). Two of the most common areas protected by clean indoor air provisions are workplaces and restaurants. Figure 8 shows the number of communities adopting 100 percent smoke-free workplace and/or restaurant provisions during the period of 1985 to 1998.

Workplace Restrictions—An unanticipated consequence of the earliest smoke-free workplace ordinances was the congregation of smokers immediately outside smoke-free buildings. Workers—particularly those in lobby areas or near first-floor windows—began complaining of secondhand smoke re-entering the building through open doors and windows. To address this problem, many smoke-free ordinances now include provisions banning smoking within a minimum distance from smoke-free buildings to prevent re-circulation of ETS back into the smoke-free building. Federally, the National Institutes of Health revised their smoking policy in March of 1999, banning smoking in and around specific outdoor areas such as building

Figure 8
Number of Communities Adopting Ordinances with Major Smoke-free Provisions



entrances and exits, air intake ducts, loading docks, covered parking garages, and designated courtyards. However, the policy still permits smoking in most other outdoor areas.

Some jurisdictions have expanded outdoor smoking restrictions beyond workplace settings, adopting provisions making outdoor lines and waiting areas smoke-free (*e.g.*, Davis, CA), making outdoor public park and recreation areas smoke-free (*e.g.*, Bellaire, TX; North Providence, RI), or establishing smoke-free seating in outdoor sports venues (*e.g.*, Nassau County, NY; Northampton, MA). These outdoor restrictions make the most sense when they are part of a natural progression of ordinance development, making enclosed venues smoke-free before addressing outside venues (Carol and Hobart, 1998).

A total of 642 local ordinances limit smoking in workplaces. The ordinances range from simple requirements that workplaces adopt written smoking policies to 181 ordinances that require the total elimination of smoking in the workplace (see Section II, Chart 2).

Restaurant Restrictions—The most recent trend in clean indoor air ordinance development is to extend smoking restrictions to bars. San Luis Obispo, California, was the first to restrict smoking in bars, including free-standing bars, in 1990. Currently, 35 local jurisdictions and the state of California have laws that eliminate smoking in all bars (free-standing and those in restaurants). Another 17 cities have ordinances that prohibit smoking only in restaurant/bar combinations. This growing trend to protect bar

workers is supported by research demonstrating that bar and restaurant workers have the least protection from ETS in the workplace and are exposed to a higher concentration of ETS than employees in other workplaces (Siegel, 1993).

A total of 753 local ordinances limit smoking in restaurants. These range from laws that merely require restaurants to set aside a nonsmoking section of unspecified size to 227 ordinances that completely eliminate smoking in restaurants (see Section II, Chart 1).

HISTORY OF YOUTH ACCESS LEGISLATION By the early part of the twentieth century, a number of states had adopted laws making it illegal for underage youth to use tobacco products. These laws were adopted on moral rather than public health grounds, and were largely unenforced. In fact, by the mid-1960s, a number of states rescinded their youth-oriented tobacco laws (Jacobson and Wasserman, 1997). At the local level, as early as the 1940s, jurisdictions had adopted ordinances requiring tobacco retailers to obtain a license; however, the intent of these ordinances was to generate revenues, not to regulate youth access to tobacco. In 1989, the Surgeon General's report concluded that there were fewer laws restricting youth access to tobacco products on the books than had been the case in the previous quarter century (U.S. DHHS, 1989).

In the late 1980s, the public health community began to discuss youth access to tobacco as part of a tobacco control policy agenda (IOM, 1994). This focus was intensified by a 1990 Office of the Inspector General (OIG) report, which found that despite youth access laws in 44 states, active enforcement was non-existent in all instances (OIG, 1990). In 1990, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) developed and distributed a Model Sale of Tobacco Products to Minors Control Act for state and local jurisdictions. Two years later, Congress adopted the so-called "Synar Amendment," requiring all states to adopt laws prohibiting the sale and distribution of tobacco products to minors, to enforce such laws, and to provide annual reports to DHHS as to their compliance.

DHHS's recommended youth access provisions include a tobacco retailer licensing structure, a graduated system of penalties and suspensions, an emphasis on civil (rather than criminal) penalties, a legal age of sale set at 19, minimum-age-of-sale warning signs at points of sale, a designated state enforcement agency supplemented by local efforts, and a ban on tobacco vending machines. Several of these provisions would be reiterated in the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) proposed tobacco regulations, issued in 1996.

Although the early youth access legislation was passed mainly at the state level, followed in the early 1990s by intensive federal activity, youth access policy development moved relatively quickly to the local level. In 1989, the U.S. Surgeon General's report noted that a handful of local jurisdictions had banned the practice of distributing free tobacco products, stating as their purpose the reduction of youth access to tobacco (U.S. DHHS,

1989). By September of 1992, the ANR Foundation's database of local ordinances included records for 161 communities with ordinances containing at least one provision designed to reduce youth access to tobacco products (NCI, 1993a).

Local ordinances include and go beyond the DHHS recommendations. The most common of these ordinances ban or limit the placement of cigarette vending machines. Others include bans on self-service displays, distribution of free tobacco products and/or single cigarette sales, and a number of state or local laws are also being enacted that criminalize youth for possession and/or use of tobacco products. Finally, an increasing number of ordinances include provisions for licensing tobacco retailers.

Following enactment of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration Reorganization Act in 1992, local youth access ordinance enactment escalated, quickly replacing clean indoor air as the chief subject of legislation at the local level. Beginning in 1994, the number of local youth access laws being enacted exceeded the number of clean indoor air laws being enacted in every year (see Figure 3).

Despite major efforts at the federal, state, and local levels to curtail access to tobacco products by minors, there is no compelling evidence that minors experience any significant difficulty in obtaining tobacco products, nor that teen tobacco consumption has declined as a result. In fact, the opposite appears to be the case. Tobacco use among youth remained relatively stable from 1980 to 1992, a year that marked the beginning of significant increases in local activity around youth access and an increase in youth smoking rates (Johnston, 1998).

Youth Access and Youth Smoking The effort to restrict youth access to cigarettes and other tobacco products stems from a desire to reduce tobacco use by minors. Youth access is itself a global term encompassing such diverse strategies as merchant education campaigns, signage, required ID checks, bans on self-service displays, the elimination of vending machines, and other strategies designed to make it more difficult for youth to obtain tobacco products. Of these strategies, most resources have been devoted to lowering the rate of illegal sale of tobacco products by merchants.

To date, there is little experimental evidence demonstrating that higher rates of merchant compliance with age-of-sale laws will result in significant reduction of youth smoking rates. Early support was offered by Jason *et al.* (1991) and DiFranza *et al.* (1992), who found decreases in self-reported cigarette use following enforcement of age-of-sale laws. Both studies, however, used non-random samples with no control group. Studies with more rigorous methodologies have failed to replicate these findings and have found no consistent relationship between the presence of, or the enforcement of, youth access laws and smoking patterns among youth (Chaloupka and Grossman, 1996; Hinds, 1992; Rigotti *et al.*, 1997). In one study widely cited as supporting the efficacy of youth access ordinances (Forster *et al.*, 1998), youth smoking rates increased less substantially in "intervention" communities where youth access laws were passed than in "control" communities where no youth access legislation was enacted. However, since

there was no statistical difference in the rates of illegal tobacco sales to minors between the intervention and control communities either before or after the intervention, it is likely that the observed differences in youth smoking behavior resulted from unmeasured factors (such as changing community norms in response to increased community action) rather than the presence of the youth access laws.

One reason that youth access legislation may be ineffective in curbing youth smoking is that only 38.7 percent of current smokers under the age of 18 purchase their cigarettes in stores (CDC, 1996a). Even when strong enforcement of local youth access laws improved merchant compliance and decreased illegal tobacco sales to minors, adolescents' perceived access to tobacco was not altered (Rigotti *et al.*, 1997). Numerous social sources of cigarettes are available to youth who seek to obtain them, including older friends, family members, and strangers who will purchase them if given the money. While attempts to convince social sources not to provide cigarettes to minors may have modest impact, given the widely available nature of tobacco to adult consumers, it is probable that even in the best of circumstances, minors who seek tobacco can easily find channels of supply.

Glantz (1996) questions the whole focus on youth access, noting that it unintentionally reinforces the "forbidden fruit" theme of tobacco advertising and that strategies that target all citizens, youth and adults alike, may prove more effective. Wasserman *et al.* (1991), for example, found that clean indoor air laws had a strong deterrent effect on teen smoking, a finding supported by Chaloupka and Grossman (1996). Traditionally, youth are among the least protected by clean indoor air regulation (Gerlach *et al.*, 1997). However, when they and the adults around them are not allowed to smoke at work or in other public venues, smoking may have less appeal.

The Synar Amendment A provision of the 1992 Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration Reorganization Act (known as the "Synar Amendment") requires states to: (a) adopt laws prohibiting the sale and distribution of tobacco products to minors under age 18, (b) implement enforcement programs, and (c) provide annual reports to DHHS demonstrating that they have complied. If they fail to comply, states risk losing block grants for substance abuse prevention and treatment programs.

The effects of the Synar regulations on tobacco control are complex. After Synar was passed, tobacco industry lobbyists succeeded in getting Congress to leave final implementation of the amendment up to state legislatures (Weisskopf, 1993). Moreover, the time lag between original passage and the release of accompanying regulations by DHHS in 1993 provided ample opportunity for tobacco industry lobbyists to press both national and state legislators for measures favorable to the industry (IOM, 1994). Most importantly, the tobacco industry and its allies used the Synar Amendment to push for passage of relatively weak state laws that were preemptive, foreclosing the opportunity of local jurisdictions to enact more stringent local ordinances (Weisskopf, 1993; Feder, 1996; Siegel *et al.*, 1997).

According to the *1998 Report to Congress on Synar Implementation* submitted by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration,

all states were in compliance with the Synar Regulation as of fiscal year 1997. The median noncompliance rate of sales to minors as reported by the states was 40 percent, down from rates of 60 to 90 percent in pre-1997 studies. All states reported that they expected to achieve a maximum illegal sales rate of 20 percent or less by fiscal year 2003 (U.S. DHHS, 1998b).

The Food and Drug Administration Rule On August 23, 1996, the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) asserted its authority to regulate nicotine as an addictive drug and cigarettes as drug delivery devices. It issued its final rule designed to reduce youth tobacco use by 50 percent in 7 years. The regulations were to be implemented in three phases. The first phase, which began 6 months after the rule's publication, requires retailers to check the photo ID of anyone under 27 and not to sell tobacco products to anyone under age 18. The second phase, which was to go into effect on August 23, 1997, contains a number of youth access provisions—most notably bans on free samples and single cigarette sales—and includes the elimination of vending machines and self-service displays, except in adult-only venues.


Additionally, a number of advertising restrictions were to be implemented, including a ban on outdoor advertising within 1,000 feet of schools and a ban on all color and graphics in print advertising. The final phase, originally intended to take effect 2 years after publication of the rule, would have prohibited brand-name sponsorship of sporting, cultural, and entertainment events.

The FDA rule was immediately challenged by the tobacco industry and its allies on a number of legal grounds. On April 25, 1997, the Federal District Court in Greensboro, North Carolina upheld the FDA's jurisdiction over nicotine-containing products. The court also upheld all restrictions involving youth access and labeling, but it invalidated on statutory grounds the FDA's restrictions on advertising and promotion of tobacco products. Significantly, the judge did not rule that the FDA's advertising and promotions restrictions violated the First Amendment, only that the FDA charter did not give it sufficient authority. The Court allowed the proof-of-age requirements, which were already operative, to remain in force. However, though upholding the other youth access restrictions, the Court delayed their implementation pending appeals. Both sides of the dispute appealed those aspects of the District Court ruling that went against them.

On August 14, 1998, a three-member panel of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed the District Court's decision, striking down all of the FDA's 1996 regulations. The following month, the government petitioned the Court for a rehearing by either the three-member panel or by the entire Fourth Circuit Court. Although the Court denied the government's petition, the Department of Justice appealed the Fourth Circuit Court's ruling to the Supreme Court on January 21, 1999; the Supreme Court has agreed to hear the case.

One issue of considerable concern to the tobacco control community is FDA preemption. Because case law requires FDA regulations to be preemptive, whatever regulations are eventually implemented will preempt stricter state and local laws. Preemption will apply to all issues addressed by

Figure 9
Number of Communities Passing Major Youth Access Provisions by Year



the FDA regulations, such as age, identification, vending machines, self-service displays, and advertising—assuming the regulations are upheld. However, in its regulations, the FDA has established a procedure whereby state and local jurisdictions can appeal for exemption from preemption if their legislation is stronger than the FDA regulation and will result in a benefit to the public.

Enforcement Studies on interventions to reduce illegal youth access to tobacco show that a major predictor of success in reducing sales to minors is active local enforcement of laws prohibiting the sale of tobacco to minors (Jacobson and Wasserman, 1997). Civil penalties are preferable to criminal penalties, as youth access to tobacco is often a low priority for police and the court system (Feighery *et al.*, 1991; IOM, 1994). Civil offenses are generally handled administratively, and many local jurisdictions designate the health department or the city manager as the enforcement agency. Rather than being found guilty by a court of law, an offender may pay a fine or lose his or her license to sell tobacco products.

Findings: There are 764 local ordinances containing one or more youth access provisions listed in the monograph (see Section II, Summary Table 2). Figure 9 shows the trends in the passage of various types of local youth access legislation from 1987 through 1998.

Tobacco Vending Machine Ordinances—Vending machines account for a relatively small percentage of total tobacco sales, but they account for 16 percent of sales to minors (OIG, 1990). Those sales are frequently to the youngest customers (U.S. DHHS, 1994). Young children, often too intimi-

dated to attempt over-the-counter purchases, have no such barrier when facing a vending machine.

Currently, a number of vending machine ordinances institute partial bans that permit either (a) vending machines with locking devices, or (b) the placement of machines in bars and other facilities from which minors are excluded by law. The effectiveness of partial bans, however, is limited (Forster *et al.*, 1992; IOM, 1994; U.S. DHHS, 1994). The state of Utah and the City of Seattle, Washington, for example, both passed legislation requiring locking devices, only to find them ineffective. Both states have gone on to pass more restrictive ordinances.

To date, 263 cities and counties have passed ordinances that completely ban tobacco vending machines (see Section II, Chart 4). If the courts uphold the FDA regulations, all vending machines in areas accessible to youth will be banned. Exceptions will be made only for vending machines in adult-only venues that are placed at least 25 feet from any entrance.

Tobacco Self-Service Displays—Tobacco companies spend over \$1 billion per year in subsidies to retailers to ensure that tobacco products are openly displayed and within easy reach of customers (Working Group AG, 1994). Self-service displays in which tobacco products are featured prominently near checkout counters are an important source of tobacco products for minors. It is less intimidating to pick up a pack of cigarettes from a self-service display than to request one from a clerk. Self-service displays are also a source of tobacco via shoplifting (IOM, 1994), a fact that the tobacco companies exploit to their benefit (Cooper, 1999). R.J. Reynolds distributed a document called *Pilferage in Perspective* to convince retailers that theft is no reason to abandon self-service displays, since slotting fees more than make up for loss due to pilferage (R.J. Reynolds, *n.d.*).

Two hundred thirty-three (233) local jurisdictions have passed bans on self-service displays. If the courts uphold the FDA regulations, all self-service displays will be prohibited except in adult-only venues.

Tobacco Sampling Bans—Both cigarette and chewing tobacco manufacturers distribute free product samples as part of their advertising and promotional activities. Typically, distribution of free samples is conducted in locations where young people congregate: music concerts, county fairs, athletic events, and motor sports races (Davis and Jason, 1988).

Although most states prohibit the distribution of free samples to underage youth, there is significant evidence that such laws are poorly enforced (Davis and Jason, 1988). A survey of elementary and high school students found that 20 percent of high school students and 4 percent of elementary students reported receiving free samples, and approximately half of elementary and high school students reported having seen children and adolescents receive free samples (Davis and Jason, 1988).

A total of 208 cities and counties have passed ordinances prohibiting the distribution of free tobacco product samples or coupons for free samples (see Section II, Chart 4). These ordinances typically eliminate free sampling completely, or at minimum, do so on public property, such as sidewalks

and fairgrounds. If the courts uphold the FDA regulations, the distribution of free samples of cigarettes or smokeless tobacco will be prohibited.

Single Cigarette Sales—Merchants sometimes remove cigarettes from their package and sell them individually. This is a violation of the federal prohibition on selling tobacco products without the required warning label, but it is a practice that is widespread nonetheless. In a study of convenience stores in a Southern California community, 49 percent of the stores sold single cigarettes, and most were sold to minors (Klonoff *et al.*, 1994). This practice may mitigate the negative influence of increases in cigarette prices on the purchasing habits of youth (IOM, 1994).

One hundred twenty-one (121) local jurisdictions have enacted ordinances that prohibit single cigarette sales to youth. If the FDA regulations are allowed to go into effect, they will prohibit the sale of cigarettes in anything less than packs of twenty.

Licensing Tobacco Retailers—Requiring a license to sell tobacco products provides localities with a mechanism to enforce merchants' compliance with laws prohibiting tobacco sales to minors. Merchants more carefully monitor tobacco sales to minors when such sales jeopardize their license to sell tobacco to adults. One city—Woodridge, Illinois—has carefully monitored its licensing ordinance and has found it extremely effective in reducing tobacco sales to minors, particularly over-the-counter sales (Jason *et al.*, 1991).

Only those ordinances that actually provide a mechanism for revoking or suspending a tobacco license for selling to minors are included in the present document; 252 local jurisdictions have enacted such licensing ordinances (see Section II, Chart 4).

Youth Possession Laws—A growing trend is to pass or begin enforcing laws that penalize youth for the purchase, possession, and/or use of tobacco. Such laws have a long history, dating back to the early part of the century (Cismoski, 1994). They are supported by some law enforcement agencies, in part because they can be used for other law enforcement goals. The tobacco industry has also supported the enactment and enforcement of youth possession laws (Pasternak, 1997; Wolfson and Hourigan, 1997). The Institute of Medicine opposes imposing legal penalties on youth who obtain tobacco products and recommends that existing penalties be repealed (IOM, 1994).

To date, there are no well-designed studies suggesting that penalizing youth for purchase, possession, or use of tobacco has any deterrent effect on either the initiation of tobacco use or the consumption of tobacco products. In fact, some tobacco control experts suggest that such laws are either ineffective or counterproductive (Carol, 1992; Cismoski, 1994; Jacobson and Wasserman, 1997). Concerns that youth penalties shift the responsibility from adults to under-age youth have been validated; where youth possession laws are enacted, enforcement targeting the adult merchants who sell to youth typically declines (Forster *et al.*, 1996; Wolfson and Hourigan, 1997).

There are 156 local jurisdictions that have enacted ordinances allowing for the citation of youth for one or more of the following: purchase, possession, or use of tobacco. In contrast, the FDA's regulations do not include penalties for any of the above activities.

**HISTORY OF ADVERTISING
AND PROMOTION
LEGISLATION**

The preemption clause of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (FCLAA) prevents states and localities from regulating or prohibiting cigarette advertising based on health-related reasons. In 1973, Utah enacted a ban on most forms of tobacco advertising, including billboards; however, the tobacco industry never filed a legal challenge of Utah's law. In general, however, the FCLAA preemption clause, coupled with First Amendment concerns, has had a dampening effect on local ordinance development in this area.

The first local advertising ordinance, which banned tobacco advertising on public transit, was adopted in 1987 by Amherst, Massachusetts. This ground-breaking effort was not duplicated until the early 1990s, when a handful of jurisdictions began passing restrictions on tobacco advertising, again focusing on public transit. The tobacco industry did not legally challenge these early advertising ordinances, perhaps because they only covered tobacco advertising on public and quasi-public systems.


Then, in 1994, a number of communities adopted broader restrictions on tobacco advertising, either by prohibiting placement of outdoor tobacco advertisements near youth-oriented venues (*e.g.*, schools and playgrounds) or by allowing outdoor tobacco advertisements only in locations zoned for non-residential uses (*e.g.*, industrial and commercial zones). Although the bulk of these ordinances were passed in Massachusetts (Canton, Holyoke, Dudley, Holliston, and Attleboro to name a few), the industry—apparently wanting a high-profile target—filed a legal challenge to an advertising ordinance adopted by the city of Baltimore, Maryland.

As intended, the lawsuit against Baltimore's ordinance had a chilling effect on further advertising ordinance development. However, following a Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals ruling upholding the ordinance in 1996, an immediate increase in local advertising ordinance enactment occurred (see Figure 10).

The Food and Drug Administration's proposed regulations, released in 1996, further stimulated interest in tobacco advertising issues. Although the industry's legal challenge to the advertising provisions remains unresolved, if implemented, the FDA regulations will ban outdoor advertising within 1,000 feet of schools and will ban all color and graphics from print advertising, as well as prohibiting brand-name sponsorship of sporting, cultural, or entertainment events.

The recent multi-state Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) settling the state Attorneys General Medicaid lawsuits against the tobacco industry includes a series of advertising restrictions. However, there are significant

Figure 10
Number of Ordinances Containing Advertising Restrictions by Year



exceptions in the agreement that will allow a number of tobacco ads to remain in place. It is too early to determine the level of compliance with the settlement provisions, or the ban’s effect on local advertising ordinance development. Nor is it known whether the agreement will have any effect on national advertising and promotional expenditures.

The major cigarette manufacturers spent \$5.66 billion on all forms of cigarette advertising and promotion in 1997, the last year for which data are available—an increase of nearly 11 percent over the previous year’s spending. Detailed data for 14 separate categories of advertising and promotional expenditure by the tobacco industry for calendar years 1996 and 1997 are presented in Table 3.

Legal Issues The effort to regulate tobacco advertising and promotion through local ordinances requires careful attention to potential legal obstacles, most notably potential preemption by the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (FCLAA), and challenge under the Constitutional protection of free speech.

FCLAA Preemption—In 1965, with passage of the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act, Congress required cigarettes to carry health warning labels. In addition to providing the tobacco industry with significant protections against lawsuits brought by smokers, the FCLAA also restricted state and local authority to regulate tobacco advertising with the

Table 3
Domestic Cigarette Advertising and Promotion Expenditures—1996 & 1997
(Thousands of Dollars)

Type of Advertising	1996	% total 1996	1997	% total 1997	Relative Change %
Newspapers	\$ 14,067	0.3	\$ 16,980	0.3	+ 20.7
Magazines	\$ 243,046	4.8	\$ 236,950	4.2	- 2.5
Outdoor	\$ 292,261	5.7	\$ 295,334	5.2	+ 1.1
Transit	\$ 28,865	0.6	\$ 26,407	0.5	- 8.5
Point of Sale	\$ 252,619	4.9	\$ 305,360	5.4	+ 20.9
Promotional Allowances	\$ 2,150,838	42.1	\$ 2,438,468	43.1	+ 13.4
Sampling Distribution	\$ 15,945	0.3	\$ 22,065	0.4	+ 38.4
Speciality Item Distribution	\$ 544,345	10.7	\$ 512,602	9.6	- 5.8
Public Entertainment	\$ 171,177	3.4	\$ 195,203	3.4	+ 14.0
Direct Mail	\$ 38,703	0.8	\$ 37,310	0.7	- 3.6
Endorsements/Testimonials*	-----		-----		
Coupons and Retail Value Added	\$ 1,308,708	25.6	\$ 1,522,913	26.9	+ 16.4
Internet	\$ 432	0.0	\$ 215	0.0	- 50.2
All Others	\$ 46,696	0.9	\$ 50,207	1.0	+ 7.5
Totals	\$ 5,107,700	100.0	\$ 5,660,014	100.0	+ 10.8

*In 1989 the FTC required cigarette companies to declare whether any money or form of compensation had been paid to have any cigarette brand names or products appear in any motion picture or TV shows. This practice has been reported as unfunded since 1989.

Source: Federal Trade Commission, 1999

following preemption clause: “No requirement or prohibition based on smoking and health shall be imposed under State law with respect to the advertising or promotion of any cigarettes the packages of which are labeled in conformity with the provisions of this chapter” (Section 5 of the Cigarette Act, 15 USC § 1334).

This clause is not all encompassing, however; it does allow for laws that regulate tobacco advertising based on issues other than the relationship between smoking and health. Several court cases have interpreted the scope of preemption under FCLAA.

In 1992, New York City adopted an ordinance requiring that one anti-smoking ad be run for every four tobacco ads run on city cabs. In a legal challenge to the ordinance (*Vango Media v. City of New York*), the court ruled that the city’s ordinance was preempted by FCLAA. The declarations section of the ordinance stated that the ordinance’s purpose was to reduce economic costs to taxpayers, referring to health care benefits and lost productivity caused by smoking. In addition, other parts of the ordinance made reference to the health risks of smoking.

In 1994, the city of Baltimore, Maryland adopted an ordinance restricting tobacco and alcohol billboards in residential areas, making exceptions for ads in stores, on commercial and public vehicles, in stadiums, on billboards by highways, and in certain industrially and commercially zoned neighborhoods. The stated purpose of Baltimore’s ordinance is

to reduce illegal sales to minors by reducing their exposure to advertising that encourages the use of products they cannot legally purchase. It is thus a law-enforcement issue, avoiding potential preemption under the FCLAA's prohibition against health-based legislation.

The tobacco industry challenged the ordinance, but the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals held that the Baltimore ordinance was not preempted by FCLAA because it did not relate to the content of advertising but rather to billboard location, and that it attacked a "particularly large and attention-attracting medium while not unnecessarily interfering with local businesses" (*Penn Advertising v. City of Baltimore*, U.S. Court of Appeals, Fourth District, 1995).

Also in 1994, Preston, Minnesota adopted an ordinance prohibiting point of sale tobacco advertising in stores, allowing only "tombstone" advertising of price and tar/nicotine information. This ordinance failed to withstand a legal challenge (*Citgo One Stop v. City of Preston*, U.S. District Court, Third Division, 1995). The court distinguished Preston's ordinance from the Baltimore ruling in two ways. First, the Baltimore ordinance was designed only to reduce underage tobacco use. Preston, on the other hand, made mention of health risks. Second, the Baltimore ordinance regulated location but did not address content of tobacco ads, whereas the Preston ordinance regulated content of tobacco ads.

First Amendment Issues—The U.S. Constitution provides for freedom of speech, but not all forms of speech are protected and some forms of speech are offered only limited protection. One type of speech afforded limited protection is commercial speech, defined as speech that does no more than propose a commercial transaction. The Supreme Court has prescribed the four-part *Central Hudson test* to determine whether a particular restriction on commercial speech is constitutional (*Central Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Public Serv. Comm'n*, 447 U.S. 557, 1980). Accordingly, (1) the restriction must deal with speech that is protected (that is, it must concern a lawful activity and not be fraudulent or misleading); (2) there must be a substantial government interest in regulating it; (3) the restriction itself must directly advance the government interest; and (4) the regulation must not be more extensive than necessary to serve that interest; this last point does not require the restriction to be the "least restrictive alternative," only that it be carefully tailored to its goals. Tobacco advertising ordinances can meet the *Central Hudson test*, but to do so they need to identify the governmental interest involved, provide evidence that the restriction will advance that interest, and demonstrate that the restriction is sufficiently narrow in scope and is targeted to meet its objective.

The first part of the *Central Hudson test* requires identifying the government interest involved. An advertising ordinance based on protecting public health, however, risks preemption by the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act (FCLAA). State and local governments can regulate tobacco advertising, but the regulations must further a state interest that is different from "smoking and health."

Multi-State Master Settlement Agreement—In November of 1998, the State Attorneys General signed a multi-state Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) settling the state Medicaid lawsuits against the tobacco industry. As of April 22, 1999, all tobacco billboards exceeding 14 square feet in area were to be removed. The MSA also provides for the elimination of signs and placards that are outdoors or on the surface of a window facing outward. But there are significant exceptions—ads outside a tobacco manufacturing facility; ads that are less than 14 square feet in area and are either outside a tobacco retail store or inside the store on a window facing outward; ads inside a tobacco retail store; ads outside an adult-only facility promoting a tobacco company sponsored event within 14 days of the event; and billboards advertising the brand name sponsored event at the site of the event for 100 days.

Findings: There are 68 local ordinances containing restrictions on
Advertising Restrictions tobacco advertising, covering a population of 28 million (see Section II, Summary Table 3).

Location Restrictions—In 1997, the tobacco industry spent \$295.3 million on outdoor advertising (FTC, 1999).

Some communities, such as Fort Worth, TX and Warren, MI, ban outdoor tobacco advertising (*e.g.*, billboards, free-standing signs, banners, etc.) in designated areas (*e.g.*, within 1,000 feet of schools and other youth-oriented venues). Some communities have set the minimum distance so that it becomes a *de facto* ban on outdoor tobacco advertising (*e.g.*, within 2 miles of any school or playground). Others, such as Oakland, CA and Cleveland, OH, allow outdoor tobacco advertising only within certain designated zones (*e.g.*, areas zoned for industrial uses, areas facing interstate highways). A handful of communities, such as Seymour, CT and Dudley, MA, have eliminated outdoor tobacco advertising in all areas.

Advertising tactics used by the tobacco industry make it clear how important location restrictions are to a successful tobacco control program. A series of 1991 R. J. Reynolds memos outlines a plan of “having outdoor suppliers locate near middle/junior high school locations.” Staff were sent into communities to ensure that the company had not missed any near-school placements, and suppliers were not to be paid for locations too far away from schools (Harris, 1991a & b).

Through calendar year 1998, 47 communities have adopted ordinances that restrict or eliminate tobacco advertising by location or zone.

Public Transit Restrictions—Both transportation shelters and the vehicles themselves have been a popular advertising venue for tobacco products. In 1997, the tobacco industry spent \$26.4 million on transit advertising (FTC, 1999). Children and the poor—traditional tobacco industry target groups—comprise 60 to 70 percent of the ridership in cities with populations under one million (APTA, 1999).

Bans on public transit tobacco advertising have not been challenged in court, perhaps because transportation systems are usually public or quasi-public entities, and policies restricting advertising on them are not treated

as broad regulations on advertisements in the private sector (Pertschuk and Siegel-Morse, 1994).

Twenty-eight (28) communities have adopted ordinances that ban tobacco advertising on public transit. In addition, a number of transit systems have adopted their own resolutions or policies banning tobacco advertising. These policies are not captured in the ANR Foundation's database, which includes only local ordinances adopted by city or county jurisdictions.

Retail Stores Restrictions—The tobacco industry spent over \$2.74 billion in 1997 on retailer-based point-of-sale advertising and promotional allowances to encourage retailers to stock and promote their products (FTC, 1999). Studies of tobacco advertising patterns in both California and Massachusetts documented that stores located within 1,000 feet of schools have a higher average number of cigarette ads and promotions than do stores outside the 1,000 foot radius (CA DHS, 1996; MA TCP, 1998). Furthermore, the California study found that stores close to schools are more likely to place tobacco ads near candy displays and at child's-eye level.

Twenty-five (25) communities have adopted restrictions on tobacco advertising in retail stores. The majority of these ordinances restrict "publicly visible" tobacco advertising (in the form of signs, banners, etc.) on storefronts and windows that are visible from the street. Some, like Pierce County, WA, extend retailer restrictions to all stores, while others, like St. Louis, MO, affect only those stores within a specified distance of schools and other youth-oriented venues. Other communities, like Deptford, NJ, prohibit tobacco advertising placement at child's-eye level.

Exemptions for Tombstone Advertising—Tombstone advertising is generic, black-and-white text-only advertising that provides information on price and availability. Twenty-two (22) communities with restrictions on tobacco advertising have allowed exemptions for tombstone advertising.

TOBACCO INDUSTRY RESPONSE Not surprisingly, the tobacco industry has fought aggressively against local tobacco control ordinances (Samuels and Glantz, 1990 & 1991; Advocacy Institute, 1995; Aguinaga and Glantz, 1995; Ellis *et al.*, 1996). In the early 1990s, the industry became increasingly concerned with local ordinance activity and developed a sophisticated national strategy to defeat local ordinance development (Malmgren, 1992).

In 1978, a secret public opinion survey conducted on behalf of the Tobacco Institute concluded the following:

"What the smoker does to himself may be his business, but what the smoker does to the nonsmoker is quite a different matter. This (the nonsmokers' rights movement) we see as the most dangerous development to the viability of the tobacco industry that has yet occurred" (The Roper Organization, 1978).

An internal Philip Morris document uncovered during the Minnesota Medicaid case reiterates the industry's concerns about smoke-free ordinances:

"Financial impact of smoking bans will be tremendous. Three to five fewer cigarettes per day per smoker will reduce annual manufacturers profits a billion dollars plus per year" (Philip Morris, Inc., 1993).

The Attorneys General Medicaid lawsuits against the tobacco industry have resulted in the availability of millions of pages of internal industry documents. These documents have provided a wealth of information confirming the tobacco industry's long-held antipathy to local ordinance development and have outlined its strategies to thwart such development. These strategies include discrediting legitimate scientific research, forming smokers' rights and business front groups, promoting ineffective prevention or policy programs as alternatives to legislation, filing legal challenges against local ordinances, and promoting state and federal legislation to preempt local tobacco control ordinances.

An internal memo from Philip Morris, Inc. outlines the tobacco company's strategy to oppose local ordinances in California during the height of local ordinance enactment in that state (Merlo, 1994), a strategy that has since been used in other states. The strategy included filing a legal challenge as "co-plaintiff along with local business people" against San Francisco's smoke-free workplace ordinance; introduction of "smoking accommodation" ordinances to "confound the antis" and forestall smoke-free ordinance development in other jurisdictions; and the introduction by "three independent business and/or association members" of a statewide initiative to preempt smoke-free ordinances.

Discrediting Research The tobacco industry has a long history of disputing the links between smoking and disease. A *Wall Street Journal* article described the tobacco industry's activities as "the longest-running misinformation campaign in U.S. business history" (Freedman and Cohen, 1993).

The industry's campaign to discredit the scientific evidence implicating ETS as a cause of disease in nonsmokers began years before the groundbreaking 1986 Surgeon General's Report on involuntary smoking. In 1978, a Roper Organization report for the Tobacco Institute made the following recommendation: "The strategic and long run antidote to the passive smoking issue is, as we see it, developing and publicizing clear-cut, credible, medical evidence that passive smoking is not harmful to the nonsmokers' health" (The Roper Organization, 1978).

The industry vigorously attacked both the 1990 draft and the 1993 final *Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Risk Assessment* report. The industry began by challenging the report's finding that ETS was a Group A carcinogen during the public comment period. The majority of submissions (71 percent) received by the EPA claiming the conclusions to be invalid were from individuals affiliated with the tobacco industry (Bero and Glantz, 1993). Following the release of the EPA's completed report, six tobacco-related organizations filed a lawsuit against the EPA in federal court asking the

court to “declare that the EPA’s classification of ETS is wrong as a matter of law and science.”

On July 17, 1998, North Carolina District Court Judge William L. Osteen vacated the EPA’s classification of ETS as a known human (Group A) carcinogen (*Flue-Cured Tobacco Cooperative v. EPA*, U.S. District Ct., LEXIS 10986, 1998). He did not, however, invalidate the EPA’s extensive findings regarding secondhand smoke and respiratory disorders other than lung cancer. The EPA will appeal Judge Osteen’s ruling.

In 1995, the tobacco industry began disseminating a study by the Congressional Research Service (CRS), claiming that the study refutes the EPA report (Perske, 1996; Chwat, 1995). However, the CRS study does not dispute the EPA’s finding that secondhand smoke is a known human carcinogen, and one of the study’s authors has stated that the study was being misinterpreted or selectively referred to out of context by clean indoor air opponents (Jalsevac, 1996).

Tobacco industry sponsored research disputing the health effects of ETS often relies on non-peer-reviewed literature and typically focuses on individual studies, while ignoring the full body of scientific evidence (Bero and Glantz, 1993). In addition, newly released documents from the Minnesota Medicaid trial show that the tobacco industry paid scientists up to \$10,000 to draft letters critical of the EPA’s 1993 ETS report. The letter writing campaign was organized by the Tobacco Institute and two of the industry’s law firms—Covington & Burling and Shook, Hardy & Bacon. In the majority of cases, the letter writers did not reveal that they had been paid by the tobacco industry for their services (Hanners, 1998b), nor did they reveal that the attorneys from both law firms often reviewed and approved all text prior to publication.

The tobacco industry and its allies have also attacked individual scientists engaged in tobacco-related research. In 1997, the Philip Morris-funded National Smokers’ Alliance sponsored a lawsuit against University of California researcher Stanton A. Glantz, 3 years after the release of his study in the *American Journal of Public Health* on the economic impact of smoke-free restaurant ordinances. The lawsuit was eventually dismissed with prejudice from a California court (*Californians for Scientific Integrity v. University of California*, 1997).

Smokers’ Rights and Business Front Groups A 1982 study conducted for the Tobacco Institute found that “overt industry opposition to proposed non-smokers’ rights legislation actually increased support for the legislation” (Samuels and Glantz, 1991). As one Tobacco Institute lobbyist noted, “I’ve learned from experience that as soon as I’m identified as a representative of the Tobacco Institute, I lose all credibility so I try to work behind the scenes whenever I can” (Stumbo, 1986). In response, the tobacco industry has sought out intermediary groups to carry its message (Merlo, 1993), funding smokers’ rights and business front groups to oppose tobacco control ordinance development.


The tobacco industry generally hires professional public affairs and political consulting firms to conceal their involvement in local ordinance campaigns (Brass, 1993; Ferris, 1991; Samuels and Glantz, 1991; Traynor *et al.*, 1993). Firms hired by the industry create other organizations that have the appearance of independent business groups, using neutral names such as Restaurants for a Sound Voluntary Policy (RSVP) or the California Business and Restaurant Alliance (CBRA) (McAdam, 1991). Following the release of internal documents in the Minnesota Medicaid lawsuit, the Tobacco Institute was forced to acknowledge previously unreported funding that it had provided to the Empire State Restaurant and Tavern Association, an ostensibly independent trade association that had opposed local smoke-free ordinances and promoted a state preemption bill in New York state (Levy, 1998).

In other cases, the industry identifies existing organizations that are willing to accept industry support to oppose local ordinances. Internal documents outline the industry's strategy to use groups like the California Grocers Association and the Mexican American Grocers Association to "pre-empt future groundswell of severe local level point-of-sale restrictions, protect PM point-of-sale retain/marketing strategies, visibility and promotion." The action plan outlines how the industry would work within targeted cities and counties and shows their intention to expand their association relations to include the "Korean Grocers Association, Northern California Grocers Association, local Chambers of Commerce and other organizations" (Philip Morris, Inc., [1994]; Tansey, 1998).

In addition to business front groups, the tobacco industry also supports smokers' rights groups (McAdam, 1991; Malmgren, 1992; Stone, 1996), which generally attempt to portray themselves as independent grass-roots organizations (Figure 11). The most active such group is the National Smokers Alliance (NSA), launched in 1993 with over \$7 million in seed money from Philip Morris (Levin, 1998). Internal industry documents show that the NSA was formed for Philip Morris by the public relations firm Burson-Marsteller, which also helped create the Tobacco Institute (Philip Morris, Inc., *n.d.* & 1994a; Burson-Marsteller, [1986]). Although the NSA promotes itself as a member-supported, grass-roots organization (Rosen, 1996; Harrold, 1998; Bell, 1998), Internal Revenue Service documents show that in 1996, when total receipts were over \$9 million, the NSA collected just under \$74,000 in membership dues (Levin, 1998).

Tobacco industry representatives have instructed smokers' rights groups to conceal any industry support they receive (Samuels and Glantz, 1991; ANR Foundation, 1999). Even when smokers' rights groups don't receive direct financial support from the tobacco industry, they often receive in-kind support in the form of access to public relations and political consultants, tobacco company mailing lists, and other materials (brochures, reports, tee-shirts, stickers, etc.) (Dunsmore, 1995; Ferris, 1991; Samuels and Glantz, 1991).

Figure 11
Organizational Chart of Philip Morris, Inc. Front Groups in California



Source: [n.a.] "California action plan", Philip Morris (PM) Web Site: <http://www.philipmorris.com>, [1994].

Smokers' rights and business front groups undertake a number of activities in their efforts to undermine local clean indoor air efforts, including monitoring of ordinance campaigns (Traynor *et al.*, 1993), meetings with local businesses to generate opposition to a proposed law (Napoles, 1992; Ferris, 1991; Brass, 1993), ghost-writing letters from businesses claiming negative economic impact as a result of ordinances (Mazzocco, 1992; Howard, 1992; Jacobs, 1992), and organizing referendum campaigns against enacted ordinances (Traynor *et al.*, 1993).

Promoting Ineffective Alternatives *Clean Indoor Air*—R. J. Reynolds, Philip Morris, and the Tobacco Institute have all developed their own "clean indoor air" programs and materials. These programs, often labeled *Accommodation* or *Red Light - Green Light*, typically restrict smoking in public places to designated smoking areas, then require businesses to post signs. The industry, often working through its business allies, promotes these alternative "clean indoor air" proposals to forestall the passage and implementation of clean indoor air ordinances (Merlo, 1994). An internal document summarizes the tobacco industry's position that "Accommodation is a better alternative to more legislation" (Philip Morris, Inc., 1994b).

The first “accommodation program” was introduced in 1987 in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania as part of Philip Morris’ strategy to derail the city’s ordinance restricting smoking in restaurants (Samuels *et al.*, 1992). Since then, these types of proposals have been introduced to forestall proposed clean indoor air ordinances in communities throughout the country, from Montrose, CO to Niagara County, NY; Spokane, WA; and Monongalia County, WV.

Youth Access and Youth Prevention—The tobacco industry has actively promoted its own youth access and youth prevention materials. Philip Morris, R.J. Reynolds, and the Tobacco Institute each sponsor programs with the stated purpose of encouraging merchant compliance with laws prohibiting the sale of tobacco to minors. Under various names, these programs involve the distribution of such things as window stickers, signs, training materials, calendars indicating the birth date required for legal tobacco sales, and other educational enhancements. Though often released with great fanfare, these programs have been demonstrated to be ineffective in curtailing youth’s ability to purchase tobacco (DiFranza *et al.*, 1996).

The tobacco industry has also developed educational materials for use by youth, parents, and schools. Under such headings as *Helping Youth Say No* and *Right Decisions, Right Now*, the programs are ostensibly designed to discourage tobacco use among teens. The materials are offered free of charge, and many financially strapped school districts utilize them. Key themes running throughout the program are that peer pressure is a major cause of teen smoking and that smoking is an adult decision. The peer pressure thesis is not only an oversimplification of research, but contains the false subtext that smoking is the norm among teens. The theme about smoking as an adult choice plays into the “forbidden fruit” motif common to tobacco advertising (DiFranza and McAfee, 1992).

Recently released tobacco industry documents suggest that the real motives behind the industry’s youth access and youth prevention programs are to deflect political pressure, avoid government regulation, and promote a positive corporate image (Hanners, 1998a). For example, an internal Philip Morris document reveals how that company used its relationship with the California Grocer’s Association to promote weak point of sale advertising restrictions in an effort to prevent a “future groundswell of severe local level point of sale restrictions” (Philip Morris, [1994]).

Legal Challenges To forestall pending ordinances, or repeal enacted ones, the tobacco industry and its business allies often threaten legal action (Merlo, 1994; Fogel, 1994). Although these threats are generally not followed through, and if filed, lose more often than not, the industry knows that such lawsuits can have a chilling effect on other jurisdictions, many of which will postpone ordinance development until any legal challenges are resolved. In 1994, Puyallup, Washington repealed the state’s first local smoke-free restaurant ordinance following a legal challenge filed by local restaurant owners supported financially by R.J. Reynolds. Although city officials believed the court would have upheld the ordinance, they did not

have the financial resources to match the industry's "bottomless pockets" (Suttle, 1994). To date, no other Washington state local jurisdiction has enacted a smoke-free ordinance of any type.

Constitutional Challenges—With a few limited exceptions, recent legal challenges against clean indoor air and youth access ordinances have failed. This includes challenges brought under the Equal Protection Clause and the Due Process Clause of the U.S. Constitution. Ordinances are most susceptible to these types of legal challenges when they don't take adequate steps to achieve their purpose of protecting nonsmokers from ETS. In *Alford v. City of Newport News* (1979), a weak local law in Virginia restricting smoking in restaurants was invalidated on the grounds that it failed to achieve its express purpose of protecting nonsmokers.

Regulatory Authority Challenges—Local tobacco control regulations adopted by local regulatory agencies, such as health boards and commissions, are somewhat more vulnerable to legal challenges. Although regulations adopted by health departments and boards of health in the states of Massachusetts, West Virginia, and New York have been upheld, the authority of these agencies to adopt smoking restrictions varies from state to state.

Preemption Challenges—Having had relatively little success filing constitutional challenges, the industry more frequently has filed legal challenges claiming preemption under state law. In Corvallis, Oregon and Marquette, Michigan, tobacco industry allies filed suits against the first smoke-free restaurant ordinances in each respective state. In each case, the state restaurant association argued that state law preempted stronger local ordinances. Oregon courts upheld the local ordinance in Corvallis (*Oregon Restaurant Association v. City of Corvallis*, Oregon Circuit Court Case No. 97-10260), but a lower Michigan court overturned Marquette's ordinance (*Michigan Restaurant Association v. City of Marquette*, Michigan Court of Appeals Docket No. 217232, Circuit Court Case No. 98-35362).

In several states, vending machine companies—often with financial support from the tobacco industry—have sued communities over vending machine ordinances under preemption claims (Levin, 1991). The bulk of these lawsuits have failed; however, some suits claiming preemption of vending machine restrictions under state tax law have been upheld (Tapscott, 1993).

Enactment of Preemptive Legislation The tobacco industry has found its opposition to local ordinance enactment relatively ineffective when compared to its power at the state and federal levels, and it considers local ordinances a significant threat (Malmgren, 1992). In 1986, a tobacco executive was quoted in the *U.S. Tobacco and Candy Journal* as saying, "Our record in defeating state smoking restrictions has been reasonably good. Unfortunately our record with respect to local measures...has been somewhat less encouraging...Over time, we can lose the battle over smoking restrictions just as decisively in bits and pieces—at the local level—as with state or federal measures" (Pritchard, 1986).

In the mid-1980s, faced with an increasing amount of local legislative activity and recognizing its relative vulnerability at the local level, the tobacco industry found an effective antidote to local tobacco control ordinances: preemption.

Preemptive legislation is defined as legislation that includes a provision preventing local jurisdictions from enacting laws more stringent than, or at a variance with, what the state (or federal) law mandates (CDC, 1999b). There are two broad categories of preemption—explicit (or express) preemption, in which preemptive language is expressly written into the law, and implicit preemption, which is implied rather than explicitly stated in the law. Implicit preemption occurs when Congress or a state legislature adopts comprehensive regulations on a subject that are later interpreted by the courts to “occupy the field” being regulated and therefore preclude inconsistent local (or state) regulation.

In 1985, the tobacco industry supported the passage of the first preemptive state tobacco control law in Florida; the law not only precluded future local clean indoor air laws, it also wiped out a handful of clean indoor air ordinances already enacted by local jurisdictions in the state. The tobacco industry quickly recognized that preemption was the most effective measure for countering local tobacco control ordinances, and the promotion of preemptive legislation at the state and federal level has now become the tobacco industry’s chief strategy for eradicating local tobacco control ordinances (Skolnick, 1995; Ellis *et al.*, 1996). In 1989, the Tobacco Institute identified preemption of local smoking and youth access restrictions as its “proactive” legislative goal for the 1990 legislative session (Malmgren, 1989).

Numerous internal industry documents released as part of the state Attorneys General Medicaid lawsuits confirm the industry’s commitment to enacting preemption (Tobacco Institute, 1989; Malmgren, 1989; Donoho and Morris, 1993; Malmgren, 1993). In 1994, the tobacco industry spent at least \$18.9 million in California to qualify and promote a state-wide ballot measure, Proposition 188, which would have repealed all local tobacco control ordinances in the state, and wiped out local authority to enact new ordinances (Siegel *et al.*, 1997).

In consultation with two senior California state legislators, tobacco executives developed a ‘sheep in wolves clothing’ preemption strategy spelled out in a 1991 Smokeless Tobacco Council memo: tobacco-friendly legislators introduce “a Comprehensive Tobacco Control Act along the lines of the alcohol model attempt[ing] to make the Tobacco Control Act as close as possible in “appearance” to the concepts that the anti-tobacco groups were fostering. The concept behind the bill was to be that the tobacco companies appeared to be against the bill” (Kerrigan, 1991). To achieve preemption, the tobacco industry has influenced legitimate anti-tobacco bills to insert preemption language (Feder, 1996) and hidden its activity behind legitimate trade associations that publicly sponsor and promote preemption bills with the support of their tobacco industry allies (Siegel *et al.*, 1997; Zimmerman, 1996).

Figures 12a & 12b show how effective a strategy preemption has been for the tobacco industry. In 1989, the Surgeon General's report noted three states with preemption legislation on the books (U.S. DHHS, 1989); by 1991, the number had increased to seven (NCI, 1991). By 1998, a total of 30 states had some form of preemption in tobacco control—14 preempt some or all clean indoor air ordinances, 22 preempt some or all youth access ordinances, and 17 preempt some or all tobacco advertising and promotion ordinances (ALA, 1998; CDC, 1999a & b).

In some states, preemption is narrow in its coverage; Massachusetts, for instance, preempts local ordinances restricting the sale of cigarette papers. In others, such as Oklahoma, preemption eliminates local jurisdiction over all aspects of tobacco control, from smoking regulations, to youth access measures to advertising and promotion restrictions (See Appendix to Section II). Of all the states with preemption, only Maine has successfully organized to overturn preemption in a state law, repealing in 1997 a provision preempting enactment of ordinances restricting tobacco displays.

Regardless of how they are worded, laws that preempt the ability of local jurisdictions to pass tobacco control ordinances have a wide range of negative effects on tobacco control efforts in general. These negative effects include:

Elimination of local policy development—the level where tobacco industry opposition is least effective (Siegel *et al.*, 1997; Ellis *et al.*, 1996; Conlisk *et al.*, 1995);

Establishment of weak statewide public health standards which cannot be strengthened at the local level (Siegel *et al.*, 1997; Conlisk *et al.*, 1995); and

Division of tobacco control coalitions (Siegel *et al.*, 1997; Jacobson *et al.*, 1993).

In light of these effects, the major public health organizations have adopted formal positions opposing preemption in tobacco control legislation. These organizations include the three leading voluntary health agencies (the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, and the American Lung Association); the American Public Health Association; the Association of State and Territorial Health Officials; the Institute of Medicine; and the American Medical Association. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, *Healthy People 2000 Objectives, Midcourse Review, 1995* calls for states to repeal laws which preempt stronger local clean indoor air laws (U.S. DHHS, 1996).

Since 1996, the number of preemption bills enacted by state legislatures has fallen off somewhat (CDC, 1999a)(Figures 12a & 12b). This was the year an inter-agency team calling itself the "Preemption Strike-force" was formed; members included the Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights, the American Lung Association, the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, and the Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids. This *ad hoc*

Figure 12a

Cumulative Number of Local Tobacco-Control Ordinances Preempted by State Laws by Year Preemptive Law Became Effective—United States, 1982-1998





Figure 12b

Cumulative Number of States with Preemptive Clauses—United States, 1982-1998



Source: Both figures above are from CDC, 1999a

coalition provides technical assistance and support to state coalitions on how to prevent enactment of preemption legislation. Nonetheless, by the end of 1998, more than half of all states (30 states) have preemption provisions in their tobacco control laws. Six states have passed preemptive laws since 1995.

REFERENCES

- Administrative Management Society. Ninth Annual Smoking Policies Survey. *Employee Relations Weekly* 7: 370, 1989.
- Advocacy Institute. *By hook or by crook, stealth lobbying: Tactics and counterstrategies*. Washington, D.C.: Advocacy Institute, August 1995.
- Aguinaga, S., Glantz, S.A.. The use of public records acts to interfere with tobacco control. *Tobacco Control* 4:222-230, 1995.
- American Lung Association. *State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues*. Washington, D.C.: American Lung Association, 1998.
- American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation. *The Hidden War: Big Tobacco's Stealth Strategy video-documentary*. Berkeley, CA, 1999.
- American Public Transit Association. *Americans in Transit*. New York, NY, 1999.
- Bartosch, W., Pope, G. The economic effect of smoke-free restaurant policies on restaurant business in Massachusetts. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 5(1):53-62, 1999.
- Bell, D. 'Big tobacco' weighs in against Prop 200: Virginia-based Smokers Alliance spends \$5,000 in campaign. *Today's News Herald*, September 3, 1998.
- Bero, L.A., Glantz, S.A. Tobacco industry response to a risk assessment of environmental tobacco smoke. *Tobacco Control* 2:103-113, 1993.
- Bierer, M., Rigotti, N. Public policy for the control of tobacco-related disease. *Medical Clinics of North America* 76(2):515-539, 1992.
- Bolinder, G., Alfedsson, L., Englund, A., de Faire, U. Smokeless tobacco use and increased cardiovascular mortality among Swedish construction workers. *American Journal of Public Health* 84:399-404, 1994.
- Boyd, G.M. *et al.* Use of smokeless tobacco among children and adolescents in the United States. *Preventive Medicine* 167:402-421, 1987
- Boyd, G.M., Glover, E.D. Smokeless tobacco use by youth in the U.S. *Journal of School Health* 59:189-194, 1989.
- Brandt, A.M. Recruiting women smokers: the engineering of consent. *Journal of the American Medical Women's Association* 51(1&2):63-66, 1996.
- Brass, K. Tobacco industry tied to smoking ban opposition. *Los Angeles Times*, August 5, 1993.
- Brauer, M., Mannetje, A. Restaurant smoking restrictions and environmental tobacco smoke exposure. *American Journal of Public Health* 88(12):1834-1836, 1998.
- Bureau of National Affairs (BNA). SHRM-BNA survey no. 55: Smoking in the workplace: 1991. Bulletin to Management, August 29, 1991.
- Burson-Marsteller. *Philip Morris and Burson-Marsteller: A partnership*. Burson-Marsteller internal document. Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 2046875317. [August 1986].
- California Department of Health Services. *Tobacco marketing in California*. California Department of Health Services, Tobacco Control Section, June 1996.

- Capreol, G. *Memo to C. Alverson, Re: San Francisco and California*. Minnesota Tobacco Litigation. BATES Number 2045891103. November 3, 1993.
- Carol, J. It's a good idea to criminalize purchase and possession of tobacco by minors—NOT! *Tobacco Control* 1:296-297, 1992.
- Carol, J., Hobart R. Restrictions make sense: smokers have responsibility not to harm nonsmokers. *USA Today*, June 15, 1998, p. 18A.
- Cooper, M. Tempting teens with tobacco: critics say tobacco companies lure kids to steal. CBS Evening News, April 12, 1999.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Changes in the cigarette brand preferences of adolescent smokers—United States, 1989-1993. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 43:577-581, 1994.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Assessment of the impact of a 100% smoke-free ordinance on restaurant sales. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 44:370-372, 1995.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Tobacco use and usual source of cigarettes among high school students—United States, 1995. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 45(No. 45):413-418, 1996a.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Projected smoking-related deaths among youth—United States. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 45(No. 44):971-974, 1996b.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance—United States, 1995. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 45(No. SS-4):1-86, 1996c.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Cigar smoking among teenagers—United States, Massachusetts and New York, 1996. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 46:433-440, 1997.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Incidence of initiation of cigarette smoking—United States, 1965-1996. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 47:837-840, 1998a.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Tobacco use among high school students—United States, 1997. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 47(12):229-233, 1998b.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Preemptive state tobacco-control laws—United States, 1982-1998. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 48:1112-1114, 1999a.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. State Laws on Tobacco Control—United States, 1998. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 48(SS-3):21-69, 1999b.
- Chaloupka, F., Grossman, M. *Price, tobacco control policies and youth smoking*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 5740. September 1996.
- Chwat, J. *Memo to NLBA Government Affairs Committee Re: CRS Report*. Chwat & Company, Inc., Washington, D.C., November 15, 1995.
- Cismoski, J. Blinded by the light: the folly of tobacco possession laws against minors. *Wisconsin Medical Journal* 93(11):591-598, 1994.
- Conlisk, E., Siegel, M., Lengerich, V., MacKenzie, W., Malek, S., Eriksen, M. The status of local smoking regulations in North Carolina following a state preemption bill. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 273:805-807, 1995.
- Consumer Reports. *Self-serving surveys: The 30 percent myth, in public interest pretenders: that group with the do-good name may not be what it seems*. Consumer Reports 59(5):316-320, 1994.
- Cummings, M.K. *Economic Impact of the New York City Smoke-Free Air Act*. Roswell Park Cancer Institute. 1997.
- Davis, R.M. Current trends in cigarette advertising and marketing. *New England Journal of Medicine* 316(12):725-732, 1987.
- Davis, R.M., Jason, L.A. The distribution of free cigarette samples to minors. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 4:21-26, 1988.
- DiFranza, J.R., Carlson, R.R., Caisse, R.E.J. Reducing youth access to tobacco. *Tobacco Control* 1:58, 1992.
- DiFranza, J.R., McAfee, T. The Tobacco Institute: helping youth say "yes" to tobacco. *Journal of Family Practice* 34: 694-699, 1992.
- DiFranza, J.R., Savageau, J.A., Aisquith, B.F. Youth access to tobacco: The effects of age, gender, vending machine locks, and "It's the Law" programs. *American Journal of Public Health* 86(2):221-224, 1996.
- Donoho, P., Morris, R. *Memo To Member Company Attendees. Re: Lobbyists' meeting - preemption exercise*. Minnesota Tobacco Litigation: ATX 09 0045377. August 30, 1993.
- Dunsmore, P. Smoking gun? Tobacco company may be linked to smoking fliers. *Times Record News* 88(349): p. 1A+, May 5, 1995.
- Eisner, M.D., Smith, A.K., Blanc, P.D. Bartenders' respiratory health after establishment of smoke-free bars and taverns. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 280(22):1909-1914, 1998.
- Ellis, G.A., Hobart, R.L., Reed, D.F. Overcoming a powerful tobacco lobby in enacting local smoking ordinances: the Contra Costa County experience. *Journal of Public Health Policy* 17(1):28-46, 1996.
- Evans, N., Farkas, A., Gilpin, E., Berry, C., Pierce, J. Influence of tobacco marketing and exposure to smokers on adolescent susceptibility to smoking. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 87(20):1538-1544, 1995.
- Feder, B.J. Federal rule intensifies smoking fight in states. *New York Times*, March 15, 1996.
- Federal Trade Commission. *Report to Congress for 1997, Pursuant to the Federal Cigarette Labeling and Advertising Act*. Federal Trade Commission, 1999.

- Feighery, E., Altman, D., Shaffer, G. The effects of combining education and enforcement to reduce tobacco sales to minors: a study of four Northern California communities. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 266(22):3163-3171, 1991.
- Ferris, J. Smoke screen clouds tobacco industry action. *Contra Costa Times*, June 23, 1991, sec. 1A+.
- Fielding, J., Piserchia, P. Frequency of worksite health promotion activities. *American Journal of Public Health* 79(1):16-20, 1989.
- Flinn, J. No tobacco laws have tobacco industry fuming. *San Francisco Examiner*, May 12, 1991.
- Fogel, B. Testimony before the New York City Council. June 6, 1994.
- Forster, J., Hourigan, M.E., Kelder, S. Locking devices on cigarette vending machines: Evaluation of a city ordinance. *American Journal of Public Health* 82:1217-1219, 1992.
- Forster, J.L., Komro, K.A., Wolfson, M. Survey of city ordinances and local enforcement regarding commercial availability of tobacco to minors in Minnesota, United States. *Tobacco Control* 5(1):46-51, 1996.
- Forster, J.L., Murray, D.M., Wolfson, M., Blaine, T.M., Wagenaar, A.C., Hennrikus, D.J. The effects of community policies to reduce youth access to tobacco. *American Journal of Public Health* 88: 1193-1198, 1998.
- Freedman, A.M., Cohen, L.P. Smoke and mirrors: how cigarette makers keep health questions 'open' year after year. *Wall Street Journal*, February 11, 1993.
- Frodyma, F. Acting Director of Policy, Letter to I. Sharenow. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Washington, D.C., February 27, 1998.
- Garfinkle, L. Time trends in lung cancer mortality among nonsmokers and a note on passive smoking. *Journal of the National Cancer Institute* 66(6):1061, June 1981.
- Gerlach, K., Shopland, D., Hartman, A., Gibson, J., Pechacek, T. Workplace smoking policies in the United States: results from a national survey of more than 100,000 workers. *Tobacco Control* 6(3):199-206, 1997.
- Glantz, S.A., Smith, L.R.A. The effect of ordinances requiring smokefree restaurants on restaurant sales. *American Journal of Public Health* 84(7):1081-1085, 1994.
- Glantz, S.A. Preventing tobacco use: the youth access trap. *American Journal of Public Health* 86(2):156-157, 1996
- Glantz, S.A., Smith, L.R.A. The effect of ordinances requiring smoke-free restaurants and bars on revenues: A follow-up. *American Journal of Public Health* 87(10):1687-1693, 1997.
- Glantz, S.A. Back to basics: getting smoke-free workplaces back on track. *Tobacco Control* 6:164-166, 1997.
- Glantz, S.A., Charlesworth, A. The effect of smoke-free restaurant ordinances on tourism. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 281(20): 1911-1918, 1999.
- Goebel, K. Lesbians and gays face tobacco targeting. *Tobacco Control* 3:65-67, 1994.
- Goldstein, A.O., Sobel, R.A. Environmental tobacco smoke regulations have not hurt restaurant sales in North Carolina. *North Carolina Medical Journal* 59(5):284-287, 1998.
- Hanners, D. *Tobacco industry waged false battle against youth smoking*. St. Paul: Pioneer Press, August 26, 1998a.
- Hanners, D. *Scientists were paid to write letters: tobacco industry sought to discredit EPA report*. St. Paul Pioneer Press, August 4, 1998b.
- Hanauer, P., Barr, G., Glantz, S. *Legislative Approaches to a Smoke Free Society*. Berkeley, CA: American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation, 1986.
- Harris, T.C. *Re: OOH - near school and bulletins*. RJ Reynolds Website (www.rjrtdocs.com): BATES Numbers 511999051-9052. November 26, 1991a.
- Harris, T.C. *Re: OOH plan*. RJ Reynolds Website (www.rjrtdocs.com): BATES Numbers 511999046-9048. December 4, 1991b.
- Harrold, R. National group eyes proposed smoking ban. *Morning Sun*, March 9, 1998.
- He, J., Vupputuri, S., Allen, K., Prerost, M.R., Hughes, J., Whelton, P.K. Passive smoking and the risk of coronary heart disease—A meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies. *New England Journal of Medicine* 340(12): 920-926, March 25, 1999.
- Hinds, M.W. Impact of a local ordinance banning tobacco sales to minors. *Public Health Reports* 107:356-358, 1992.
- Hirayama, T. Non-smoking wives of heavy smokers have a higher risk of lung cancer: A study from Japan. *British Medical Journal* 282(6259):183-185, 1981.
- Howard, S. Smoking battle ignites: Bellflower politicians join with tobacco giant Philip Morris to fight a smoking ban in Loma Linda. *San Bernardino Sun*, October 12, 1992.
- Hyland, A., Cummings, K.M., Nauenberg, E. Analysis of taxable sales receipts: was New York City's smoke-free air act bad for restaurant business? *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice* 5(1):14-21, 1999.
- InContext, Inc. *Economic impact of smoking restrictions in Massachusetts*. Conducted for the Massachusetts Restaurant Association. Washington, D.C.: InContext, Inc., September 30, 1996.
- Institute of Medicine. *The Future of Public Health*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1988.
- Institute of Medicine. *Growing up Tobacco Free: Preventing Nicotine Addiction in Children and Youths*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1994.

Section I: The Role of Public Policy Change in Tobacco Control

- ISCOSH. *Report of the Scientific Committee on Tobacco and Health: fifth report*. London: HMSO, 1998
- Jacobs, A.J. Sparks fly - bar's letter just a smoke-screen? *Daily Ledger-Post Dispatch*, July 11, 1992.
- Jacobson, P.D., Wasserman, J., Raube, K. The politics of antismoking legislation. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 18(4):787-819, 1993.
- Jacobson, P., Wasserman, J. *Tobacco Control Laws: Implementation and Enforcement*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand, 1997.
- Jalsevac, P. Second-hand smoke study misused, scientist says. *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, February 8, 1996.
- Jason, L.A., Ji, P.Y., Anes, M.D., Birkhead, S.H. Active enforcement of cigarette control laws in the prevention of cigarette sales to minors. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 266(22):3159-3161, 1991
- Johnston, L. *Cigarette smoking continues to rise among American teen-agers in 1996*. University of Michigan News and Information Services. December 19, 1996.
- Johnston, L. *The Monitoring the Future Study: Data Tables*. The University of Michigan. University of Michigan Website (www.isr.umich.edu/src/mth/pr98cg1.html). December 1998.
- Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P.M., Bachman, J.G. *National Trends in Drug Use and Related Factors Among American High School Students and Young Adults, 1975-1986*. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration, National Institute on Drug Abuse, DHHS Publication No (ADM) 87-1535, 1987.
- Kerrigan, M. *Memo To SmokeLess Tobacco Council, Committee of Counsel. Re: A proposed comprehensive tobacco control act in California*. Washington, D.C.: Smokeless Tobacco Council, Inc. June 28, 1991.
- Klonoff, E., Fritz, J., Landrine, H., Riddle, R., Tully-Payne, L. The problem and sociocultural context of single-cigarette sales. *Journal of the American Medical Association*. 271(8):618-620, 1994.
- KPMG Peat Marwick. *Effects of 1998 California smoking ban on bars, taverns and night clubs*. American Beverage Institute Website (www.abionline.org). 1998.
- Laventhol & Horwath for Restaurants for a Sensible Voluntary Policy. *Preliminary analysis of the impact of the proposed Los Angeles ban on smoking in restaurants*. Los Angeles: Laventhol & Horwath, October 1990.
- Law, M.R., Morris, J.K., Wald, N.J. Environmental tobacco smoke exposure and ischaemic heart disease: an evaluation of the evidence. *British Medical Journal* 315(7114):973-980, 1997.
- Levin, M. Fighting laws with smoking proxies. *Los Angeles Times*, August 5, 1991.
- Levin, M. Smoker group's thick wallet raises questions. *Los Angeles Times*, March 30, 1998.
- Levy, C.J. Lobby admits to higher spending in smoking-law fight. *New York Times*, December 12, 1998.
- Macdonald, H.R., Glantz, S.A. Political realities of statewide smoking legislation: the passage of California's Assembly Bill 13. *Tobacco Control* 6(1):41-54, 1997.
- Malmgren, K. *Memo to W.E Ainsworth, et al., Re: 1990 proactive legislative plans*. Minnesota Tobacco Litigation. October 2, 1989.
- Malmgren, K. *Memo to S.D Chilcote, Re: Expanded local program*. Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 2023965875. November 30, 1992.
- Malmgren, K. [no subject]. *Philip Morris internal memo*. Tobacco Institute Website (www.tobaccoinstitute.com): BATES Number 2025660350. December 3, 1993.
- Maroney, N., Sherwood, D., Stubblebine, W.C. *The impact of tobacco control ordinances on restaurant revenues in California*. Claremont, CA: The Claremont Institute for Economic Policy Studies, January 1994.
- Massachusetts Department of Public Health. *Massachusetts Tobacco Control Program: Tobacco Control Provisions - A Survey*. Massachusetts Tobacco Control Program, 1996.
- Massachusetts Tobacco Control Program. *Massachusetts Operation Storefront 1998: It's Time We Made Smoking History*. Massachusetts Department of Health, Tobacco Control Program, 1998.
- Mazzocco, M. Pro-tobacco group trying to block an expanded ban. *Contra Costa Times*, January 14, 1992.
- McAdam, R.S. *California local referenda program*. Tobacco Institute internal memo, November 27, 1991.
- Merlo, E. *Memo to Distribution [no subject]*. Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 2021252097. February 19, 1993.
- Merlo, E. *Memo to G. Bible, Re: California initiative*. Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 2022839335. January 12, 1994.
- Moore, D.J., Williams, J.D., Qualls, W.J. Target marketing of tobacco and alcohol-related products to ethnic minority groups in the United States. *Ethnicity & Disease* 6:83-98, 1996.
- Moore, S., Wolfe, S., Lindes, D., Douglas, C. Epidemiology of failed tobacco control legislation. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 272(15):1171-1175, 1994.
- Napoles, M. Bellflower councilwoman writing to all cities, not just Chino Hills. *Chino Hills Champion*, October, 23, 1992.

- National Cancer Institute. *Strategies to Control Tobacco Use in the United States: A Blueprint for Public Health Action in the 1990's. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 1.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institute of Health, National Cancer Institute. NIH Publication No. 92-3316, 1991.
- National Cancer Institute. *Smokeless Tobacco or Health: An International Perspective. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 2.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute NIH Publication No. 92-3461, 1992.
- National Cancer Institute. *Major Local Tobacco Control Ordinances in the United States. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 3.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute. NIH Publication No. 93-3532, 1993a.
- National Cancer Institute. *Respiratory Health Effects of Passive Smoking: Lung Cancer and Other Disorders. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph Number 4.* U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute. NIH Publication No. 93-3605, 1993b.
- National Cancer Institute. *Cigars: Health effects and trends. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 9.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute. NIH Publication No. 98-4302, 1998.
- National Research Council. *Environmental Tobacco Smoke: Measuring Exposures and Assessing Health Effects.* Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press, 1986.
- National Health and Medical Research Council. *The health effects of passive smoking: A Scientific Information Paper.* National Health and Medical Research Council (Australia). November 1997.
- Office of the Inspector General. *Youth Access to Cigarettes: A Report of the Office of the Inspector General.* Office of the Inspector General. Publication No. OEI, 02-90-02310, May 1990.
- Office of the Inspector General. *Youth Access to Tobacco.* Office of the Inspector General. Publication No. OEI, 02-92-00880, December 1992.
- Ohsfeldt, R., Boyle, R.G., Capilouto, E.I. *Tobacco taxes, smoking restrictions and tobacco use.* NBER Working Paper No. 6486. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research, March 1998.
- O'Keefe A., Pollay R. Deadly targeting of women in promoting cigarettes. *Journal of the American Medical Women's Association.* 51(1&2):67-69, 1996.
- Pasternak, J. Town has just the ticket to fight teen smoking. *Los Angeles Times*, October 1, 1997, p. A1+.
- Patten, C., Gilpin, E., Cavin, S., Pierce, J. Workplace smoking policy and changes in smoking behavior in California: a suggested association. *Tobacco Control* 4: 36-41, 1995a.
- Patten, C., Pierce, J., Cavin, S., Berry, C., Kaplan, R. Progress in protecting non-smokers from environmental tobacco smoke in California workplaces. *Tobacco Control* 4: 139-144, 1995b.
- Perske, M. Are anti-smokers attempting to manipulate the public?: NSA members should judge for themselves. *NSA Voice*, 3(4), p. 1+, 1996.
- Pertman, A. Why U.S. future is virtually smokefree. *San Jose Mercury News*, May 8, 1994, p. 2A.
- Pertschuk, M., Siegel-Morse, N. *Tobacco Advertising and Promotion: A Guide to Developing Policy.* National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, ASSIST. November 1994.
- Pertschuk, M., Shopland, D.R., (Editors). *Major Local Smoking Ordinances in the United States: A detailed Matrix of the Provisions of Workplace, Restaurant, and Public Places Smoking Control Ordinances.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute. NIH Publication No. 90-479, 1989.
- Philip Morris, Inc. *Memo: Impact of workplace smoking restrictions on consumption and incidence.* Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 2045447779. January 21, 1992a.
- Philip Morris, Inc. *Memo: Progression of Workplace Restrictions - POL Database.* Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 2023774761. February 26, 1992b.
- Philip Morris, Inc. *A smokers' alliance (draft).* Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 2025771934. July 1, 1993.
- Philip Morris, Inc. *California action plan.* Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 2044325927. [1994]
- Philip Morris, Inc. *National smokers alliance: 1994 political action plan (draft 3).* Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 2047897334. February 3, 1994a.
- Philip Morris, Inc. *Philip Morris ETS project.* Minnesota Tobacco Litigation. BATES Number 2024137597. January 14, 1994b.
- Philip Morris, Inc. *NSA political plan outline.* Philip Morris (PM) Website (www.pmdocs.com): BATES Number 20223203153. n.d.
- Pierce, J., Gilpin, E., Burns, D., Whalen, E., Rosbrook, B., Shopland, D., Johnson, M. Does tobacco advertising target young people to start smoking? Evidence from California. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 266(22):3154-3158, 1991.

Section I: The Role of Public Policy Change in Tobacco Control

- Pierce, J., Shanks, T., Pertschuk, M., Gilpin, E., Shopland, D., Johnson, M., Bal, D. Do smoking ordinances protect non-smokers from environmental tobacco smoke at work? *Tobacco Control* 3:15-20, 1994.
- Pierce, J., Lee, L., Gilpin, E. Smoking initiation by adolescent girls, 1944 through 1988. An association with targeted advertising. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 271:608-611, 1994.
- Price Waterhouse. Potential economic effects of a smoking ban in the state of California. Conducted for the San Diego Tavern and Restaurant Association. Price Waterhouse, May 1993.
- Pritchard, R. Tobacco industry speaks with one voice, once again. *U.S. Tobacco and Candy Journal* July 17-August 6, 1986.
- Quinn, M. Don't aim that pack at us. *Time Magazine*, January 29, 1990.
- R.J. Reynolds. *Pilferage presentation: core presentation*. RJ Reynolds internal document. R.J. Reynolds Website (www.rjrtdocs.com): BATES Number 514348983, n.d.
- Rigotti, N.A., Pashos, C.L. No-smoking laws in the United States: An analysis of state and city actions to limit smoking in public places and workplaces. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 266(22):3162-3167, 1991.
- Rigotti, N.A., Bourne, D., Rosen, A., Locke, J.A., Schelling, T.C. Workplace compliance with a no-smoking law: a randomized community intervention trial. *American Journal of Public Health* 82(2):229-235, 1992.
- Rigotti, N.A., Stoto, M.A., Schelling, T.C. Do businesses comply with a no-smoking law? Assessing the self-enforcement approach. *Preventive Medicine* 23:223-229, 1994.
- Rigotti, N.A., DiFranza, J.R., Chang, Y., Tisdale, T., Kemp, B., Singer, D. The effect of enforcing tobacco-sales laws on adolescents' access to tobacco and smoking behavior. *New England Journal of Medicine* 337:1044-1051, 1997.
- Robinson, R., Pertschuk, M., Sutton, C. Smoking and African Americans: spotlighting the effects of smoking and tobacco promotion in the African American community. In: *Improving the Health of the Poor: Strategies for Prevention*. Menlo Park, CA: Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, May 1992.
- Roper Organization. A Study of Public Attitudes Toward Cigarette Smoking and the Tobacco Industry in 1978, Volume 1. The Roper Organization, Inc., 1978.
- Rosen, J. Smokers' alliance fuming: group says bans infringe on liberty. *The News & Observer*, July 14, 1996.
- Samuels, B., Glantz, S.A. The politics of local tobacco control. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 266(15):2110-2117, 1991.
- Samuels, B., Begay, M., Hazan, A., Glantz, S.A.. Philip Morris's failed experiment in Pittsburgh. *Journal of Health Politics, Policy and Law* 17(2):329-351, 1992.
- Sciacca, J.P., Ratliff, M.I. Prohibiting smoking in restaurants: effects on restaurant sales. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 12(3):176-184, 1998.
- Siegel, M. Involuntary smoking in the restaurant workplace: a review of employee exposure and health effects. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 270(4):490-493, 1993.
- Siegel, M., Carol, J., Jordan, J., Hobart, R., Schoenmarklin, S., DuMelle, F., Fisher, P. Preemption in tobacco control: review of an emerging public health problem. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 278:858-863, 1997.
- Skolnick, A. Cancer converts tobacco lobbyist: Victor L. Crawford goes on the record. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 274:199-202, 1995.
- Smee, C. *The effects of tobacco advertising on tobacco consumption*. Department of Health Economics, Operational Research Division. London, England: Department of Health Economics, 1993.
- Steinfeld, J.L. The Public's Responsibility: A bill of rights for the non-smoker. *Rhode Island Medical Journal* 55(4):124-126, 1972.
- Stone, P.H. Blowing smoke at its critics. *National Journal*. 884-887, 1996.
- Stumbo, B. Where there's smoke. *Los Angeles Times*, August 24, 1986. p. 11+.
- Suttle, G. Puyallup ban goes up in smoke after tobacco-financed lawsuit. *The News Tribune*, December 20, 1994.
- Tansey, B. Document shows tobacco firm strategy front frights proposed laws, officials say. *San Francisco Chronicle*, October 24, 1998.
- Tapscott, R. Maryland court reflects local laws limiting cigarette machines. *The Washington Post*, September 18, 1993.
- Thun, M.J., Day-Lally, C.A., Calle, E.E., Flanders, W.D., Heath, C.W. Jr. Excess mortality among cigarette smokers: Changes in a 20-year interval. *American Journal of Public Health* 85(9):1223-1230, 1995.
- Thun, M.J., Myers, D.G., Day-Lally, C.A., Namboodiri, M.M., Calle, E.E., Flanders, W.D., Adams, S.L. Heath, C.W. Jr. Age and the exposure-response relationships between cigarette smoking and premature death in Cancer Prevention Study II. In: *Changes in Cigarette-Related Disease Risks and Their Implication for Prevention and Control. Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 8*. National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, NIH Publication No. 97-4213, 1997.
- Tobacco Institute. *Legislative Opportunities: Year-to-Date Summary*. Tobacco Institute Website (www.tobaccoinstitute.com): BATES Number TIMN 0015097. December 1, 1989.

- Tobacco Institute. *Legislative Action Plans*. Tobacco Institute Website (www.tobaccoinstitute.com). October 18, 1990.
- Traynor, M., Begay, M.E., Glantz, S.A. New tobacco industry strategy to prevent local tobacco control. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 270(4):479-486, 1993.
- Trichopolos, D., Kalandidi, A., Sparros L., MacMahon, B. Lung cancer and passive smoking. *International Journal of Cancer* 27(1):1-4, 1981.
- Tuckson, R.V. Race, sex, economics, and tobacco advertising. *Journal of National Medical Association* 81(11):1119-1124, 1989.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *The Health Consequences of Smoking. A Report of the Surgeon General: 1972*. U.S. DHEW, Public Health Service, Health Services and Mental Health Administration. DHEW Publication No. (HSM) 727516, 1972.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *The Health Consequences of Smoking: 1975*. U.S. DHEW, and Welfare, Public Health Service, Center for Disease Control. DHEW Publication No. (CDC) 778704, 1977.
- U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. *The Health Consequences of Smoking: a report of the Surgeon General*. U.S. DHEW, Public Health Service, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Office on Smoking and Health. DHEW Publication No (PHS) 79-50066, 1979.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *The Health Consequences of Smoking: Cancer. A report of the Surgeon General 1982*. U.S. DHEW, Public Health Service, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Office on Smoking and Health. DHHS Publication No (PHS) 82-50179, 1982.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *The Health Consequences of Involuntary Smoking*. U.S. DHHS, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health. DHHS (CDC) Publication No. 87-8398, 1986.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Reducing the Health Consequences of Smoking: 25 Years of Progress*. A Report of the Surgeon General. U.S. DHHS, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control, Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion, Office on Smoking and Health. DHHS Publication No. (CDC) 89-8411, 1989.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Young People: A Report of the Surgeon General*. U.S. DHHS, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control. DHHS Publication No. S/N 017-001-00491-0), 1994.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Healthy people 2000 review, 1997*. U.S. DHHS, Public Health Service, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. DHHS Publication No. (PHS)98-1256, 1996.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *National Household Survey on Drug Abuse: Main Findings 1996*. U.S. DHHS, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Administration, Office of Applied Studies. DHHS Publication No. (SMA) 98-3200, 1998a.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. *Synar Regulation Implementation: Report to Congress on FFY 1997 State Compliance*. U.S. DHHS, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. DHHS Publication No. (SMA) 98-3185, 1998b.
- Warner, K.E., Goldenhar, L.M., McLaughlin, C.G. Cigarette advertising and magazine coverage of the hazards of smoking. A statistical analysis. *New England Journal of Medicine* 326(5): 305-309, 1992.
- Wasserman, J., Manning, W.G., Newhouse, J.P., Winkler, J.D. The effects of excise taxes and regulations on cigarette smoking. *Journal of Health Economics* 10(1):43-64, 1991.
- Weisskopf, M. Hill bid to curb youth tobacco sales falters. *The Washington Post*, July 10, 1993.
- Wolfson, M., Hourigan, M. Unintended consequences and professional ethics: criminalization of alcohol and tobacco use by youth and young adults. *Addiction* 92:1159-1164, 1997.
- Woodruff, T., Rosbrook, B., Pierce, J., Glantz, S.. Lower levels of cigarette consumption found in smoke-free workplaces in California. *Archives of Internal Medicine* 153(12):1485-1493, 1993.
- Working Group of State Attorneys General. *No Sale: youth, tobacco, and responsible retailing. Developing responsible retail sales practices and legislation to reduce illegal tobacco sales to minors: findings and recommendations of a working group of state attorneys general*. December 1994.
- Zimmerman, L. *Memo To J. Graff [no subject]*. Englewood, CO: Russell, Karsh & Hagan. February 2, 1996.

Anne M. Hartman, M.S.
Biostatistician/Coordinator
of the Tobacco Use
Supplements to the CPS
Risk Factor Monitoring and
Methods Branch
Applied Research Program
National Cancer Institute
Bethesda, MD

Section IV Model Ordinances American Nonsmokers'
Rights Foundation
Berkeley, CA

Technical Assistance
Legal Center
Public Health Institute
Berkeley, CA

The editors acknowledge the contributions of the following staff members of the **ANR Foundation**, who provided expertise on a wide range of tobacco issues as well as technical, writing, and editorial assistance in the preparation of this monograph:

Julia Carol
Co-Director

Jennifer Anderson-Moxley
Executive Assistant

Elva Yañez, M.S.
Associate Director

The editors also acknowledge the following individuals at the **Tobacco Control Policies Project, University of California San Diego**, San Diego, California, for their assistance with state population and ordinance data:

Andres Abeyta
GIS Consultant

Sharon Buxton
Administrative Assistant

Robert W. Davignon, M.S.
Production Editor

Don F. Harrell
Administrative Assistant

Jacqueline M. Major, M.S.
Statistician

Kristina M. Webb
Project Assistant

The editors and the STCP staff members would like to further acknowledge the contributions of the following staff members at **KBM Group, Inc.**, Silver Spring, Maryland, who provided technical and editorial assistance in the preparation of this monograph:

Brian E. Steyskal
Editor/Graphic Designer

Cynthia M. DeLano
Assistant Editor

Ann L. Kreske
Editorial Assistant

And Finally, the editors would like to acknowledge the contributions of James T. Gibson of Information Management Services, Inc. in Silver Spring, Maryland, who provides general data management and program support to the NCI for the Tobacco Use Supplements to the CPS; and Ronald R. Tucker and his staff at the Current Population Survey Branch of the Bureau of the Census, and the other divisions of the Bureau of the Census responsible for the data collection and processing of the Tobacco Use Supplements to the CPS.

Section II:

**State Laws and Local Ordinances to
Reduce Tobacco Use**

*Leonard Casey, Holly Senn, Maggie Leighninger,
Robin Hobart, Kathryn B. Gower, Cassandra E. Welch*

INTRODUCTION

This section presents five charts containing a wide range of state laws and local ordinances designed to reduce tobacco use. There are also three summary tables that present the total number of various types of local ordinances by state.

Clean Indoor Air Provisions Summary Table 1 (page 71) summarizes the local clean indoor air provisions that appear in Charts 1 through 3.

Charts 1 through 3 cover the provisions of ordinances that restrict smoking in enclosed public places and workplaces, including restaurants and bars. To be included, an ordinance must have as its purpose the protection of nonsmokers from the health effects of secondhand smoke. Older ordinances designed as fire-safety measures are not included. Also not included are ordinances and administrative policies that limit smoking only in government-owned and operated buildings. Because of their limited impact on the public at large, these ordinances are not analyzed for inclusion in the ANR Foundation's database.

Youth Access Provisions Summary Table 2 (page 139) summarizes the various local youth access ordinances that appear in Chart 4.

Chart 4 covers the provisions of ordinances that restrict youth access to tobacco products. These include provisions banning tobacco vending machines, tobacco sampling, self-service displays, and single cigarette sales, as well as provisions licensing tobacco retailers and penalizing youth for purchase, possession, and/or use.

Advertising Restrictions Summary Table 3 (page 167) summarizes the local advertising restrictions appearing in Chart 5.

Chart 5 covers the provisions of ordinances that restrict tobacco advertising and promotion. These include provisions restricting placement of tobacco advertising by location (*e.g.*, within 1,000 feet of schools) or zones (*e.g.*, only allowed in industrial or commercial zones), on public transit, and in tobacco retail locations. Also captured are provisions allowing for so-called "tombstone exemptions," which allow generic, text-only tobacco advertisements in specified locations.

Also included in Charts 1 through 5 are maps prepared by the Tobacco Control Policies Project at the University of California, San Diego. These maps show the relationships between local ordinances and corresponding state level restrictions.

The data used to create the maps were obtained from two sources. The state data were taken from State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues, American Lung Association, 1997 (those data are current through Dec 31,

1997). The local ordinance data were taken from the National Matrix of Local Ordinances, Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights, 1998 (those data are updated through June 30, 1998).

The maps describe the tobacco control laws by presenting the laws at different levels of restriction. The Restaurant and Workplace maps measure the degree to which any covered establishment is required to be smoke-free. The Vending Machine and Self-service Display maps present areas which prohibit vending machines or self-service displays by law. The Licensing map indicates the type of licenses retailers are required to obtain to sell tobacco products, ranked by the severity of punishment for tobacco sales to minors.

The darker colors on the maps represent stronger restrictions required by law. The lightest color shows where there are no legal restrictions. The background color of each state (which will be the lightest color for that state) is determined by the level of restriction required by state law. Cities and counties that have more restrictive laws appear as darker colors within each state.

Whereas the tables provide precise information about state laws and local ordinances, the maps are designed to give a visual overview of certain state laws and local ordinances. This overview allows for a direct comparison between states regarding the level of restrictions required by law. Presenting the ordinances on a map also allows for the communities with strong tobacco control laws to stand out, especially if the state has weak or non-existent tobacco control laws. In Figure 1 (p. 72), for example, North Carolina shows low levels of restriction at the state level, but at the local level, the laws are more restrictive.

APPENDIX TO SECTION II This appendix contains information on state tobacco control laws. Appendix Table 1 covers state laws that restrict smoking in public places; Appendix Table 2 covers age restrictions for the sale of tobacco products; Appendix Table 3 covers state laws that restrict tobacco sales through vending machines; and Appendix Table 4 covers state restrictions on the distribution of tobacco product samples.

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES IN SECTION II

List of Tables

Summary Table 1	Local Clean Indoor Air Ordinances: Total Numbers by State	71
Chart 1	State Laws and Local Ordinances: Summary of Clean Indoor Air Provisions	73
Chart 2	State Laws and Local Ordinances: Workplace Provisions	97
Chart 3	State Laws and Local Ordinances: Enclosed Public Place Provisions	117
Summary Table 2	Local Ordinances Restricting Youth Access to Tobacco: Total Number by State	139
Chart 4	State Laws and Local Ordinances to Reduce Youth Access to Tobacco Products	143
Summary Table 3	Local Ordinances Restricting Tobacco Advertising: Total Number by State	167
Chart 5	State Laws and Local Ordinances to Restrict Tobacco Advertising	169

Appendix Tables

Appendix Table 1	State Laws Restricting Smoking in Public Places	178
Appendix Table 2	Age Restrictions for Sale of Tobacco Products by State	180
Appendix Table 3	Restrictions on Tobacco Sales through Vending Machines by State	182
Appendix Table 4	Restrictions on Distribution of Tobacco Product Samples by State	183

List of Figures

Figure 1	Smoking Laws in Restaurants: 1997	72
Figure 2	Smoking Restrictions in Workplaces: 1997	96
Figure 3	Vending Machine Placement Laws: 1997	140
Figure 4	Tobacco Retailer Licensing Laws: 1997	141
Figure 5	Self-service Display Laws: 1997	142

CLEAN INDOOR AIR PROVISIONS STATE LAWS AND LOCAL ORDINANCES: SUMMARY

SUMMARY TABLE 1 This table gives a tally of the local clean indoor air ordinances listed in Charts 1, 2, and 3. It also provides tallies for specific provisions within the clean indoor air ordinances.

Total: This column lists the total number of local communities with clean indoor air ordinances. This includes laws covering workplaces, restaurants, bars, and enclosed public places.

Workplaces: This column lists the total number of local communities with clean indoor air ordinances that have workplace provisions.

Restaurants: This column lists the total number of local communities with clean indoor air ordinances that have restaurant provisions.

Retail Stores: This column lists the total number of local communities with clean indoor air ordinances that cover retail stores.

Enclosed Public Places: This column lists the total number of local communities with clean indoor air ordinances that have provisions for indoor public places. Indoor public places include theater lobbies, bowling centers, retail stores, food markets, public transportation, and bingo parlors.

CHART 1 This is a quick reference to the major provisions of clean indoor air ordinances in the United States. It presents state laws and major city and county smoking ordinances. For each region covered, the table lists the population, date of last amendment, and whether the law covers smoking in workplaces, restaurants, bars, or enclosed public places. The agency responsible for enforcing the ordinance is also listed. There are 846 local clean indoor air ordinances included herein.

Last Amendment: This column indicates when a community enacted or last amended an ordinance containing clean indoor air provisions (normally by a city council, county board of supervisors, or local health board). In the case of ordinances that have been amended following original adoption, the column reflects the date of last amendment. Those ordinances that have been amended following original adoption are indicated by an asterisk next to the date.

Population: This column gives the Census Bureau estimate of the population for July 1, 1996, for each state, county, and city. These data can be found on the Census Bureau's web page at <http://www.census.gov/population/estimates/metro-city/scful96/sc96ful.zip>. County smoking ordinances cover the unincorporated areas of the county. Thus, the population is only for the unincorporated area. We estimated unincorporated areas by taking the balance of the county after subtracting out all city

populations. Population numbers are in thousands, except for numbers in (parentheses), which are exact figures for areas inhabited by less than 1000 people. The local (city and county) clean indoor air ordinances cover a total population of approximately 87,899,000.

Workplaces Covered: This column indicates whether an ordinance restricts smoking in places of work. "Partial" indicates that smoking restrictions exist, but smoking is still allowed in some areas or under some circumstances. "Total" indicates that smoking is entirely prohibited or allowed only in enclosed, separately ventilated smoking lounges that workers are not required to enter during the course of their work duties. "Public" indicates that the ordinance's workplace provisions apply only to government workplaces and don't affect private workplaces.

Restaurants: This column indicates whether restaurants are covered by the ordinance. The minimum size for no-smoking sections is indicated ("100%" means the restaurant is entirely smoke-free, "0%" means that no minimum percentage is specified). Figure 1 presents a map of the clean indoor air laws for restaurants in the United States, at the local and state levels.

Bars: This column indicates whether the ordinance includes restrictions on smoking in bars. "All" indicates that the ordinance contains restrictions that cover bars attached to restaurants, as well as free-standing bars and taverns (these restrictions may vary between restaurant/bar combinations and free-standing bars). "Restaurants" indicates that the restrictions apply only to bars attached to restaurants.

Enclosed Public Places: This column indicates whether an ordinance restricts smoking in enclosed public places. "All" indicates that the ordinance contains general restrictions or a prohibition on smoking in all enclosed public places. "Some" indicates that the ordinance contains restrictions or a prohibition on smoking only in specified public places enumerated in the ordinance.


Enforcement: This column summarizes the enforcement mechanism contained in the ordinance. If the ordinance designates several agencies as responsible for enforcement, that which is of most practical significance is listed. The options under this column are "Health Department", "City Manager", "Board of Health", "Police Department", "Other Agency" or "N/S" if no specific enforcement agency is designated in the ordinance.

Note: an entry of "—" in a field indicates that information is not available for that provision. This is generally the result of adding new fields of analysis to reflect a significant development in ordinance provisions; database records for ordinances analyzed prior to the new field of analysis do not contain information for that provision.

Summary Table 1
Local Clean Indoor Air Ordinances: Total Number by State

State	Total	Workplaces	Restaurants	Bars	Public Places
Alabama	19	18	17	0	18
Alaska	1	1	1	1	1
Arizona	16	15	13	1	16
Arkansas	3	1	0	0	3
California	286	266	274	81	272
Colorado	36	35	34	3	35
Delaware	2	2	2	0	2
District of Columbia	1	1	1	0	1
Georgia	16	11	16	0	12
Hawaii	3	2	1	0	3
Illinois	16	10	16	0	12
Indiana	3	1	3	0	3
Kansas	6	3	5	0	6
Louisiana	8	8	6	0	8
Maine	1	0	1	1	0
Maryland	9	8	7	2	8
Massachusetts	124	77	120	37	88
Michigan	29	5	3	0	28
Minnesota	1	0	0	0	0
Missouri	18	5	18	2	17
Nebraska	1	0	0	0	1
New Jersey	13	3	6	1	8
New Mexico	3	3	3	1	3
New York	11	11	11	3	11
North Carolina	38	29	33	1	34
Ohio	35	30	33	1	33
Oregon	3	3	3	2	3
Pennsylvania	4	4	4	0	4
Rhode Island	2	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	3	2	2	0	2
South Dakota	1	1	0	0	1
Tennessee	3	0	3	0	3
Texas	59	34	50	4	55
Vermont	1	1	1	0	1
Virginia	18	6	17	0	17
Washington	4	3	3	0	3
West Virginia	40	39	40	0	40
Wisconsin	7	2	4	1	5
Wyoming	2	2	2	0	2
Totals	846	642	753	142	759

Figure 1: Smoking Laws in Restaurants: 1997



Data Source: *State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues*, American Lung Association, 1997
National Matrix of Local Ordinances, American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation, 1998

Chart 1

State Laws and Local Ordinances: Summary of Clean Indoor Air Provisions

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Alabama	None	4,273	None	None	None	No	None
Alexander City	1993	16	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Anniston	1993	26	Partial	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Auburn	1992	38	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Birmingham	1995*	259	Public	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Cullman	1993	18	Public	0%	None	Some	Police Dept.
Daphne	1993	15	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Decatur	1993	54	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Dothan	1992	56	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Eufaula	1990	13	None	0%	None	Some	Police Dept.
Homewood	1995	23	Partial	100%	None	All	Other Agency
Huntsville	1993*	170	Partial	0%	None	Some	Police Dept.
Jackson	1991	6	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Madison	1993*	24	Partial	25%	None	All	Police Dept.
Mobile	1994*	203	Partial	75%	None	All	Other Agency
Montgomery	1989	196	Partial	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Prattville	1991	24	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Rainbow City	1995	8	Partial	None	None	None	Other Agency
Tuscaloosa	1990	82	Public	None	None	Some	Not Specified
Wetumpka	1992	6	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Alaska	1990*	607	Partial	0%	None	Some	Other Agency
Bethel	1998	16	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Arizona	1978*	4,428	Public	None	None	Some	N/S
Chandler	1991*	143	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Flagstaff	1991*	55	Partial	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Gilbert	1988	64	Partial	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Glendale	1987	182	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Kingman	1988	17	Partial	None	None	Some	Police Dept.
Maricopa Co.	1988	182	Partial	40%	None	All	N/S
Mesa	1996*	345	Total	100%	All	All	Other Agency
Paradise Valley	1992*	14	None	25%	None	All	N/S
Peoria	1991	76	Partial	0%	None	All	City Mgr.
Phoenix	1986	1,159	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Pima Co.	1992*	288	Partial	None	None	All	N/S
Prescott	1986	33	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Scottsdale	1992*	179	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Tempe	1994*	163	Total	0%	None	All	N/S
Tucson	1988*	449	Partial	None	None	All	N/S
Yuma	1987	61	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Arkansas	1985*	2,510	Public	None	None	No	N/S
Little Rock	1994*	176	None	None	None	Some	N/S
McGehee	1987	5	Partial	None	None	All	N/S
North Little Rock	1989	60	None	None	None	Some	N/S
California	1994*	31,878	Total	100%	All	All	N/S
Agoura Hills	1993*	21	Partial	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Alameda	1987	76	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Alameda Co.	1986	124	Partial	40%	None	All	Health Dept.
Albany	1992*	16	Total	100%	None	All	Police Dept.
Alhambra	1989	84	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Alpine Co.	1988	1	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Anaheim	1986	289	Partial	0%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Anderson	1993*	9	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Antioch	1993*	76	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Apple Valley	1991	55	None	60%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Arcata	1997*	16	Total	100%	None	All	Police Dept.
Atascadero	1991	24	None	0%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Auburn	1991	12	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Belmont	1993*	26	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Belvedere	1993	2	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Benicia	1987	26	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Berkeley	1996*	103	Total	100%	All	All	City Mgr.
Beverly Hills	1989*	32	None	60%	None	Some	N/S
Big Bear Lake	1987	6	Public	None	None	Some	City Mgr.
Blue Lake	1987	1	Partial	25%	None	All	City Mgr.
Brea	1986	35	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Brentwood	1985	13	Partial	40%	None	All	City Mgr.
Buellton	1996	4	Public	100%	Rest.	Some	Health Dept.
Burbank	1987	97	None	None	None	Some	N/S
Burlingame	1993*	28	Total	100%	None	All	N/S
Butte Co.	1992*	103	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Calabasas	1993	17	Partial	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Calistoga	1995	5	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Camarillo	1994*	57	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Campbell	1990*	38	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Capitola	1994	10	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Carlsbad	1983	69	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Carpinteria	1995*	14	Public	100%	Rest.	Some	Other Agency
Cathedral City	1982	36	None	None	None	Some	N/S
Ceres	1995*	31	Total	100%	All	All	Other Agency
Chico	1992*	46	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Chino Hills	1993	42	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Chula Vista	1984	152	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Clayton	1993*	8	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amendment*	Population ¹ (000)	Workplaces Covered	Restaurants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
California (cont.)							
Cloverdale	1989	6	Partial	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Coachella	1988	22	Partial	25%	None	All	N/S
Colfax	1991	1	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Concord	1993*	115	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Contra Costa Co.	1991*	170	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Coronado	1984	26	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Corte Madera	1981	8	None	0%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Costa Mesa	1998	101	None	None	None	None	Police Dept.
Cotati	1994*	6	Total	100%	Rest.	All	N/S
Culver City	1987	39	Partial	66%	None	All	City Mgr.
Cupertino	1994*	43	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Cypress	1987	47	Partial	25%	None	All	City Mgr.
Dana Point	1993	34	None	100%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Danville	1994*	38	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Davis	1993*	52	Total	100%	All	All	City Mgr.
Del Mar	1993*	5	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Del Norte Co.	1988	20	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Desert Hot Springs	1986	15	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Dixon	1986	13	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Downey	1989	93	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Duarte	1995*	21	Total	100%	None	None	Other Agency
Dublin	1994*	25	Total	100%	All	All	City Mgr.
East Palo Alto	1992	25	Partial	67%	None	All	City Mgr.
El Cajon	1994*	92	Partial	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
El Centro	1993	37	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
El Cerrito	1995*	24	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
El Dorado Co.	1991	119	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
El Segundo	1989	16	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Emeryville	1987	6	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Encinitas	1987	58	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Escondido	1991*	116	Partial	50%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Eureka	1985	26	Partial	25%	None	All	City Mgr.
Fairfax	1994	7	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Fairfield	1987	86	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Folsom	1994	41	Total	100%	None	All	Other Agency
Fontana	1986	104	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Fort Bragg	1994	6	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Fortuna	1988	9	Partial	25%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Foster City	1994	30	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Fremont	1993*	188	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Fresno	1994*	396	Partial	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Garden Grove	1990	149	Partial	25%	None	None	N/S
Gardena	1977	53	None	None	None	Some	N/S

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
California (Cont.)							
Gilroy	1995*	34	Partial	50%	None	None	City Mgr.
Grand Terrace	1985	12	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Grass Valley	1990	10	Partial	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Gridley	1990*	4	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Hanford	1994	36	None	70%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Hayward	1993*	122	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Healdsburg	1994*	10	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Hemet	1986	51	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Hercules	1992*	19	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Hesperia	1992	61	Public	60%	None	Some	Other Agency
Hollister	1994*	25	Partial	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Hughson	1993	3	Total	100%	All	All	City Mgr.
Huntington Beach	1993*	191	Partial	100%	None	Some	N/S
Huntington Park	1994	57	None	80%	None	None	N/S
Imperial Beach	1985	28	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Imperial Co.	1994	35	Partial	100%	None	All	N/S
Indian Wells	1990	3	Partial	77%	None	All	City Mgr.
Indio	1985	44	Partial	50%	None	Some	N/S
Irvine	1986	128	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
La Canada Flintridge	1990	20	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
La Mesa	1991*	55	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
La Mirada	1977*	44	None	None	None	Some	City Mgr.
La Quinta	1992	18	Partial	75%	None	All	N/S
Lafayette	1992*	26	Total	40%	None	All	City Mgr.
Laguna Beach	1992*	25	Partial	100%	None	Some	N/S
Laguna Hills	1997*	29	Total	100%	All	All	City Mgr.
Laguna Niguel	1989	52	Partial	20%	None	Some	N/S
Lakewood	1988	75	Public	0%	None	Some	N/S
Lancaster	1988	116	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Larkspur	1993*	11	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Lathrop	1991	9	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Lemon Grove	1994*	25	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Lindsay	1993	9	Total	85%	None	All	Other Agency
Live Oak	1986	5	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Livermore	1993*	65	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Livingston	1987	10	Partial	50%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Lodi	1990	55	Partial	100%	None	All	Other Agency
Loma Linda	1992*	22	Partial	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Lompoc	1990	41	Partial	25%	None	All	City Mgr.
Long Beach	1993*	422	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Los Alamitos	1989	12	Public	40%	None	Some	N/S
Los Altos	1979	28	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Ammendment*	Population ¹ (000)	Workplaces Covered	Restaurants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
California (Cont.)							
Los Angeles	1993*	3,554	Partial	100%	None	Some	N/S
Los Angeles Co.	1992*	975	Public	0%	None	None	N/S
Los Gatos	1991*	29	Total	100%	Rest.	All	N/S
Madera	1993	36	Partial	0%	None	All	Other Agency
Manhattan Beach	1987	33	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Marin Co.	1993*	65	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Martinez	1991*	33	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Marysville	1986	12	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Mendocino Co.	1993	57	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Menlo Park	1993*	29	Partial	100%	None	All	N/S
Merced	1994*	58	Total	75%	None	All	N/S
Mill Valley	1992*	13	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Other Agency
Millbrae	1995*	21	Total	100%	All	All	N/S
Milpitas	1985	59	Partial	50%	None	Some	N/S
Mission Viejo	1988	85	Partial	20%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Modesto	1993*	179	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Monterey	1987	28	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Monterey Co.	1994*	90	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Moorpark	1993*	29	Total	100%	Rest.	All	N/S
Moraga	1986	18	Partial	40%	None	All	N/S
Moreno Valley	1990	141	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Morgan Hill	1985	29	Partial	0%	None	All	City Mgr.
Morro Bay	1986	10	Partial	50%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Mountain View	1994*	71	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Napa	1995*	65	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Napa Co.	1994	30	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
National City	1984	51	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Nevada City	1993	3	Partial	80%	None	All	City Mgr.
Nevada Co.	1992*	66	Partial	80%	None	All	Other Agency
Newark	1993*	40	Partial	40%	None	All	City Mgr.
Newport Beach	1985	70	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Novato	1997*	48	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Oakdale	1987	15	Partial	50%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Oakland	1992*	367	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Oceanside	1983	146	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Ojai	1993*	8	Total	100%	All	All	City Mgr.
Ontario	1987	145	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Orange Co.	1993*	191	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Orinda	1992*	19	Total	80%	None	All	City Mgr.
Orland	1993	6	None	0%	None	None	Police Dept.
Oroville	1987	12	Partial	10%	None	All	Health Dept.
Oxnard	1988	151	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Pacific Grove	1995*	15	None	None	None	All	City Mgr.

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
California (Cont.)							
Palm Desert	1986	28	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Palm Springs	1986	43	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Palmdale	1988	107	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Palo Alto	1995*	58	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Paradise	1991*	26	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Pasadena	1993*	134	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Patterson	1993	10	Total	100%	None	All	Police Dept.
Petaluma	1994*	48	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Piedmont	1988	11	Partial	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Pinole	1992*	19	Total	60%	None	All	City Mgr.
Pittsburg	1995*	51	Total	100%	All	All	City Mgr.
Placer Co.	1994*	95	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Placerville	1992*	9	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Pleasant Hill	1993*	32	Total	80%	None	All	N/S
Pleasanton	1994*	57	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Port Hueneme	1989	20	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Poway	1992*	47	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Rancho Cucamonga	1988	117	None	40%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Rancho Mirage Rancho	1987	11	Partial	66%	None	All	N/S
Palos Verdes	1993	42	None	100%	All	None	City Mgr.
Redding	1993*	77	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Redlands	1987	67	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Redwood City	1988	71	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Rialto	1990	82	Partial	None	None	None	City Mgr.
Richmond	1994*	91	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Riverside	1985	255	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Riverside Co.	1985	412	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Rohnert Park	1993*	39	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Roseville	1991	63	Total	100%	None	All	Other Agency
Ross	1989	2	None	100%	None	All	Police Dept.
Sacramento	1990*	376	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Sacramento Co.	1992*	683	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Salinas	1995*	112	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
San Anselmo	1993	12	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
San Bernardino San Bernardino Co.	1994* 1987	183 277	Total Partial	100% 0%	None None	All All	City Mgr. N/S
San Bruno	1987	40	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
San Carlos	1993*	28	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
San Clemente	1987	45	Partial	50%	None	Some	N/S
San Diego	1994*	1,171	Total	80%	None	All	City Mgr.

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
California (Cont.)							
San Diego Co.	1991*	419	Partial	50%	None	Some	N/S
San Francisco	1994*	735	Total	100%	None	Some	Health Dept.
San Jose	1993*	839	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
San Juan Bautista	1994	2	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
San Juan							
Capistrano	1994*	29	Partial	100%	None	Some	City Mgr.
San Leandro	1988	70	Partial	40%	None	Some	City Mgr.
San Luis Obispo	1995*	42	Total	100%	All	Some	City Mgr.
San Marcos	1983	90	Partial	0%	None	Some	City Mgr.
San Mateo	1993*	90	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
San Mateo Co.	1992*	61	Total	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
San Pablo	1985	26	Partial	40%	None	All	N/S
San Rafael	1993*	50	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
San Ramon	1994*	40	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Santa Ana	1994	302	Total	75%	None	Some	N/S
Santa Barbara	1984	86	Partial	25%	None	Some	N/S
Santa Barbara Co.	1994*	163	Total	100%	All	Some	Health Dept.
Santa Clara	1994*	99	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Santa Clara Co.	1994*	108	Total	100%	All	All	Other Agency
Santa Clarita	1994	125	Total	None	None	All	City Mgr.
Santa Cruz	1994*	51	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Santa Cruz Co.	1994*	134	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Santa Maria	1988	67	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Santa Rosa	1993*	122	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Santee	1983	56	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Saratoga	1994*	29	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Sausalito	1994	7	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Scotts Valley	1994*	9	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Seaside	1992	31	Partial	25%	None	All	City Mgr.
Sebastopol	1994*	7	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Police Dept.
Shafter	1994	11	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Shasta Co.	1993*	67	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Shasta Lake	1993*	9	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Simi Valley	1987	107	None	50%	None	All	N/S
Solana Beach	1992*	13	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Solano Co.	1991*	20	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Solvang	1988	5	Partial	50%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Sonoma	1992*	9	Total	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Sonoma Co.	1994*	160	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
South Lake Tahoe	1992	23	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
South Pasadena	1988	24	None	50%	None	Some	City Mgr.
S. San Francisco	1993*	57	Public	0%	None	All	City Mgr.
Stanislaus Co.	1993*	103	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
California (Cont.)							
Stockton	1988	233	Partial	70%	None	All	N/S
Sunnyvale	1986	125	Partial	60%	None	Some	N/S
Susanville	1995	13	None	None	None	None	Police Dept.
Sutter Co.	1986	38	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Temecula	1985	39	Partial	25%	None	None	N/S
Thousand Oaks	1993*	113	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Tiburon	1992*	8	Total	100%	All	All	City Mgr.
Torrance	1987	136	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Tracy	1994*	45	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Truckee	1993	10	Partial	80%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Tuolumne Co.	1994	48	Total	100%	Rest.	All	N/S
Turlock	1993*	49	Total	50%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Tustin	1994*	62	Partial	0%	None	All	Other Agency
Ukiah	1993*	15	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Union City	1994*	58	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Vacaville	1992*	81	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Vallejo	1994*	110	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Ventura	1994*	97	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Ventura Co.	1993*	93	Total	100%	Rest.	All	N/S
Victorville	1988	67	Partial	50%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Visalia	1992	88	Total	100%	None	All	Police Dept.
Vista	1992*	78	Partial	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Walnut	1992*	31	Public	25%	None	Some	N/S
Walnut Creek	1991*	63	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Waterford	1991	7	Partial	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Watsonville	1994*	33	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
West Hollywood	1993*	37	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	N/S
West Sacramento	1991	30	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Westlake Village	1993	8	Total	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Wheatland	1986	2	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Whittier	1991	79	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Willows	1993	6	Public	100%	None	None	Police Dept.
Woodside	1990	5	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Yolo Co.	1988	21	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Yorba Linda	1985	58	Partial	33%	None	Some	N/S
Yountville	1994*	3	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Yuba City	1986	32	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Colorado	1998*	3,823	Public	0%	None	Some	N/S
Arapahoe Co.	1988	134	Partial	0%	None	All	Police Dept.
Arvada	1986	96	Partial	25%	None	All	N/S
Aspen	1985	5	Partial	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Aurora	1986	252	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Florida	1992*	14,400	Partial	35%	None	Some	Other Agency
Georgia	1998*	7,353	None	None	None	Some	N/S
Albany	1995	79	Total	100%	None	All	Other Agency
Athens/Clark Co.	1994	89	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Augusta	1994*	66	None	75%	None	None	Board of Health
Chatham Co.	1995	66	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Cordele	1995	11	None	25%	None	None	Other Agency
Dahlonega	1993	3	None	50%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Decatur	1993	18	Partial	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
DeKalb Co.	1992	503	Partial	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Fulton Co.	1993	202	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Gainesville	1991	19	Partial	75%	None	All	Other Agency
Gwinnett Co.	1993	382	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Hall Co.	1993*	89	Partial	75%	None	All	Other Agency
Richmond Co.	1994*	148	None	75%	None	None	Board of Health
Roswell	1988	55	None	0%	None	None	Health Dept.
Savannah	1994	136	Partial	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Snellville	1992	15	Partial	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Hawaii	1992*	1,184	Public	0%	None	Some	N/S
Hawaii Co.	1986	138	None	0%	None	Some	Other Agency
Honolulu	1997*	423	Total	None	None	Some	N/S
Maui Co.	1998	117	Public	None	None	All	Police Dept.
Idaho	1985*	1,189	Public	0%	None	All	N/S
Illinois	1995*	11,847	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Arlington Heights	1989	77	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Chicago	1993*	2,722	Partial	30%	None	All	Health Dept.
DeKalb	1988	36	None	50%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Des Plaines	1988	55	Partial	25%	None	All	City Mgr.
Downers Grove	1979	50	None	10%	None	Some	N/S
Elgin	1989	86	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Evanston	1988	72	None	20%	None	None	Health Dept.
Highland Park	1986	31	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Hoffman Estates	1988	49	Partial	0%	None	None	City Mgr.
Oak Park	1989	52	Partial	25%	None	All	N/S
Orland Park	1988	46	Partial	0%	None	None	N/S
Park Ridge	1989	37	None	0%	None	None	N/S
Rockford	1988	144	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Schaumburg	1986	74	None	0%	None	Some	Police Dept.
Skokie	1987	59	Partial	0%	None	All	City Mgr.
Wilmette	1988	26	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Indiana	1998*	5,841	Public	None	None	None	Other Agency
Bloomington	1987	66	None	25%	None	Some	N/S
Fort Wayne	1998*	185	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Monroe Co.	1995*	45	None	0%	None	All	Board of Health
Iowa	1990*	2,852	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Kansas	1994*	2,572	Public	0%	None	All	N/S
Lawrence	1986	72	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Overland Park	1994*	131	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Prairie Village	1986	24	None	None	None	Some	N/S
Roeland Park	1994	8	None	0%	None	All	City Mgr.
Topeka	1986	120	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Wellington	1992	9	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Kentucky	1993*	3,884	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Louisiana	1994*	4,351	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Baton Rouge	1989	216	Partial	None	None	Some	N/S
Calcasieu Parish	1993	72	Partial	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Catahoula Parish	1993	8	Partial	70%	None	All	Other Agency
E. Baton Rouge Parish	1989	157	Partial	None	None	Some	N/S
Jefferson Parish	1995	342	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Lake Charles	1989	71	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
New Orleans	1988	477	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Sulphur	1993	21	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Maine	1993*	1,243	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Portland	1998	63	None	100%	Rest.	None	Other Agency
Maryland	1994*	5,072	Total	60%	Rest.	All	N/S
Anne Arundel Co.	1993	432	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Baltimore Co.	1993	718	Public	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Gaithersburg	1988	46	Public	50%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Howard Co.	1993*	224	Partial	100%	All	All	Police Dept.
Montgomery Co.	1991*	696	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Prince George's Co.	1988	563	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Rockville	1987	46	None	50%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Takoma Park	1990	12	Partial	50%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Talbot Co.	1994	19	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Massachusetts	1997*	6,092	Public	0%	None	Some	N/S
Acton	1982	19	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Acushnet	1995	10	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Agawam	1992*	27	Public	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Amherst	1994*	35	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Massachusetts (Cont.)							
Andover	1994	31	None	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Arlington	1995*	44	Total	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Attleboro	1995*	39	Total	0%	All	All	Health Dept.
Auburn	1986	15	None	50%	None	Some	Board of Health
Bedford	1994	14	Partial	100%	None	All	Board of Health
Bellingham	1997*	16	Partial	100%	None	None	Board of Health
Belmont	1994*	24	Partial	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Beverly	1984	39	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Billerica	1995	39	None	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Boston	1998*	558	Partial	100%	None	None	Board of Health
Boxborough	1995	4	None	100%	None	All	Board of Health
Braintree	1984	35	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Brewster	1989*	9	None	50%	None	None	Board of Health
Brookline	1995*	54	Total	100%	All	All	N/S
Burlington	1992	23	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Cambridge	1987*	94	Partial	25%	None	All	Health Dept.
Canton	1994*	20	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Chatham	1986	7	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Chelmsford	1991*	33	Partial	75%	None	Some	Board of Health
Chicopee	1995*	55	None	100%	Rest.	None	Board of Health
Clinton	1994	13	None	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Cohasset	1991*	7	Partial	75%	None	All	Board of Health
Concord	1989	18	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Danvers	1986	24	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Dedham	1994	24	None	50%	None	None	Board of Health
Dennis	1985	14	None	0%	None	None	Board of Health
Dover	1994	5	Partial	0%	None	All	Board of Health
Dudley	1994	10	Partial	75%	None	All	Board of Health
East Longmeadow	1994*	14	Public	100%	Rest.	None	Board of Health
Easthampton	1994*	16	Total	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Everett	1992	35	None	75%	None	None	Board of Health
Falmouth	1993	30	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Foxborough	1993*	16	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Framingham	1994*	65	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Gardner	1996	20	Public	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Gloucester	1994	29	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Granby	1995	6	None	None	None	Some	Board of Health
Great Barrington	1992	8	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Greenfield	1994	19	Total	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Harwich	1993	11	None	50%	None	None	Board of Health
Haverhill	1995	54	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Hingham	1993	20	Partial	75%	None	All	Board of Health
Holden	1993*	15	Public	100%	None	All	Board of Health

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Massachusetts (Cont.)							
Holyoke	1994*	41	Total	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Hudson	1984	18	None	20%	None	None	Board of Health
Hull	1992*	10	None	50%	None	None	Board of Health
Lawrence	1994	69	Partial	75%	None	All	Board of Health
Lee	1994*	6	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Lenox	1994*	5	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Leominster	1989*	39	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Lexington	1994*	29	Total	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Longmeadow	1994*	15	None	75%	None	Some	Board of Health
Lowell	1995	101	Public	75%	None	None	Health Dept.
Lynnfield	1984	11	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Malden	1993*	53	None	25%	None	Some	N/S
Mansfield	1993	19	Partial	75%	None	All	Board of Health
Marblehead	1994*	20	None	67%	All	All	Board of Health
Marion	1994	5	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Marlborough	1987	33	None	30%	None	None	Board of Health
Mashpee	1995	9	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Maynard	1988	10	None	50%	None	Some	Board of Health
Medfield	1997*	11	Partial	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Medford	1984	56	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Methuen	1995	41	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Middleton	1995	6	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Millis	1991	8	Partial	35%	None	All	Board of Health
Milton	1994	26	Public	50%	None	None	Board of Health
Montague	1995*	8	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Nahant	1995*	4	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Natick	1987*	31	Partial	25%	None	All	Board of Health
Needham	1995*	28	Partial	100%	None	All	Board of Health
Newton	1993*	80	Partial	100%	None	All	Board of Health
North Andover	1995	24	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
North Attleboro	1995*	26	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Northampton	1994*	29	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Norton	1995	16	Public	None	None	None	Board of Health
Norwell	1994*	10	Total	100%	None	All	Board of Health
Norwood	1992*	29	None	50%	None	None	Board of Health
Oak Bluffs	1993	3	Partial	100%	None	All	Board of Health
Orange	1995*	8	Total	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Pittsfield	1995	46	None	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Plainville	1993*	7	Partial	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Plymouth	1993	48	Partial	0%	None	All	Board of Health
Quincy	1988	86	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Randolph	1984	31	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Reading	1989*	23	None	25%	None	Some	Board of Health

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Massachusetts (Cont.)							
Revere	1992*	42	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Salem	1988	38	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Sandwich	1993*	18	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Saugus	1994	26	Total	60%	None	All	Board of Health
Scituate	1987	17	None	50%	None	None	Board of Health
Seekonk	1995	13	None	0%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Sharon	1998*	17	Partial	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Somerville	1992*	74	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
South Hadley	1994	17	None	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Southwick	1992	8	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Sterling	1987	7	None	40%	None	All	Board of Health
Stockbridge	1994*	2	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Stoneham	1990	22	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Stoughton	1983	27	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Sudbury	1988*	15	Partial	50%	All	All	Board of Health
Swampscott	1994*	14	None	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Tewksbury	1994*	29	None	100%	None	All	Board of Health
Townsend	1987	9	Partial	None	None	None	Board of Health
Wakefield	1995	25	Total	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Walpole	1995*	22	Partial	50%	None	Some	Board of Health
Watertown	1991*	32	Partial	80%	None	None	Board of Health
Wellesley	1990*	27	Partial	25%	None	None	Board of Health
West Springfield	1994*	26	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Westborough	1998	15	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Westfield	1995*	38	Public	100%	All	All	Board of Health
Westford	1993*	19	Partial	75%	None	Some	Board of Health
Westminster	1985	7	None	0%	None	None	Board of Health
Westwood	1996	13	Partial	100%	None	All	Board of Health
Weymouth	1994*	55	None	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Wilbraham	1994	12	None	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Williamstown	1993*	8	Total	70%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Winchester	1984	20	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Winthrop	1994*	17	None	25%	None	None	Board of Health
Wrentham	1995	10	None	None	None	Some	Board of Health
Michigan	1993*	9,594	Public	50%	None	Some	N/S
Argentine	1993	5	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Atlas	1993	6	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Burton	1993	27	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Clio	1993	3	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Davison	1993	6	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Detroit	1992	1,000	Partial	None	None	None	Health Dept.
East Lansing	1995*	48	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.
Fenton	1993	10	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Michigan (Cont.)							
Flint	1993	135	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Flushing	1993	8	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Genesee	1993	24	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Genesee Co.	1993	225	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Goodrich	1993	1	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Grand Blanc	1993	8	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Linden	1993	3	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Marquette	1997*	17	Total	100%	None	All	City Mgr.
Marquette Co.	1987	36	Partial	60%	None	All	City Mgr.
Montrose	1993	2	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Mundy	1993	13	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Otisville	1993	(722)	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Pontiac	1998	71	Public	None	None	Some	Police Dept.
Swartz Creek	1993	5	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Thetford	1993	9	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Minnesota	1993*	4,658	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Farmington	1991	9	None	None	None	None	Police Dept.
Mississippi	1964	2,716	None	None	None	Some	N/S
Missouri	1993*	5,359	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Brentwood	1990	13	Public	33%	None	All	N/S
Chesterfield	1992*	45	None	50%	None	All	Police Dept.
Clayton	1988	14	None	25%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Columbia	1990*	77	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Crestwood	1993	12	None	70%	None	All	N/S
Des Peres	1989	8	None	50%	None	Some	N/S
Frontenac	1994	3	None	50%	None	All	N/S
Independence	1986	110	Partial	0%	None	All	Other Agency
Jefferson City	1989	36	Partial	0%	None	All	Other Agency
Kansas City	1986	441	Partial	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Ladue	1993	8	None	40%	All	None	na
Oak Grove	1993	5	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Pacific	1993	5	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Pleasant Hill	1993	5	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Rock Hill	1987	5	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Springfield	1991	143	None	0%	None	All	Board of Health
St. Joseph	1993	70	None	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Webster Groves	1993	22	None	70%	All	All	N/S
Montana	1993*	879	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Nebraska	1979	1,652	Private	0%	None	All	N/S
Lincoln	1990	209	None	None	None	Some	na

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Nevada	1993*	1,603	Public	0%	None	Some	Local Bd. Health
New Hampshire	1997*	1,162	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
New Jersey	1998*	7,988	Partial	0%	None	Some	Loc. Bd. Health
Bayonne	1998	61	Public	None	None	None	Health Dept.
Glassboro	1998	7	None	100%	None	None	Health Dept.
Highland Park	1996	13	Total	None	None	All	Board of Health
Hillsborough Twtnshp.	1981	33	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Irvington	1994	58	None	None	None	Some	Health Dept.
Jefferson Twtnshp.	1996	18	None	None	None	None	Police Dept.
Lawrence Twtnshp.	1994	28	None	50%	None	All	N/S
Marlboro	1997	3	None	50%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Medford	1998	56	Public	None	None	None	Police Dept.
Pequannock	1995	14	None	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Princeton Twtnshp.	1998	14	None	None	None	None	na
Secaucus	1993	14	None	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Union Twtnshp.	1992	50	None	None	None	Some	Other Agency
New Mexico	1994*	1,713	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Albuquerque	1988	420	Partial	67%	None	All	N/S
Las Cruces	1997*	75	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	City Mgr.
Los Alamos Co.	1994	18	Partial	67%	None	All	Police Dept.
New York	1994*	18,185	Partial	70%	None	All	Other Agency
Chautauqua Co.	1988	63	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Erie Co.	1996*	516	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Livingston Co.	1998	40	Partial	100%	Rest.	All	Board of Health
Monroe Co.	1997*	458	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Nassau Co.	1996*	814	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
New York City	1994*	7,381	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Niagara Co.	1998	221	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Ontario Co.	1987	62	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Rockland Co.	1997*	171	Partial	75%	None	All	N/S
Suffolk Co.	1994*	1,238	Partial	100%	Rest.	Some	Health Dept.
Westchester Co.	1996*	254	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
North Carolina	1993	7,123	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Boone	1993	14	Partial	None	None	Some	Other Agency
Buncombe Co.	1993	113	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Burke Co.	1993	56	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Burlington	1993	40	None	25%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Caldwell Co.	1993	41	Partial	33%	None	All	Health Dept.
Carrboro	1993	14	Partial	50%	None	All	N/S
Catawba Co.	1993	74	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Chapel Hill	1992*	44	Partial	25%	None	Some	City Mgr.

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
North Carolina (Cont.)							
Chatham Co.	1993	37	Total	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Cleveland Co.	1993	37	Partial	50%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Craven Co.	1993	35	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Cumberland Co.	1993	187	None	33%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Davie Co.	1993	15	Public	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Durham	1993	150	None	50%	None	Some	N/S
Durham Co.	1993	46	Partial	50%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Forsyth Co.	1994	99	None	None	None	Some	Health Dept.
Gaston Co.	1993	86	Partial	80%	None	All	Health Dept.
Graham Co.	1993	8 [†]	None	None	None	All	Health Dept.
Greensboro	1989*	195	None	25%	None	None	N/S
Guilford Co.	1993	102	Partial	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Halifax Co.	1993	33	Partial	80%	None	All	Board of Health
Haywood Co.	1993	36	Partial	None	None	None	Health Dept.
Henderson Co.	1993	66	Total	66%	None	All	Health Dept.
High Point	1993	74	None	25%	None	None	N/S
Lee Co.	1993	25	Partial	50%	None	Some	Board of Health
Montreat	1993	(671)	Total	50%	None	All	Other Agency
New Hanover	1993*	144	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
New Hanover Co.	1993*	74	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Northampton Co.	1993	15	Partial	33%	None	All	Board of Health
Onslow Co.	1994*	71	Partial	80%	None	All	Health Dept.
Orange Co.	1993	45	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Raleigh	1993*	244	Partial	33%	None	Some	N/S
Randolph Co.	1993	87	None	75%	None	None	Board of Health
Rowan Co.	1993	73	None	0%	None	All	Board of Health
Wake Co.	1993	159	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Wilkes Co.	1993	55	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Wilmington	1990	62	Partial	25%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Wrightsville Beach	1993	3	Partial	25%	None	Some	Health Dept.
North Dakota	1993*	644	Public	0%	None	Some	N/S
Ohio	1994*	11,173	Public	None	None	Some	N/S
Akron	1995*	217	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Athens	1988	21	None	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Barberton	1988	27	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Beachwood	1989	11	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Cincinnati	1985	346	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Cleveland	1986	498	Partial	40%	None	All	Health Dept.
Cleveland Heights	1987	54	Partial	30%	None	All	Health Dept.
Columbus	1993	657	Total	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Dayton	1971	173	None	None	None	Some	N/S

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Ohio (Cont.)							
Delaware Co.	1997	83	Partial	60%	None	All	Health Dept.
Eastlake	1988	21	Partial	0%	None	None	Police Dept.
Euclid	1989	52	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Findlay	1993	37	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Hancock Co.	1994	22	Partial	50%	None	Some	Board of Health
Knox Co.	1994	31	Total	100%	All	All	Health Dept.
Lakewood	1987	56	Partial	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Licking Co.	1993	58	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Lorain	1992	70	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Mahoning Co.	1994	132	None	50%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Maple Heights	1988	26	Partial	0%	None	All	Other Agency
Mayfield Village	1986	3	Partial	10%	None	All	Other Agency
Medina	1987	22	None	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Muskingum Co.	1993	85 [†]	Partial	60%	None	All	Health Dept.
Newark	1992	49	Partial	50%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Parma	1988	85	Partial	0%	None	All	Other Agency
Parma Heights	1987	21	Partial	0%	None	All	Other Agency
Shaker Heights	1988	29	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Stark Co.	1997	197	None	None	None	Some	Board of Health
Summit Co.	1988*	86	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Toledo	1987	318	Partial	20%	None	All	Health Dept.
University Heights	1987	14	Partial	50%	None	All	Other Agency
Warren	1987	48	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Warren City	1992	48	Partial	0%	None	Some	Board of Health
Xenia	1985	23	Partial	0%	None	None	N/S
Muskingum Co.	1993	85	Total	60%	None	All	Health Dept.
Oklahoma	1994*	3,301	Public	0%	None	Some	Other Agency
Oregon	1985*	3,204	Public	0%	None	All	Loc. Bd. Health
Benton Co.	1997	20	Total	100%	Rest.	All	N/S
Corvallis	1997	48	Total	100%	All	All	N/S
Eugene	1980	124	Public	0%	None	Some	N/S
Pennsylvania	1992*	12,056	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Erie	1988	105	Partial	20%	None	All	N/S
Lower Merion	1988	57	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Pittsburgh	1987	350	Partial	20%	None	All	Other Agency
State College	1987	39	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Rhode Island	1998*	990	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
North Providence	1997	31	None	None	None	None	N/S
Portsmouth	1998	101	None	None	None	None	N/S

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
South Carolina	1996*	3,699	Public	None	None	Some	N/S
Greenville	1987	57	None	50%	None	Some	N/S
Hampton Co.	1987	9	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Spartanburg	1993	42	Partial	50%	None	Some	N/S
South Dakota	1994*	732	Public	None	None	Some	N/S
Sioux Falls	1980	113	Partial	None	None	Some	N/S
Tennessee	1995*	5,320	Public	None	None	Some	N/S
Collierville	1993	25	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Germantown	1989	32	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Memphis	1986	597	None	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Texas	1987*	19,128	None	None	None	Some	N/S
Abilene	1987	108	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Addison	1988	11	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Amarillo	1988	170	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Arlington	1994*	295	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Austin	1994*	541	Total	100%	All	All	N/S
Baytown	1990*	68	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Bedford	1986	49	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Bellaire	1996	15	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Brownsville	1988	132	Partial	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Bryan	1986	58	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Carrollton	1994	97	None	100%	All	Some	N/S
College Station	1990	59	None	50%	None	All	N/S
Colleyville	1989	19	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Corpus Christi	1993*	280	Partial	70%	None	All	Health Dept.
Dallas	1993*	1,053	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Del Rio	1987	34	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Denton	1986	73	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Desoto	1989	35	Partial	75%	None	Some	N/S
Duncanville	1989	36	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Eagle Pass	1987	28	None	0%	None	All	N/S
El Paso	1986	600	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Euless	1987	42	None	None	None	Some	N/S
Fort Worth	1993*	480	Partial	100%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Galveston	1989	60	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Garland	1991	190	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Granbury City	1993*	5	None	50%	None	Some	N/S
Grand Prairie	1986	109	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Greenville	1986	24	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Haltom City	1986	36	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Houston	1992*	1,744	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Huntsville	1987	29	None	30%	None	Some	N/S
Hurst	1986	37	None	0%	None	Some	N/S

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Texas (Cont.)							
Irving	1979	177	None	None	None	Some	N/S
Keller	1998	20	Public	None	None	None	City Mgr.
Kerr Co.	1987	20	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Kerrville	1987	20	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Lancaster	1988	23	None	0%	None	Some	N/S
Leon Valley	1987	10	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Longview	1987	75	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Lubbock	1987	194	Partial	0%	None	All	Other Agency
Mansfield	1987	21	None	None	None	Some	N/S
McAllen	1987	103	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Mesquite	1988	112	None	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Midland	1990	97	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
New Braunfels	1990	34	Public	0%	None	Some	N/S
N. Richland Hills	1987	53	None	0%	None	All	N/S
Plano	1994*	192	None	100%	All	All	City Mgr.
Richardson	1988	81	Partial	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Rockwall	1986	14	Public	0%	None	Some	N/S
Round Rock	1994	52	Partial	51%	None	All	City Mgr.
San Antonio	1992*	1,068	None	0%	None	All	City Mgr.
Seguin	1988	21	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Southlake	1992	14	Partial	0%	None	Some	N/S
Sugar Land	1987	48	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Texarkana	1986	32	Public	None	None	Some	N/S
Travis Co.	1986	121	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Tyler	1987	82	Partial	None	None	All	N/S
West Lake Hills	1993	3	Partial	100%	None	All	N/S
Wichita Falls	1994*	100	Total	100%	Rest.	All	Health Dept.
Utah	1997*	2,000	Partial	100%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Vermont	1997*	589	Partial	100%	All	All	N/S
Burlington	1987*	39	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Virginia	1996*	6,675	Public	0%	None	Some	N/S
Albemarle Co.	1989	74	Partial	20%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Alexandria	1988	118	None	25%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Arlington	1987*	175	None	25%	None	Some	N/S
Charlottesville	1988	41	Partial	20%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Chesapeake	1988	192	Public	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Fairfax	1986*	21	None	25%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Fairfax Co.	1985	869	None	25%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Falls Church	1990*	10	None	25%	None	Some	N/S
Franklin	1988	9	None	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amendment*	Population ¹ (000)	Workplaces Covered	Restaurants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
Virginia (Cont.)							
Hampton	1989	139	None	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Lynchburg	1989	67	None	25%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Newport News	1989	176	Public	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Norfolk	1979	233	None	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Portsmouth	1989*	101	None	0%	None	Some	City Mgr.
Prince William Co.	1987*	243	Public	25%	None	Some	N/S
Stafford Co.	1988	82	Public	None	None	None	Other Agency
Suffolk	1989	59	None	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Virginia Beach	1989	430	None	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Washington	1994*	5,533	Total	0%	None	All	N/S
Kennewick	1985	51	None	0%	None	All	N/S
King Co.	1986	539	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Pierce Co.	1986*	657	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Seattle	1983	525	Partial	0%	None	Some	Health Dept.
West Virginia	1987*	1,826	None	None	None	None	N/S
Belmont	1990	1	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S
Bluefield	1991	12	None	0%	None	All	City Mgr.
Boone Co.	1997	22	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Braxton Co.	1995	11	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Brooke Co.	1996	15	Total	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Cabell Co.	1995	42	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Calhoun Co.	1994	7	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Clay Co.	1995	10	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Fairmont	1987	20	Partial	0%	None	All	City Mgr.
Gilmer Co.	1997	7	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Grant Co.	1994*	8	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Greenbrier Co.	1995	36	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Hampshire Co.	1994*	16	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Jackson Co.	1996	20	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Kanawha Co.	1995	99	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Lincoln Co.	1995	21	Total	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Marshall Co.	1998	36	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
McDowell Co.	1996	24	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Mercer Co.	1995	44	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Monongalia Co.	1992	45	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Monroe Co.	1996	12	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Morgan Co.	1997	12	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Morgantown	1997*	27	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Nicholas Co.	1998	22	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Pendleton Co.	1993	7	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Pleasants Co.	1994	4	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Princeton	1990	7	Partial	50%	None	All	City Mgr.

State Community	Last Amend- ment*	Popu- lation ¹ (000)	Work- places Covered	Restau- rants	Bars	Enclosed Public Places	Enforcement
West Virginia (Cont.)							
Putnam Co.	1996	37	Partial	75%	None	All	Board of Health
Raleigh Co.	1995	57	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Randolph Co.	1994	19	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Ritchie Co.	1994	6	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Roane Co.	1994	13	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Upshur Co.	1995	18	Partial	100%	None	All	Health Dept.
Wayne Co.	1997	31	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Webster Co.	1997	10	Partial	50%	None	All	Health Dept.
Ohio Co.	1996	50	Partial	50%	None	All	Board of Health
Wirt Co.	1994	5	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Wood Co.	1994	40	Partial	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Wyoming Co.	1997	28	Total	75%	None	All	Health Dept.
Wisconsin	1994*	5,160	Partial	0%	Rest.	Some	Other Agency
Dane Co.	1998*	72	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Fitchburg	1991	18	None	0%	None	Some	Other Agency
Madison	1992*	198	None	100%	None	Some	Health Dept.
Middleton	1996	14	None	100%	None	None	N/S
Oak Creek	1988	25	None	None	None	Some	N/S
Rice Lake	1983	8	Public	None	None	Some	N/S
Shorewood Hills	1994*	2	None	100%	Rest.	Some	N/S
Wyoming	1989	481	Public	None	None	None	N/S
Casper	1988	49	Partial	0%	None	All	Health Dept.
Laramie	1986	27	Partial	0%	None	All	N/S

* There was an earlier enactment; this is the year of the most recent amendment.

¹ Populations are in thousands unless otherwise noted. Population numbers in (parentheses) are for counties with less than 1000 residents; those numbers are exact population figures. County populations are for unincorporated areas only unless otherwise noted.

[†] Population includes incorporated and unincorporated areas of the county.

YOUTH ACCESS PROVISIONS

SUMMARY TABLE 2 This table gives a tally of the local ordinances listed in Chart 4 that restrict youth access to tobacco products. It also provides tallies for specific youth access ordinances.

Total: This column lists the total number of local communities with youth access ordinances. This includes laws covering vending machines, free or low-cost distribution of tobacco product samples, single cigarette sales, and tobacco retailer licensing.

Vending Machines: This column lists the total number of local communities with ordinances that place restrictions on vending machines.

Tobacco Sampling: This column lists the total number of local communities with ordinances that restrict free or low-cost promotional distribution of tobacco products.

Licensing: This column lists the total number of local communities with ordinances that require tobacco retailers to be licensed, and provide for the suspension or revocation of that license if the retailer repeatedly sells to minors.

Self-Service Displays: This column lists the total number of local communities with ordinances that prohibit stocking tobacco products in displays accessible to the public without the intervention of a sales clerk. Ordinances that exempt unbroken cartons of cigarettes are included.

Single Cigarette Sales: This column lists the total number of local communities with ordinances that prohibit the sale of single cigarettes.

Use/Possession/Purchase: This column lists the total number of local communities with ordinances that penalize minors for purchasing, possessing, or using tobacco products.

CHART 4 This chart lists local ordinances designed to control youth access to tobacco. In general, the majority of these provisions cover both smoking and chewing tobacco products. There are 764 local youth access ordinances listed herein.

Figure 3 presents a map of the tobacco vending machine laws in the United States at the local and state levels.

Figure 4 presents a map of the licensing laws for tobacco retailers in the United States at the local and state levels.

Figure 5 presents a map of the self-service display laws in the United States at the local and state levels.

Last Amendment: This column indicates when a community enacted or last amended an ordinance with youth access provisions. In the case of

ordinances that have been amended following original adoption, the column reflects the date of the latest amendment. Those ordinances that have been amended following original adoption are indicated by an asterisk next to the date.

Vending Machines: A “Total” in this column indicates that the ordinance prohibits tobacco vending machines in all areas, without exception. A “Partial” in this column indicates that the ordinance allows tobacco vending machines under certain circumstances. Partial restrictions include restricting vending machine placement to adult-only areas (*e.g.*, bars, workplace cafeterias, etc.), a requirement that vending machines be equipped with a mechanical locking device which prevents a sale until activated by a sales clerk, a requirement that vending machines operate on tokens which cannot be sold to minors, or a requirement that vending machines be placed in areas under constant adult supervision. A “Partial” in this column indicates that the ordinance allows one or more of these partial restrictions.

Sampling: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance limits or bans free or low-cost distribution of tobacco product samples to minors and adults. Ordinances that exempt private clubs or other adult-only areas are included. Ordinances that prohibit providing tobacco product samples to minors but permit distribution to adults are not included.

Licensing: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance requires tobacco retailers to obtain a license to sell tobacco products and provides for suspension and/or revocation of the license if the merchant is repeatedly caught selling tobacco to minors. Ordinances that require merchants to obtain a license but do not provide for its suspension or revocation are not included, as they are designed to raise revenue and not to reduce youth access to tobacco.

Self-Service Displays: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance prohibits stocking tobacco products in displays accessible to the public without the intervention of a sales clerk (*i.e.*, tobacco products must be placed behind or above the counter and be accessible only to the sales clerk). Ordinances that exempt unbroken cartons of cigarettes are included.

Single Cigarette Sales: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance prohibits selling single cigarettes, or cigarettes out of the original manufacturer’s sealed packaging which includes the health warning label.

Use/Possession/Purchase: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance penalizes minors for purchasing, possessing, and/or using tobacco products.


Note: An entry of “—” in a field indicates that information is not available for that provision. This is generally the result of adding new fields of analysis to reflect a significant development in ordinance provisions; database records for ordinances analyzed prior to the new field of analysis do not contain information for that provision.

Summary Table 2

Local Ordinances Restricting Youth Access to Tobacco: Total Number by State


State	Total	Vending Machine	Sam-pling	Licen-sing	Self-Service Displays	Single Cigarette Sales	Use/Possession/Purchase
Alabama	2	2	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska	1	1	0	0	1	1	1
Arizona	6	6	0	1	1	0	0
California	156	152	38	2	57	24	3
Colorado	17	10	2	2	5	1	14
Connecticut	3	1	0	0	1	0	1
Delaware	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
District of Columbia	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
Florida	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Georgia	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Illinois	56	34	34	36	0	3	48
Indiana	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Iowa	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Kansas	4	3	1	1	1	2	3
Louisiana	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Maine	3	1	1	1	2	0	0
Maryland	2	2	2	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	109	104	94	75	60	68	3
Michigan	36	11	2	27	1	0	3
Minnesota	95	79	8	60	25	4	20
Missouri	6	3	3	2	1	2	4
Nebraska	3	0	1	1	0	1	2
New Hampshire	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	153	143	1	18	56	2	17
New Mexico	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
New York	11	8	3	2	2	1	0
North Carolina	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
North Dakota	12	12	0	7	4	0	8
Ohio	12	9	3	2	1	1	8
Oregon	3	0	0	2	3	0	0
Pennsylvania	12	11	0	0	1	1	0
Rhode Island	2	1	0	0	0	0	1
Texas	13	9	3	0	3	1	4
Utah	7	5	0	0	7	0	0
Washington	7	7	3	5	0	1	1
West Virginia	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	17	5	4	5	1	6	12
Wyoming	2	1	0	0	0	0	2
Totals	764	628	208	252	233	121	156

Figure 3: Vending Machine Placement Laws: 1997




Data Source: *State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues*, American Lung Association, 1997
National Matrix of Local Ordinances, American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation, 1998

Figure 4: Tobacco Retailer Licensing Laws: 1997



Data Source: State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues, American Lung Association, 1997
National Matrix of Local Ordinances, American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation, 1998

Figure 5: Self-service Display Laws: 1997



Data Source: State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues, American Lung Association, 1997
National Matrix of Local Ordinances, American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation, 1998

Chart 4

State Laws and Local Ordinances to Reduce Youth Access to Tobacco Products

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Alabama	1997	None	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Homewood	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Mobile	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Alaska	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Anchorage	1997*	Partial	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Buckeye	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Arizona	1978	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Cottonwood	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Paradise Valley	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Scottsdale	1993	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Tempe	1993	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Tucson	1997*	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Arkansas	1991	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
California	1996*	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Alameda Co.	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Albany	1992	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Amador Co.	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Anderson	1993	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Antioch	1993	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Atascadero	1992	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Avenal	1998	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Belmont	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Belvedere	1993	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Berkeley	1991	Total	Yes	No	No	No	No
Buellton	1996	Partial	No	—	No	Yes	—
Burlingame	1993	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Calistoga	1995	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Camarillo	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Capitola	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Carpinteria	1995	Partial	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Chino Hills	1992	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Chula Vista	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Clayton	1992	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Concord	1993	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Contra Costa Co.	1998*	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Corcoran	1997	None	No	No	Yes	No	No
Coronado	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Corte Madera	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
California (Cont.)							
Cotati	1994	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Cupertino	1992	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Dana Point	1993	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Danville	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Davis	1992	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Del Mar	1993	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Dixon	1992	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Duarte	1995	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Dublin	1994	Total	Yes	No	No	No	No
Dunsmuir	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
El Cajon	1997*	Total	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
El Cerrito	1991	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
El Dorado Co.	1993	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Escondido	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Exeter	1997	Partial	No	—	Yes	No	—
Fairfax	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Fairfield	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Fort Bragg	1994	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Fremont	1993	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Hanford	1998	Partial	No	—	Yes	Yes	—
Hayward	1993	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Healdsburg	1994	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Hercules	1992	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Hesperia	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Hollister	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Huntington Beach	1993	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Imperial Beach	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Imperial Co.	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Lafayette	1992	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Laguna Beach	1992	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Laguna Hills	1993	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Larkspur	1993	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Lathrop	1992	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Lemon Grove	1994	Total	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Livermore	1993	Total	Yes	No	No	No	No
Loma Linda	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Long Beach	1994*	None	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Los Banos	1997	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Los Gatos	1991	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Manteca	1976	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Marin Co.	1993	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Mendocino Co.	1993	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Menlo Park	1993	Total	No	No	—	—	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
California (Cont.)							
Mill Valley	1992	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Millbrae	1993	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Mission Viejo	1993	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Monterey Co.	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Mount Shasta	1993	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Mountain View	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Napa	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Napa Co.	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Novato	1997*	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Oakland	1995*	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Oceanside	1998	Total	No	—	Yes	Yes	—
Ojai	1993	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Orange Co.	1993	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Orinda	1992	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Palo Alto	1991	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Paradise	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Pasadena	1998	Total	—	—	Yes	—	—
Petaluma	1994	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Pinole	1992	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Pittsburg	1995	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Placerville	1993	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Pleasant Hill	1993	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Pleasanton	1991	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Plymouth	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Poway	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Rancho Mirage	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Redding	1993	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Redlands	1996*	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Richmond	1994	Total	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Riverside	1993	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Rohnert Park	1992	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Sacramento	1991	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Salinas	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
San Anselmo	1993	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
San Bernardino	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
San Diego	1998*	Total	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
San Diego Co.	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
San Francisco	1997*	Total	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
San Jose	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
San Luis Obispo	1997*	Total	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
San Luis Obispo Co.	1991	Total	No	No	—	—	—
San Marcos	1977	Partial	No	No	—	—	—

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
California (Cont.)							
San Mateo	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
San Mateo Co.	1998*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
San Rafael	1993	Total	No	No	Yes	—	—
San Ramon	1994	Total	Yes	No	No	No	No
Santa Ana	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Santa Barbara	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Santa Barbara Co.	1996*	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	No
Santa Clarita	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Santa Cruz	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Santa Cruz Co.	1998*	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Santa Monica	1991	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Santa Rosa	1993	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Saratoga	1994	Total	Yes	No	No	No	No
Sausalito	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Scotts Valley	1991	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Seal Beach	1993	Partial	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Seaside	1992	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Sebastopol	1994*	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Shafter	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Shasta Co.	1993	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Shasta Lake	1993	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Siskiyou Co.	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Solana Beach	1992*	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Solano Co.	1991	Total	Yes	No	—	—	—
Sonoma	1994	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Sonoma Co.	1994	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
South Lake Tahoe	1993	Total	—	—	—	—	—
Thousand Oaks	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Tiburon	1992	Total	No	No	Yes	—	—
Tracy	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Ukiah	1993	Partial	No	No	Yes	—	—
Union City	1994	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Vacaville	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Vallejo	1994*	Total	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Ventura	1994	—	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Vista	1996*	Total	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Walnut Creek	1991	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Watsonville	1991	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Weed	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
West Hollywood	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
West Sacramento	1991	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Whittier	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Windsor	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
California (Cont.)							
Woodland	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Yolo Co.	1998	None	No	—	Yes	Yes	—
Yountville	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Yreka	1992	Partial	—	—	—	—	—
Colorado	1998*	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Alamosa	1998	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Boulder	1996*	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Colorado Springs	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Denver	1998*	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Englewood	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Estes Park	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Federal Heights	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Fort Collins	1997	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Monte Vista	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Montrose	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Northglenn	1995	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Olathe	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Parker	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Pueblo	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Sterling	1990	Total	No	No	No	No	Yes
Westminster	1988	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Woodland Park	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Connecticut	1996	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Haddam	1998	None	No	No	Yes	No	No
Orange	1998	Total	No	—	No	No	—
Seymour	1998	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Delaware	1996	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Wilmington	1995	None	No	No	No	Yes	No
District of Columbia	1991*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Florida	1998*	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Jacksonville	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Georgia	1998*	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Atlanta	1986	—	Yes	No	—	—	—
East Point	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Hawaii	1998*	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Honolulu	1998*	None	Yes	No	No	No	No
Maui Co.	1997	None	Yes	—	No	No	—
Idaho	1998*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Illinois	1995*	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Addison	1989	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Alsip	1995	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Arlington Heights	1996	None	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Bensenville	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Berwyn	1997	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Bloomington	1974	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Bolingbrook	1989	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Buffalo Grove	1997*	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Charleston	1990	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Chicago	1991	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Chicago Ridge	1993	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Cook Co.	1997	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Crystal Lake	1996	None	No	No	No	Yes	No
Danville	1996	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Darien	1994	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Downers Grove	1998*	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Elk Grove Village	1991	Partial	Yes	Yes	—	—	—
Elmhurst	1990	Partial	Yes	Yes	—	—	—
Elmwood Park	1996	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Evanston	1996	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Evergreen Park	1995	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Glen Ellyn	1993	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Glenview	1990	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Hanover Park	1990	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Highland Park	1996	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
La Grange	1993*	None	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Lake in the Hills	1998	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Lake Zurich	1995	None	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Lemont	1993	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Libertyville	1994	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Lisle	1995*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Lockport	1997	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Melrose Park	1998	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Moline	1996	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Naperville	1992	None	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Niles	1995*	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Normal	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Northbrook	1997	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Orland Park	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Park Ridge	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Pleasant Plains	1997	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Quincy	1997	None	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Rochester	1997	None	No	No	No	No	Yes

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Illinois (Cont.)							
Salem	1995	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Schaumburg	1989	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Streamwood	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Wellington	1995	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Western Springs	1993	None	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Westmont	1993	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Wheeling	1996	None	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Willowbrook	1993	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Wilmette	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Winfield	1993	None	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Wood Dale	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Woodridge	1989	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Woodstock	1992	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Indiana	1997*	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Indianapolis	1991	—	No	Yes	—	—	—
Iowa	1998*	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Des Moines	1993	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Kansas	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Emporia	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Ottawa	1997	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Overland Park	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Wichita	1994	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	No
Kentucky	1998*	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Louisiana	1997	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Iowa	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Maine	1996*	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Orono	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Portland	1998	None	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Westbrook	1995	None	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Maryland	1994	None	No	No	No	No	No
Bowie	1991*	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Takoma Park	1990	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Massachusetts	1996	None	No	No	No	Yes	No
Acton	1993	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Acushnet	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Amherst	1994*	Total	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Andover	1994	Partial	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Arlington	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Ashland	1993	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Massachusetts (Cont.)							
Attleboro	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Barre	1991	Partial	Yes	Yes	—	—	—
Bedford	1994	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bellingham	1994	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Belmont	1994*	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Billerica	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Bolton	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Boston	1997*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Boxborough	1995	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Brockton	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Brookline	1995	Total	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Burlington	1992	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Cambridge	1993	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Canton	1994	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Chelmsford	1991	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Chicopee	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Clinton	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Cohasset	1993	—	Yes	No	No	No	No
Concord	1991	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Dedham	1994	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dennis	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Dover	1994	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Dudley	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Easthampton	1994	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Easton	1995	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Falmouth	1993	—	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Fitchburg	1992	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Foxborough	1993	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Framingham	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Gardner	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Gloucester	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Granby	1995	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Greenfield	1994	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Haverhill	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Hingham	1993	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Holden	1993	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Holliston	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Holyoke	1994	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Lancaster	1992	Partial	Yes	Yes	—	—	—
Lawrence	1994	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Lee	1994	Total	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Lenox	1994	Total	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Leominster	1998*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Massachusetts (Cont.)							
Lexington	1994	Total	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Longmeadow	1994*	Total	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Lowell	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Malden	1993	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Mansfield	1993	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Marion	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Marlborough	1995*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Mashpee	1995	Total	No	Yes	No	No	No
Medfield	1997*	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Medway	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Methuen	1995	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Middleton	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Millis	1994*	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Milton	1994	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Montague	1995	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Nahant	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Natick	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Needham	1995*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
New Bedford	1989	—	Yes	No	—	—	—
Newton	1993	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
North Adams	1995*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
North Andover	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
North Attleboro	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Northampton	1997*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Norton	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Norwood	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Oak Bluffs	1993	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Orange	1997*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Pittsfield	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Plainville	1993	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Plymouth	1993	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	No
Provincetown	1992	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Quincy	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Revere	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Sandwich	1993*	Total	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Saugus	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Seekonk	1994	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Sharon	1998*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Shirley	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Somerville	1992	Partial	Yes	Yes	—	—	—
South Hadley	1994	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Southwick	1992	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Stockbridge	1994	Total	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Massachusetts (Cont.)							
Tewksbury	1994	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Uxbridge	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Wakefield	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Walpole	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Watertown	1997	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Wellesley	1990	—	Yes	No	—	—	—
West Springfield	1994*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Westborough	1998	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Westfield	1995*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Westford	1993	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Westwood	1996	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Weymouth	1994*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Wilbraham	1994	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Williamstown	1993	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Winthrop	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Worcester	1984	—	Yes	No	—	—	—
Wrentham	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Michigan	1992	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Ann Arbor	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Argentine	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Atlas	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Burton	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Clayton	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Clio	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Davison	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Dearborn	1981	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
East Lansing	1991	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Fenton	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Flint	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Flushing	1993*	Total	No	Yes	No	No	No
Forest	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Gaines	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Genesee	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Genesee Co.	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Goodrich	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Grand Blanc	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Ingham Co.	1992	Partial	Yes	Yes	—	—	—
Linden	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Marquette	1995	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Marquette Co.	1990	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Montrose	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Mount Morris	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Mundy	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Otisville	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Richfield	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Rochester Hills	1990	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Royal Oak	1994	Partial	—	—	—	—	Yes
Sterling Heights	1991	Partial	—	—	—	—	—
Swartz Creek	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Thetford	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Troy	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Vienna	1993	—	No	Yes	No	No	No
Warren	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Zeeland	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Minnesota	1997	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Albert Lea	1991	—	Yes	Yes	—	—	—
Annandale	1968	None	—	Yes	No	No	No
Anoka	1989	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Austin	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Bayport	1980	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Bemidji	1996	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Big Lake	1990	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Blaine	1989	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Bloomington	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Brainerd	1985	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Brooklyn Center	1991	Total	No	Yes	Yes	—	—
Brooklyn Park	1990*	Total	No	Yes	—	—	—
Burnsville	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Cannon Falls	1990	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Champlin	1989	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Chanhassen	1991	Total	No	Yes	—	—	—
Chaska	1995	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Chatfield	1991	Total	No	Yes	No	No	No
Cokato	1990	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Coon Rapids	1990	Total	No	Yes	No	No	No
Cottage Grove	1983	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Crookston	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Deer River	1989	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Delano	1994*	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Duluth	1996*	Total	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Eagan	1992	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Eden Prairie	1994	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Edina	1990	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Excelsior	1972	—	No	Yes	—	—	—

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Minnesota (Cont.)							
Eyota	—	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Falcon Heights	1994	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Farmington	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Fergus Falls	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Glencoe	1995	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Golden Valley	1996*	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Grand Rapids	1990	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Ham Lake	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Hutchinson	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Jackson	1990	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Kasson	1983	—	No	Yes	—	—	—
Kenyon	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Lake City	1981	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Lindstrom	1997	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Litchfield	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Luverne	1990*	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Maple Plain	1941	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Milaca	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Minneapolis	1995*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Minnnetonka	1990	Total	No	Yes	—	—	—
Montevideo	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Monticello	1994	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Moorhead	1996	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Mora	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Morris	1996	None	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Mound	1941	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Mounds View	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
New Brighton	1989	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
New Hope	1990	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
New Ulm	1996	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
North Branch	1997	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
North Oaks	1990	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Northfield	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Orono	1993	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Owatonna	1990	Total	No	Yes	—	—	—
Park Rapids	1994	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Preston	1988	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Red Wing	1990	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Redwood Falls	1990	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
Richfield	1990	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Rochester	1991	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Rosemont	1971	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Roseville	1991	Total	No	Yes	Yes	—	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Minnesota (Cont.)							
Saint Peter	1994	Total	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Sartell	1990	Total	No	Yes	—	—	—
Savage	1995	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Shakopee	1995	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Shoreview	1994	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
St Charles	1941	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
St Francis	1990	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
St. Cloud	1990	Total	No	Yes	—	—	—
St. Joseph	1996	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
St. Louis Park	1996*	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
St. Paul	1990	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Stewartville	1996	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Stillwater	1992	None	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Thief River Falls	1997*	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Tracy	1957	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Waconia	1989	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Waseca	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Washington Co.	1998	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
West St. Paul	1990	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
White Bear Lake	1989	Total	—	No	—	—	—
Willmar	1990	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Woodbury	1998	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Worthington	1990	Partial	—	—	—	—	—
Mississippi	1997*	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	No
Missouri	1992	None	No	No	No	No	No
Brentwood	1998	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Columbia	1990	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Springfield	1998	None	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
St. Charles	1981	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
St. Charles Co.	1997	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
St. Louis Co.	1996	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Montana	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Nebraska	1993*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Gothenburg	1997	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Lincoln	1990	—	—	—	—	—	Yes
Omaha	1993	—	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Nevada	1995	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	No
New Hampshire	1997	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Keene	1993	Partial	No	No	—	—	—

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
New Jersey	1995	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Alexandria Township	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Avon By the Sea	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Barnegat Township	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Belleville Township	1996	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Berkeley Township	1996	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Bernards Township	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Bogota Borough	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Bordentown Township	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Carlstadt	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Cedar Grove	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Cherry Hill	1993	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Clark	1994	Partial	—	—	—	—	—
Clifton	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Clinton Township	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Collingswood Borough	1996	Total	No	Yes	No	No	No
Delaware Township	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Deptford	1997	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Dover Township	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Downe Township	1996	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
East Brunswick	1990	Total	No	No	No	No	No
East Greenwich	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
East Hanover Township	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
East Rutherford	1997	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
East Windsor Township	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Eatontown Borough	1997	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Edison	1994	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Emerson Township	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Evesham Township	1997*	Total	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Ewing Township	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Fairfield Township	1996	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Fairlawn	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Flemington	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	Yes
Fort Lee	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Franklin Township	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Freehold Township	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Galloway Township	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Glassboro	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
New Jersey (Cont.)							
Gloucester City	1998	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Greenwich Township	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Hackensack	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Hackettstown	1997	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Haddon Township	1998	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Haddonfield	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Haledon	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Hamilton Township	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Hardyston	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Hardyston Township	1994	Total	No	No	No	—	No
Hasbrouck Heights	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Hazlet Township	1996	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Highland Park	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Hightstown	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Hillsborough Township	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Hillsdale	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Hoboken	1998	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Hopewell Township	1998	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Howell Township	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Jefferson Township	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Keyport	1995	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Kingwood Township	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Lambertville	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Lawrence	1994	Total	—	—	—	—	—
Lawrence Township	1997*	Total	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Leonia Borough	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Little Egg Harbor	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Livingston Township	1996	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Long Hill Township	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Madison Borough	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Mahwah	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Manalapan Township	1996	Total	No	Yes	No	No	No
Mannington Township	1997	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Mansfield Township	1997	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Manville	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Maplewood	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Marlboro	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
New Jersey (Cont.)							
Maurice River	1996	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Medford	1998	Total	No	No	No	No	Yes
Metuchen	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Middletown	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Milltown Borough	1994	—	No	No	Yes	No	No
Monroe Township	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Montclair Township	1997	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Montgomery	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Montgomery Township	1993	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Montvale	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Morristown	1997	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Mount Olive Township	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Mountain Lakes	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Mullica Towhship	1998	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Neptune Township	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
New Brunswick	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
New Milford	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
North Arlington	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
North Brunswick	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
North Plainfield	1996	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Nutley	1997	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Oakland	1998	Partial	No	—	No	No	—
Ocean Township	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Oceanport Borough	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Old Bridge	1998	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Palisades Park	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Paramus	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Park Ridge	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Paterson	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Pennington	1998*	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Pequannock	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Perth Amboy	1994	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	No
Pine Beach	1994	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Pitman	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Pitman Borough	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Plainsboro	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Plumsted Township	1997	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Pompton Lakes	1998	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Princeton Borough	1993	Total	—	—	Yes	—	—
Princeton Township	1993	Total	—	—	Yes	—	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
New Jersey (Cont.)							
Rahway	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Randolph	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Raritan Township	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Readington Township	1995	Total	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Red Bank Borough	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Ridgewood	1997*	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Riverton	1998	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Runnemede Borough	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Saddle Brook	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Saddle River	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Scotch Plains	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Secaucus	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
South Brunswick	1995*	Total	—	—	Yes	—	—
South Plainfield	1997	None	No	No	Yes	No	No
Spring Lake	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Spring Lake Heights	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Stafford Township	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Summit	1994	Total	—	—	—	—	—
Teaneck	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Tenafly Borough	1995	Total	No	Yes	No	No	No
Tinton Falls Borough	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Union Township	1993	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Upper Pittsgrove	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Upper Saddle River	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Vineland	1997	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Waldwick	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Wanaque Borough	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Washington Township	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Watchung Borough	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
West Caldwell	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
West Long Branch	1997	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
West Orange	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
West Windsor Township	1998	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Westfield	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Westwood	1995	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Woodbridge Township	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	No

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
New Jersey (Cont.)							
Woodbury	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Woodbury Heights	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Woodstown Borough	1996	Total	No	No	No	No	No
New Mexico							
Albuquerque	1993	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
	1991	Partial	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
New York							
	1994*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Albany	1997	—	Yes	—	—	—	—
Albany Co.	1992	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Buffalo	1991	Partial	—	—	—	—	—
Chautauqua Co.	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Dutchess Co.	1997	None	No	Yes	No	No	No
Erie Co.	1991	None	Yes	No	—	—	—
Great Neck Plaza	1991	Total	Yes	No	—	—	—
Livingston Co.	1997	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Nassau Co.	1998*	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
New York City	1992*	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Suffolk Co.	1995*	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
North Carolina	1997	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Raleigh	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
North Dakota	1991	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Bismarck	1996*	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Devils Lake	1997*	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Fargo	1992	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Grand Forks	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Jamestown	1993*	Partial	No	Yes	—	—	—
Langdon	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Mandan	1994*	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Minot	1996*	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Valley City	1994*	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Wahpeton	1996	Partial	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
West Fargo	1996	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	No
Williston	1995	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Ohio							
	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Akron	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Anna	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Blue Ash	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Cincinnati	1988	—	Yes	No	No	No	No
Cuyahoga Falls	1998	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Eastlake	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Geneva	1997	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Girard	1997	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Ohio (Cont.)							
Lakewood	1998	Partial	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Medina	1996	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Parma	1996	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Strongsville	1997	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Oregon							
Benton Co.	1991	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Corvallis	1997	None	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Silverton	1997	None	No	No	Yes	No	No
Pennsylvania							
Allentown	1993	None	No	No	No	No	No
Bethlehem	1990	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Easttown	1990	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Haverford	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Philadelphia	1991	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Philadelphia	1995	None	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Pittsburgh	1990	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Radnor	1991	Total	No	No	—	—	—
Tredyffrin	1991	Total	—	—	—	—	—
Uwchlan Township	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Warrington Township	1991	Total	No	No	—	—	—
West Goshen Township	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Westchester	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Rhode Island							
East Providence	1996*	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
West Warwick	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
West Warwick	1997	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
South Carolina							
	1996	None	No	No	No	No	No
South Dakota							
	1998*	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Tennessee							
	1998*	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Texas							
Arlington	1997	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Arlington	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Austin	1996	Partial	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Carrollton	1994	Total	No	No	No	No	No
Dallas	1993*	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Euless	1994	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Fort Worth	1997	Partial	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Houston	1991	Partial	No	No	—	—	—
Lubbock	1995	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Rockwall	1995	None	No	No	No	No	Yes

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Texas (Cont.)							
San Antonio	1992	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	No
Temple	1995	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Victoria	1995	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Wichita Falls	1994	None	No	No	Yes	No	No
Utah							
	1994*	Partial	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Centerville	1998	None	No	No	Yes	No	No
Enoch	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Midvale City	1996	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
North Salt Lake	1998	Partial	No	No	Yes	No	No
Pleasant Grove	1995	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
Riverton	1996	Total	No	No	Yes	No	No
West Haven	1997	None	No	No	Yes	No	No
Vermont	1997	Partial	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Virginia	1998*	Partial	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Washington							
	1993	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Everett	1990	Partial	No	Yes	—	—	—
King Co.	1992*	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Lynnwood	1989	Partial	—	—	—	—	—
Mountlake Terrace	1991	Partial	No	Yes	—	—	—
Seattle	1991	Partial	Yes	Yes	—	—	—
Snohomish Co.	1991	Partial	No	Yes	—	—	—
Vancouver	1989	Partial	Yes	No	—	—	—
West Virginia							
	1998*	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Boone Co.	1997	Partial	No	No	No	No	No
Wisconsin							
	1998*	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Bloomer	1992	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Chippewa Falls	1994	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Columbus	1995	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Cornell	1992	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Dane Co.	1996	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
De Pere	1994	None	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
DeForest Village	1994	Partial	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Fond du Lac	1993	—	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Green Bay	1993	—	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Howard Mount Horeb	1989	None	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Village	1993	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Neillsville	1992	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
New Holstein	1995	None	No	No	No	No	Yes

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend- ment	Vending Mach- ines	Sam- pling	Licen- sing	Self- Serve Disp	Single Sales	Use/ Posses/ Purchase
Wisconsin (Cont.)							
Racine	1995	Partial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Sawyer Co.	1994	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Sturtevant	1993	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Waterford	1993	None	No	No	No	No	Yes
Wyoming							
Gillette	1991	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Rock Springs	1990	Partial	No	No	No	No	Yes
Rock Springs	1963	None	No	No	No	No	Yes

CLEAN INDOOR AIR PROVISIONS STATE LAWS AND LOCAL ORDINANCES: ENCLOSED PUBLIC PLACE PROVISIONS

CHART 3 This chart summarizes the provisions of ordinances that address smoking in enclosed public places. There are 759 local clean indoor air ordinances with provisions covering enclosed public places.

In General: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that all enclosed places open to the general public must prohibit smoking unless otherwise exempted by the ordinance. A “Sections” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that all enclosed places open to the general public must provide nonsmoking sections unless otherwise exempted by the ordinance.

Food Markets: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that smoking is prohibited in food markets. A “Sections” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that food markets must provide nonsmoking sections.

Retail Stores: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that smoking is prohibited in retail stores. A “Sections” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that retail stores must provide nonsmoking sections.

Bingo Parlors: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that smoking is prohibited in bingo parlors. A “Sections” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that bingo parlors must provide nonsmoking sections.

Bowling Centers: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that smoking is prohibited in bowling centers. A “Sections” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that bowling centers must provide nonsmoking sections.

Public Transit: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that smoking is prohibited on public transportation (*e.g.*, buses, taxis, etc.). A “Sections” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that public transportation vehicles must provide nonsmoking sections.

Multi-Unit Dwellings: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that smoking is prohibited in common areas (*e.g.*, hallways, lobby areas, laundry rooms, elevators) of multi-unit dwellings (*e.g.*, apartments, retirement facilities, trailer parks). A “C/A” in this column indicates that the ordinance stipulates that common areas must provide nonsmoking sections.

Note: An entry of “—” in a field indicates that information is not available for that provision. This is generally the result of adding new fields of analysis to reflect a significant development in ordinance provisions; database records for ordinances analyzed prior to the new field of analysis do not contain information for that provision.

Chart 3

State Laws and Local Ordinances: Enclosed Public Place Provisions

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Alabama	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Alexander City	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Anniston	No	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Auburn	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Birmingham	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Cullman	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Daphne	Sections	Yes	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Decatur	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Dothan	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Eufaula	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Homewood	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Huntsville	No	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Jackson	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Madison	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Mobile	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Montgomery	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Prattville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Tuscaloosa	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Wetumpka	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Alaska	No	Sections	No	No	No	Sections	—
Bethel	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Arizona	No	No	No	No	No	Sections	—
Chandler	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Flagstaff	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Gilbert	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Glendale	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Kingman	No	Yes	No	—	—	No	—
Maricopa Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Mesa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Paradise Valley	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Peoria	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Phoenix	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pima Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Prescott	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Scottsdale	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Tempe	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	Sections	—
Tucson	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Yuma	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Arkansas	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Little Rock	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Arkansas (Cont.)							
McGehee	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
North Little Rock	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—
California							
Agoura Hills	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Alameda	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Alameda Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Albany	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Alhambra	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Alpine Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Anaheim	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Anderson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Antioch	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Apple Valley	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Arcata	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Atascadero	No	No	No	—	—	Yes	—
Auburn	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Belmont	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Belvedere	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Benicia	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Berkeley	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Beverly Hills	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Big Bear Lake	No	Yes	No	—	—	No	—
Blue Lake	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Brentwood	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Buellton	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Burlingame	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Butte Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Calabasas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Calistoga	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Camarillo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Campbell	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Capitola	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Carlsbad	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Carpinteria	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Cathedral City	No	No	No	—	—	Yes	—
Ceres	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Chico	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chino Hills	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Chula Vista	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Clayton	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Cloverdale	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Coachella	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi-Units
California (Cont.)							
Colfax	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Concord	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Contra Costa Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	Yes
Coronado	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Corte Madera	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Cotati	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Culver City	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Cupertino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Cypress	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Dana Point	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Danville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Davis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Del Mar	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Desert Hot Springs	No	No	Yes	—	—	No	—
Dixon	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Downey	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Dublin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
East Palo Alto	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
El Cajon	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	Yes	—
El Centro	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
El Cerrito	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
El Dorado Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
El Segundo	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Emeryville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Encinitas	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Escondido	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Eureka	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Fairfax	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Fairfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Folsom	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Fontana	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Fort Bragg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Fortuna	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Foster City	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Fremont	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Fresno	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Gardena	No	Yes	No	—	—	Yes	—
Grand Terrace	No	No	Yes	—	—	No	—
Grass Valley	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Gridley	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Hanford	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Hayward	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Healdsburg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Hemet	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
California (Cont.)							
Hercules	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Hesperia	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Hollister	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Hughson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Imperial Beach	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Imperial Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Indian Wells	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Indio	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Irvine	No	No	No	—	—	Yes	—
La Canada							
Flintridge	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
La Mesa	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
La Mirada	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
La Quinta	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Lafayette	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Laguna Beach	No	No	No	—	—	Yes	—
Laguna Hills	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Laguna Niguel	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Lakewood	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Lancaster	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Larkspur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Lathrop	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Lemon Grove	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Lindsay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Live Oak	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Livermore	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Livingston	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Lodi	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Loma Linda	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Lompoc	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Long Beach	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Los Alamitos	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Los Altos	No	No	Yes	—	—	No	—
Los Angeles	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Los Gatos	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Madera	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	No	Yes	—
Manhattan Beach	No	Yes	No	—	—	No	—
Marin Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Martinez	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Marysville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Mendocino Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Menlo Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Merced	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Mill Valley	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi-Units
California (Cont.)							
Millbrae	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Milpitas	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Mission Viejo	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Modesto	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Monterey	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Monterey Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Moorpark	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Moraga	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Moreno Valley	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Morgan Hill	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Morro Bay	No	Yes	No	—	—	Yes	—
Mountain View	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Napa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Napa Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
National City	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Nevada City	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Nevada Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Newark	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Novato	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Oakdale	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Oakland	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Oceanside	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Ojai	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Orange Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Orinda	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Oroville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Oxnard	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pacific Grove	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Palm Desert	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Palm Springs	No	No	Yes	—	—	No	—
Palmdale	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Palo Alto	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Paradise	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pasadena	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Patterson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Petaluma	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Piedmont	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pinole	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pittsburg	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Placer Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Placerville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pleasant Hill	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pleasanton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Port Hueneme	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
California (Cont.)							
Poway	Sections	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Rancho Cucamonga	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Rancho Mirage	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Redding	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Redlands	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Redwood City	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Richmond	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Riverside	No	No	Yes	—	—	No	—
Riverside Co.	No	No	Yes	—	—	No	—
Rohnert Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Roseville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Ross	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Sacramento	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Sacramento Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Salinas	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
San Anselmo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
San Bernardino	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
San Bernardino County	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
San Bruno	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
San Carlos	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
San Diego	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
San Diego Co.	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
San Francisco	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—
San Jose	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
San Juan Bautista	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
San Juan Capistrano	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
San Leandro	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
San Luis Obispo	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
San Marcos	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
San Mateo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
San Mateo Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
San Pablo	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
San Rafael	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
San Ramon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Santa Ana	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Santa Barbara	No	Yes	No	—	—	Yes	—
Santa Barbara County	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Santa Clara	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Santa Clara Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Santa Clarita	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi-Units
California (Cont.)							
Santa Cruz	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Santa Cruz Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Santa Maria	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Santa Rosa	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Santee	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Saratoga	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—
Sausalito	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Scotts Valley	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Seaside	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Sebastopol	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Shafter	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Shasta Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Shasta Lake	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Simi Valley	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Solana Beach	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Solano Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Solvang	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Sonoma	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Sonoma Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
South Lake Tahoe	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
South Pasadena	No	Yes	No	—	—	No	—
South San Francisco	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Stanislaus Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Stockton	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Sunnyvale	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Sutter Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Thousand Oaks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Tiburon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Torrance	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Tracy	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Truckee	No	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Tuolumne Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Turlock	No	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Tustin	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Ukiah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Union City	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Vacaville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Vallejo	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Ventura	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Ventura Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Victorville	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Visalia	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Vista	No	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
California (Cont.)							
Walnut	No	No	No	—	—	Yes	—
Walnut Creek	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Waterford	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Watsonville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
West Hollywood	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
West Sacramento	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Westlake Village	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Wheatland	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Whittier	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Woodside	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Yorba Linda	No	No	Yes	—	—	No	—
Yountville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Yuba City	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Colorado	No	No	No	No	No	Sections	—
Arapahoe Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Arvada	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Aspen	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Aurora	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Boulder	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Boulder Co.	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Broomfield	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Canon City	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Carbondale	No	Yes	No	—	—	No	—
Colorado Springs	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Denver	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Englewood	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Fort Collins	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	C/A
Glenwood Springs	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Golden	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Grand Junction	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Greeley	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Greenwood Village	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Jefferson Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Lakewood	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Larimer Co.	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Littleton	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Longmont	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Louisville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Loveland	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Parker	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pitkin Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Pueblo	Sections	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Snowmass Village	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Colorado (Cont.)							
Telluride	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Thornton	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Trinidad	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Vail	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Westminster	Sections	Sections	Yes	Sections	Sections	Sections	C/A
Wheat Ridge	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Connecticut	No	Sections	No	No	No	Sections	—
Delaware	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—
Dover	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wilmington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Washington	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	Yes	—
Florida	No	Sections	Sections	No	Sections	Yes	—
Georgia	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Albany	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Athens/Clark Co.	Yes	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Chatham Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Dahlonega	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Decatur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
DeKalb Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Fulton Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Gainesville	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Gwinnett Co.	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Hall Co.	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Savannah	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Snellville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Hawaii	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—
Hawaii Co.	No	Yes	No	—	—	No	—
Honolulu	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Maui Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Idaho	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	No	Sections	—
Illinois	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	No	Sections	—
Arlington Heights	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Chicago	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
DeKalb	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Des Plaines	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Elgin	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Highland Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Oak Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Rockford	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Schaumburg	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Illinois (Cont.)							
Skokie	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Wilmette	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Indiana							
Bloomington	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Fort Wayne	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Monroe Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Iowa							
	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	No	Sections	—
Kansas							
Lawrence	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	Sections	Yes	—
Overland Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Prairie Village	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Roeland Park	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Topeka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Wellington	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Louisiana							
Baton Rouge	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	Sections	Sections	—
Calcasieu Parish	No	No	No	No	Sections	No	—
Catahoula Parish	Yes	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
E. Baton Rouge Parish	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
	No	No	No	No	Sections	No	—
Jefferson Parish	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Lake Charles	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
New Orleans	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Sulphur	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Maine							
	Sections	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	No	—
Maryland							
Anne Arundel Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Baltimore Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Gaithersburg	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Howard Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	Sections	No
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Montgomery Co.	Sections	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	Sections	—
Rockville	No	No	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Takoma Park	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Talbot Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Massachusetts							
Acushnet	No	Yes	No	No	No	Sections	—
Agawam	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Amherst	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Andover	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi-Units
Massachusetts (Cont.)							
Arlington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Attleboro	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Auburn	No	Yes	No	—	—	Yes	—
Bedford	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Belmont	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Billerica	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Boxborough	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Brookline	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Burlington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Cambridge	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Canton	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Chelmsford	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Clinton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Cohasset	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Concord	Sections	Yes	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Dover	Sections	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Sections	C/A
Dudley	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	Yes	—
Easthampton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Falmouth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Foxborough	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes
Gardner	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Gloucester	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	Sections	Sections	—
Granby	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Great Barrington	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Greenfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Haverhill	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Hingham	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	No
Holden	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Holyoke	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Lawrence	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Lee	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	Yes	—
Lenox	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	Yes	—
Leominster	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Lexington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Longmeadow	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Malden	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Mansfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Marblehead	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Marion	Sections	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Mashpee	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Maynard	No	Yes	No	—	—	No	—
Medfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Methuen	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Middleton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Massachusetts (Cont.)							
Millis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Montague	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Nahant	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Natick	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Needham	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Newton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
North Andover	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
North Attleboro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes
Northampton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Norwell	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Oak Bluffs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	No
Orange	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pittsfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Plainville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Plymouth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Reading	No	Yes	No	—	—	No	—
Revere	Sections	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Sandwich	Sections	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Saugus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Seekonk	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Sharon	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Somerville	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	No
South Hadley	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Southwick	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Sterling	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Stockbridge	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	Yes	—
Sudbury	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Swampscott	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—
Tewksbury	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wakefield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Walpole	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	—
West Springfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Westborough	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Westfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Westford	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Westwood	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Weymouth	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wilbraham	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Williamstown	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wrentham	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—
Michigan	No	Sections	No	No	No	No	—
Argentine	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Michigan (Cont.)							
Atlas	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Burton	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Clayton	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Clio	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Davison	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
East Lansing	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Fenton	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Flint	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Flushing	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Forest	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Gaines	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Genesee	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Genesee Co.	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Goodrich	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Grand Blanc	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Linden	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Marquette	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Marquette Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Montrose	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Mount Morris	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Mundy	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Otisville	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Pontiac	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
Richfield	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Swartz Creek	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Thetford	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Vienna	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Minnesota	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	No	Sections	—
Mississippi	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Missouri	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	No	Sections	—
Brentwood	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Chesterfield	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Clayton	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Columbia	Sections	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Crestwood	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	Sections	—
Des Peres	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Frontenac	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Independence	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Jefferson	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Kansas City	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Oak Grove	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	No	Sections	—
Pacific	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	No	Sections	—

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Missouri (Cont.)							
Pleasant Hill	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	Sections	—
Rock Hill	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Springfield	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
St. Joseph	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	Sections	—
Webster Groves	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	Sections	—
Montana	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Nebraska	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	No	Sections	—
Lincoln	—	—	—	—	—	Yes	—
Nevada	No	Sections	No	No	No	Sections	—
New Hampshire	Sections	Yes	Sections	No	No	Yes	—
New Jersey	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Highland Park	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Hillsborough Township	No	Yes	No	—	—	No	—
Lawrence Township	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Marlboro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Pequannock	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
Secaucus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Union Township	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
New Mexico	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Albuquerque	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Las Cruces	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Los Alamos	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	—
New York	Sections	Yes	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Chautauqua Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Erie Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Livingston Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	Yes
Monroe Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Nassau Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes
New York City	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	Yes	—
Niagara Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Ontario Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Rockland Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Sections	Yes	No
Suffolk Co.	No	No	No	No	Sections	Yes	No
Westchester Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	No
North Carolina	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Boone	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Buncombe Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Burke Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
North Carolina (Cont.)							
Burlington	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Caldwell Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	—
Carrboro	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Catawba Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Chapel Hill	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Chatham Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Cleveland Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Craven Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Cumberland Co.	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	—
Davie Co.	Sections	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Durham	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Durham Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Forsyth Co.	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Gaston Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Graham-Swain Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Guilford Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Halifax Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Henderson Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Lee Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Montreat	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
New Hanover	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
New Hanover Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Northampton Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Onslow Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Orange Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Raleigh	No	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Rowan Co.	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Wake Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wilkes Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wilmington	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Wrightsville Beach	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
North Dakota	No	No	No	No	No	Sections	—
Ohio	No	No	No	No	No	Sections	—
Akron	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Athens	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Barberton	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Beachwood	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Cincinnati	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Cleveland	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Cleveland Heights	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Columbus	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Dayton	No	Sections	Sections	No	No	No	No

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Ohio (Cont.)							
Delaware	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Euclid	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Findlay	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Hancock Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Knox Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Lakewood	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Licking Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	No	Yes	—
Lorain	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Mahoning Co.	No	Yes	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Maple Heights	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Mayfield Village	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Medina	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Muskingum Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Yes	Yes	—
Newark	No	Yes	Yes	Sections	No	Yes	—
Parma	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Parma Heights	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Shaker Heights	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Stark Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Summit Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Toledo	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
University Heights	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Warren	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Warren City	No	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Zanesville	Sections	Yes	Yes	Sections	No	Yes	—
Oklahoma	No	No	No	No	No	Sections	—
Oregon	Sections	Sections	Sections	No	Sections	Yes	—
Benton Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Corvallis	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Eugene	No	Yes	No	—	—	Yes	—
Pennsylvania	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Erie	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Lower Merion	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pittsburgh	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
State College	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Rhode Island	No	Sections	No	No	No	Sections	—
South Carolina	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Greenville	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Spartanburg	No	Sections	Sections	—	Sections	Sections	—
South Dakota	No	No	No	No	No	Sections	—
Sioux Falls	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Tennessee	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Collierville	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Germantown	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Memphis	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Texas	No	No	No	No	No	Sections	—
Abilene	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Addison	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Amarillo	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Arlington	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Austin	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Baytown	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Bedford	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Brownsville	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Bryan	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Carrollton	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
College Station	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Colleyville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Corpus Christi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—
Dallas	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Del Rio	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Denton	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Desoto	No	No	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Duncanville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Eagle Pass	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
El Paso	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Eules	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—
Fort Worth	No	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	Yes
Galveston	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Granbury City	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—
Grand Prairie	No	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Greenville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Haltom City	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Houston	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Huntsville	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Hurst	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Irving	No	No	No	—	—	Yes	—
Kerrville	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Lancaster	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Leon Valley	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Longview	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Lubbock	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Mansfield	No	No	No	—	—	Yes	—
McAllen	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Mesquite	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Texas (Cont.)							
Midland	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
New Braunfels	No	Yes	No	—	—	Yes	—
North Richland Hills	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Plano	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Richardson	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Round Rock	Yes	Yes	Yes	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
San Antonio	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Seguin	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Southlake	No	Sections	Sections	No	No	No	No
Travis Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Tyler	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
West Lake Hills	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wichita Falls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Utah	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Vermont	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Burlington	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Virginia	No	No	Sections	No	No	No	—
Albemarle Co.	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Alexandria	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Arlington	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Charlottesville	No	Yes	No	—	—	Yes	—
Chesapeake	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Fairfax	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Fairfax Co.	No	Sections	Sections	No	No	No	—
Falls Church	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Franklin	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Hampton	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Lynchburg	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Newport News	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Norfolk	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Portsmouth	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Prince William Co.	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Suffolk	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Yes	—
Virginia Beach	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Washington	Sections	Sections	Yes	No	No	Yes	—
Kennewick	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Pierce Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Seattle	No	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
West Virginia	No	No	No	No	No	No	—
Belmont	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
West Virginia (Cont.)							
Bluefield	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Boone Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Braxton Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Brooke Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Cabell Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Calhoun Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Clay Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Fairmont	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Gilmer Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Grant Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Greenbrier	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Greenbrier Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Hampshire Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Jackson Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Kanawha Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Lincoln Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Marshall Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
McDowell Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Mercer Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Monongalia Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	Yes	—
Monroe Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Morgan Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Morgantown	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Nicholas Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—
Pendleton Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Pleasants Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Princeton	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	Sections	—
Putnam Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Raleigh Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Randolph Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Ritchie Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Roane Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Upshur Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wayne Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Webster Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Wheeling- Ohio Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wirt Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wood Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—
Wyoming Co.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Wisconsin	No	No	Sections	No	No	Sections	—
Fitchburg	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—

State Community	In General	Food Markets	Retail Stores	Bingo Parlors	Bowling Centers	Public Transit	Multi- Units
Wisconsin (Cont.)							
Madison	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Sections	No
Oak Creek	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Rice Lake	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—
Shorewood Hills	No	No	Sections	No	No	Yes	—
Wyoming							
Casper	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	—	No	—
Laramie	Yes	Yes	No	—	—	No	—

CLEAN INDOOR AIR PROVISIONS STATE LAWS AND LOCAL ORDINANCES: WORKPLACE PROVISIONS

CHART 2 This chart summarizes the workplace provisions of the major local clean indoor air ordinances in the United States. A total of 642 local ordinances with workplace smoking provisions are listed. Figure 2 presents a map of the clean indoor air laws for workplaces in the United States, at the local and state levels.

100% Smoke-free: A “Yes” in this column indicates that smoking is entirely prohibited in enclosed workplaces, or allowed only in enclosed, separately ventilated smoking lounges that workers are not required to enter during the course of their work duties.

Meeting Rooms: A “Yes” in this column indicates that smoking is prohibited in meeting rooms.

Designate Own Area: A “Yes” in this column indicates that employees are allowed to designate their immediate work area as a nonsmoking area. A “na” in this column indicates that the ordinance is 100% smoke-free in the workplace, making this provision non-applicable.

Nonsmoker Preference: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance contains a provision which states that in a dispute over smoking in the workplace, if no resolution can be reached, the health needs of the nonsmoker will take precedence over the smoker’s desire to smoke in a given area. A “na” in this column indicates that the ordinance is 100% smoke-free in the workplace, making this provision non-applicable.

Nonretaliation: A “Yes” in this column indicates that the ordinance contains a provision prohibiting retaliation against an employee who exercises rights provided by the ordinance.


Common Work Areas: A “Yes” in this column indicates that smoking is prohibited in common work areas.

Separately Ventilated Rooms: A “Yes” in this column indicates that workplaces may establish a designated smoking lounge if, and only if, the lounge is enclosed and separately ventilated, with air directly exhausted outdoors so that it is not exchanged with the rest of the workplace.

Size Exemptions: A “None” in this column indicates that workplaces of any size are covered by the ordinance. A numeric figure indicates that workplaces with that number of employees (or fewer) are exempt from workplace smoking provisions.

Note: An entry of “—” in a field indicates that information is not available for that provision. This is generally the result of adding new fields of analysis to reflect a significant development in ordinance provisions; database records for ordinances analyzed prior to the new field of analysis do not contain information for that provision.

Figure 2: Smoking Restrictions in Workplaces: 1997



Data Source: *State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues*, American Lung Association, 1997
National Matrix of Local Ordinances, American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation, 1998

Chart 2
State Laws and Local Ordinances: Workplace Provisions

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
Alabama	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Alexander City	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Anniston	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	4
Auburn	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Birmingham	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Cullman	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Daphne	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Decatur	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Dothan	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	None
Homewood	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	2
Huntsville	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Jackson	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Madison	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Mobile	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Montgomery	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Prattville	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Rainbow City	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	None
Tuscaloosa	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Wetumpka	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Alaska	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Bethel	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Arizona	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	None
Chandler	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Flagstaff	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Gilbert	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Glendale	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Kingman	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Maricopa Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Mesa	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Peoria	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Phoenix	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Pima Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	—	None
Prescott	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Scottsdale	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Tempe	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Tucson	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Yuma	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Arkansas	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
McGehee	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
California	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Agoura Hills	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	None
Alameda	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Alameda Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	3
Albany	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Alhambra	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	5
Alpine Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Anaheim	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	3
Anderson	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Antioch	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Arcata	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Auburn	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Belmont	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Belvedere	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Benicia	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	2
Berkeley	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Big Bear Lake	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Blue Lake	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Brea	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Brentwood	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	3
Buellton	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Burlingame	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Butte Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Calabasas	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	None
Calistoga	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Camarillo	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	1
Campbell	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Capitola	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Carlsbad	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Carpinteria	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Ceres	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Chico	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Chino Hills	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Chula Vista	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Clayton	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Cloverdale	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	None
Coachella	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Colfax	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Concord	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Contra Costa Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Coronado	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Cotati	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Culver City	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	3

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
California (Cont.)								
Cupertino	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Cypress	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	—	None
Danville	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Davis	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Del Mar	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Del Norte Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Desert Hot Springs	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Dixon	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Downey	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Duarte	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	5
Dublin	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
East Palo Alto	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
El Cajon	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	None
El Centro	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	—	None
El Cerrito	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
El Dorado Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
El Segundo	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	5
Emeryville	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Encinitas	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	None
Escondido	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—	None
Eureka	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Fairfax	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Fairfield	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	3
Folsom	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Fontana	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	3
Fort Bragg	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Fortuna	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	None
Foster City	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Fremont	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Fresno	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Garden Grove	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	9
Gilroy	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Grand Terrace	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Grass Valley	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Gridley	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Hayward	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Healdsburg	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	4
Hemet	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	None
Hercules	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Hesperia	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	—	None
Hollister	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Hughson	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
California (Cont.)								
Huntington Beach	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	—	3
Imperial Beach	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Imperial Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Indian Wells	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	—	None
Indio	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Irvine	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
La Canada Flintridge	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	None
La Mesa	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
La Quinta	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	None
Lafayette	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Laguna Beach	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Laguna Hills	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Laguna Niguel	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Lakewood	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Lancaster	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Larkspur	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Lathrop	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Lemon Grove	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Lindsay	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Live Oak	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Livermore	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Livingston	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Lodi	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Loma Linda	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	None
Lompoc	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Long Beach	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Los Alamitos	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—	None
Los Altos	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Los Angeles	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	4
Los Angeles Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Los Gatos	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Madera	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	None
Manhattan Beach	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Marin Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Martinez	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Marysville	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Mendocino Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Menlo Park	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Merced	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Mill Valley	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	1
Millbrae	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Milpitas	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Mission Viejo	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	9

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
California (Cont.)								
Modesto	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Monterey	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	None
Monterey Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Moorpark	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	1
Moraga	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	3
Moreno Valley	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Morgan Hill	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	3
Morro Bay	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Mountain View	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Napa	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Napa Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
National City	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Nevada City	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Nevada Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Newark	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	3
Newport Beach	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	—	3
Novato	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Oakdale	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Oakland	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Oceanside	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Ojai	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Ontario	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Orange Co.	No	Yes	—	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Orinda	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Oroville	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	4
Oxnard	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Palm Desert	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Palm Springs	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Palmdale	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Palo Alto	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Paradise	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Pasadena	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	1
Patterson	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Petaluma	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Piedmont	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Pinole	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Pittsburg	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	1
Placer Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Placerville	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Pleasant Hill	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Pleasanton	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Port Hueneme	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	None
Poway	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	None

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
California (Cont.)								
Rancho Mirage	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Redding	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Redlands	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	3
Redwood City	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Rialto	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	24
Richmond	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Riverside	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Riverside Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Rohnert Park	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	3
Roseville	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Sacramento	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Sacramento Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	1
Salinas	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
San Anselmo	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
San Bernardino	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
San Bernardino Co.	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	9
San Bruno	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
San Carlos	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
San Clemente	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	3
San Diego	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
San Diego Co.	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—	None
San Francisco	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
San Jose	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
San Juan Bautista	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
San Juan Capistrano	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	2
San Leandro	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	—	4
San Luis Obispo	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
San Marcos	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
San Mateo	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
San Mateo Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
San Pablo	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	3
San Rafael	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
San Ramon	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Santa Ana	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Santa Barbara	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Santa Barbara Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	5
Santa Clara	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Santa Clara Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Santa Clarita	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	1
Santa Cruz	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Santa Cruz Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Santa Maria	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Santa Rosa	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
California (Cont.)								
Santee	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Saratoga	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Sausalito	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Scotts Valley	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Seaside	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Sebastopol	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Shafter	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	2
Shasta Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Shasta Lake	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Solana Beach	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Solano Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Solvang	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Sonoma	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Sonoma Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
South Lake Tahoe	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	1
South San Francisco	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Stanislaus Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Stockton	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	None
Sunnyvale	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	3
Sutter Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Temecula	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Thousand Oaks	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	—	4
Tiburon	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Torrance	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Tracy	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Truckee	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Tuolumne Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Turlock	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Tustin	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Ukiah	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Union City	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Vacaville	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	3
Vallejo	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Ventura	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Ventura Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Victorville	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Visalia	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Vista	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	None
Walnut	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—	None
Walnut Creek	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	2
Waterford	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	3
Watsonville	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
West Hollywood	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
California (Cont.)								
West Sacramento	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	None
Westlake Village	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Wheatland	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Whittier	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	—	None
Willows	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	None
Woodside	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	None
Yolo Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Yorba Linda	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	10
Yountville	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Yuba City	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Colorado								
Arapahoe Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Arvada	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Aspen	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Aurora	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Boulder	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Boulder Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	None
Broomfield	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Canon City	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Carbondale	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Colorado Springs	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Denver	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	4
Englewood	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Fort Collins	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	None
Glenwood Springs	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	None
Golden	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Grand Junction	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	2
Greeley	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Greenwood Village	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	2
Jefferson Co.	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Lakewood	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	None
Larimer Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Littleton	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	2
Longmont	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Loveland	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—	None
Parker	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	2
Pitkin Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Pueblo	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	None
Snowmass Village	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Telluride	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Thornton	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Trinidad	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
Colorado (Cont.)								
Vail	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Weld Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	—	None
Westminster	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	None
Wheat Ridge	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Connecticut	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	20
Delaware	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Dover	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	24
Wilmington	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	24
District of Columbia	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Florida	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Georgia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Albany	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Athens/Clark Co.	No	Yes	—	na	No	Yes	No	None
Chatham Co.	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	None
Decatur	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
DeKalb Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	None
Fulton Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	None
Gainesville	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Gwinnett Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	None
Hall Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Savannah	No	Yes	—	na	No	Yes	No	None
Snellville	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Hawaii	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	None
Honolulu	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Maui Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Idaho	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Illinois	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Arlington Heights	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	8
Chicago	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Des Plaines	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	9
Elgin	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—	None
Hoffman Estates	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	14
Oak Park	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Orland Park	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—	None
Rockford	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	None
Skokie	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—	8
Wilmette	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
Indiana	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Fort Wayne	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	None
Iowa	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Kansas	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Lawrence	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	None
Overland Park	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	None
Topeka	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Kentucky	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Louisiana	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	24
Baton Rouge	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Calcasieu Parish	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	15
Catahoula Parish	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
E. Baton Rouge Parish	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Jefferson Parish	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	15
Lake Charles	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	15
New Orleans	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	15
Sulphur	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	15
Maine	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Maryland	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Anne Arundel Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	49
Baltimore Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Gaithersburg	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Howard Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Montgomery Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	2
Prince George's Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	—	None
Takoma Park	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	—	None
Talbot Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Massachusetts	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Acushnet	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	1
Agawam	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Amherst	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	1
Arlington	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	1
Attleboro	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Bedford	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	2
Bellingham	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	1
Belmont	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	None
Boston	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Brookline	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	2
Burlington	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	1

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
Massachusetts (Cont.)								
Cambridge	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Canton	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	4
Chelmsford	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Cohasset	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Concord	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Dover	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
Dudley	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
East Longmeadow	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Easthampton	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Falmouth	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Foxborough	No	No	—	na	No	No	No	1
Gardner	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Gloucester	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	1
Great Barrington	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—	None
Greenfield	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Haverhill	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Hingham	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
Holden	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Holyoke	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	1
Lawrence	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Lee	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
Lenox	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
Leominster	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	None
Lexington	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Lowell	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Mansfield	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	—	None
Marion	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Mashpee	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	2
Medfield	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	1
Methuen	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	None
Middleton	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Millis	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Milton	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Montague	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Nahant	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	None
Natick	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	None
Needham	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	1
Newton	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
North Andover	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
North Attleboro	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
Northampton	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Norton	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Norwell	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	2

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
Massachusetts (Cont.)								
Oak Bluffs	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	1
Orange	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Plainville	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
Plymouth	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	1
Revere	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Sandwich	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
Saugus	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Sharon	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	1
Somerville	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	1
Southwick	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	1
Stockbridge	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	1
Sudbury	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	None
Townsend	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Wakefield	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Walpole	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	None
Watertown	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Wellesley	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
West Springfield	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	1
Westborough	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	1
Westfield	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Westford	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Westwood	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	1
Williamstown	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	1
Michigan								
Detroit	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	1
East Lansing	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	1
Marquette	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Marquette Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Pontiac	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	None
Minnesota								
Mississippi								
Missouri								
Brentwood	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Columbia	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	None
Independence	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Jefferson	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	2
Kansas City	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Montana								
	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	1

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
Nebraska	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	None
Nevada	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
New Hampshire	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	4
New Jersey	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	49
Bayonne	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Highland Park	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Medford	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
New Mexico	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Albuquerque	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—	None
Las Cruces	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	None
Los Alamos	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	None
New York	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Chautauqua Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Erie Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Livingston Co.	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	None
Monroe Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Nassau Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	None
New York City	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Niagara Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Ontario Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Rockland Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	None
Suffolk Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	50
Westchester Co.	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	None
North Carolina	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Boone	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Buncombe Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Burke Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Caldwell Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Carrboro	No	Yes	—	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Catawba Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Chapel Hill	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	None
Chatham Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Cleveland Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Craven Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Davie Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Durham Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Gaston Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Guilford Co.	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	None
Halifax Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Haywood Co.	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	None

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
North Carolina (Cont.)								
Henderson Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Lee Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Montreat	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
New Hanover	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
New Hanover Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Northampton Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Onslow Co.	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	None
Orange Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Raleigh	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Wake Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Wilkes Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Wilmington	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Wrightsville Beach	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
North Dakota	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Ohio								
Akron	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	24
Barberton	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	25
Beachwood	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—	None
Cincinnati	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Cleveland	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Cleveland Heights	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None
Columbus	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Delaware	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Eastlake	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	None
Euclid	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Findlay	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Hancock Co.	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Knox Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Lakewood	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Licking Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Lorain	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	24
Maple Heights	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	None
Mayfield Village	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Muskingum Co.	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Newark	No	Yes	—	No	Yes	Yes	No	None
Parma	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	None
Parma Heights	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Shaker Heights	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Summit Co.	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	—	24
Toledo	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
University Heights	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	—	None

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
Ohio (Cont.)								
Warren	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	14
Warren City	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	14
Xenia	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Zanesville	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Oklahoma								
	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Oregon								
Benton Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Corvallis	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Eugene	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Pennsylvania								
Erie	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	None
Lower Merion	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Pittsburgh	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	—	None
State College	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Rhode Island								
	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	None
South Carolina								
Hampton Co.	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Spartanburg	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
South Dakota								
Sioux Falls	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Tennessee								
	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Texas								
Abilene	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Addison	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	10
Arlington	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Austin	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Baytown	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Bellaire	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Brownsville	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	—	5
Colleyville	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Corpus Christi	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	None
Dallas	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	4
Desoto	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	—	4
El Paso	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Fort Worth	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Galveston	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Greenville	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Houston	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	19
Keller	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Kerr Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None

Smoking and Tobacco Control Monograph No. 11

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
Texas (Cont.)								
Kerrville	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Lubbock	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
McAllen	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Midland	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	10
New Braunfels	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	—	None
Richardson	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	—	4
Rockwall	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Round Rock	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	None
Seguin	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Southlake	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	1
Sugar Land	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Texarkana	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Travis Co.	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	—	None
Tyler	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
West Lake Hills	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	None
Wichita Falls	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	Yes	None
Utah	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Vermont	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	None
Burlington	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Virginia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Albemarle Co.	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	—	4
Charlottesville	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	—	4
Chesapeake	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Newport News	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
Prince William Co.	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Stafford Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	—	None
Washington	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
King Co.	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Pierce Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Seattle	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None
West Virginia	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Belmont	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	None
Boone Co.	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	None
Braxton Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Brooke Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	Yes	None
Cabell Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Calhoun Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Clay Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Fairmont	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	—	None
Gilmer Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	100% Smoke free	Mtg Rooms	Desig Own Area	NS Pref	Non retali- ation	Comm Work Areas	Sep Vent Rooms	Size Exempt
West Virginia (Cont.)								
Grant Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Greenbrier	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Greenbrier Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Hampshire Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Jackson Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Kanawha Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Lincoln Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Marshall Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
McDowell Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Mercer Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Monongalia Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	—	None
Monroe Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Morgan Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	None
Morgantown	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Nicholas Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	1
Pendleton Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Pleasants Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Princeton	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	None
Putnam Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Raleigh Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Randolph Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	None
Ritchie Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Roane Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Upshur Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Wayne Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Webster Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Wheeling- Ohio Co.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Wirt Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Wood Co.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	None
Wyoming Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	Yes	Yes	No	None
Wisconsin								
Dane Co.	Yes	Yes	na	na	No	Yes	No	None
Rice Lake	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	None
Wyoming								
Casper	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	None
Laramie	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	—	None
Laramie	No	No	No	No	No	No	—	None

ADVERTISING RESTRICTIONS

SUMMARY TABLE 3 This table gives a tally of the various advertising restrictions listed in Chart 5, giving state totals for location/zoning, public transit, and retailer restrictions.

Total: This column lists the total number of local communities with at least one kind of advertising restriction in place.

Location/Zoning: This column lists the total number of local communities with ordinances that have location or zoning restrictions on tobacco advertising.

Public Transit: This column lists the total number of local communities with ordinances that restrict tobacco advertising on forms of public transportation (*e.g.*, buses, taxis).

Retailer Restrictions: This column lists the total number of local communities with ordinances that restrict the placement of tobacco advertising in retail stores.

CHART 5 This chart lists local ordinances designed to restrict tobacco advertising. There are 68 local tobacco advertising ordinances listed herein.

Last Amendment: This column indicates when a community enacted or last amended an ordinance with tobacco advertising restrictions. In the case of ordinances that have been amended following original adoption, the column reflects the date of the latest amendment. Those ordinances that have been amended following original adoption are indicated by an asterisk next to the date.

Location/Zoning Restrictions: A "Yes" in this column indicates that placement of tobacco advertisements (*e.g.*, billboards, storefront signs, placards) is severely restricted in specified publicly visible locations (*e.g.*, within 1,000 feet of school property) or allowed only within specified locations (*e.g.*, commercial or industrial zones, fronting interstate highways).

Public Transit: A "Yes" in this column indicates that placement of tobacco advertising is restricted on forms of public transportation (*e.g.* buses, taxis).

Retailer Restrictions: A "Yes" in this column indicates that placement of tobacco advertising in tobacco retail stores is restricted (*e.g.*, prohibiting advertisements visible to the street, point-of-purchase restrictions).

Tombstone Exemption: A "Yes" in this column indicates that generic tobacco advertisements providing factual information such as price and availability without adornment or other brand advertising are allowed in areas where tobacco advertising is otherwise restricted.

Note: An entry of “—” in a field indicates that information is not available for that provision. This is generally the result of adding new fields of analysis to reflect a significant development in ordinance provisions; database records for ordinances analyzed prior to the new field of analysis do not contain information for that provision.

Summary Table 3

Local Ordinances Restricting Tobacco Advertising: Total Number by State

State	Total	Location/ Zoning	Public Transit	Retailer Restrictions
California	14	14	4	6
Colorado	1	1	0	1
Connecticut	2	2	0	1
Hawaii	1	1	0	1
Illinois	1	1	0	0
Maryland	1	1	0	0
Massachusetts	24	6	21	2
Michigan	2	2	0	0
Minnesota	1	0	0	1
Missouri	1	1	0	1
New Jersey	4	3	0	4
New York	6	5	0	4
Ohio	2	2	1	1
Pennsylvania	1	1	0	0
Texas	1	1	0	0
Washington	5	5	1	2
Wisconsin	1	1	1	1
Totals	68	47	28	25

Chart 5

State Laws and Local Ordinances to Restrict Tobacco Advertising

State Community	Last Amend	Loc/ Zone	Public Transit	Retailer	Tomb- stone
California	1997*	Yes	No	No	No
Berkeley	1998	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Carson	1998	Yes	No	No	No
Compton	1997	Yes	No	No	Yes
Contra Costa Co.	1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Covina	1998	Yes	No	No	No
Hanford	1998	Yes	No	No	No
Hawthorne	1998	Yes	No	No	No
Long Beach	1994*	Yes	No	No	No
Los Angeles	1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Los Angeles Co.	1998	Yes	No	No	No
Oakland	1997	Yes	No	No	Yes
San Diego	1998	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
San Francisco	1998*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Santa Cruz Co.	1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Colorado	None	No	No	No	No
Denver	1998	Yes	No	Yes	No
Connecticut	None	No	No	No	No
Orange	1998	Yes	No	Yes	No
Seymour	1998	Yes	No	No	No
District of Columbia	1998	No	Yes	No	No
Hawaii	None	No	No	No	No
Honolulu	1998	Yes	No	Yes	No
Illinois	1987	No	No	No	No
Chicago	1997	Yes	No	No	Yes
Indiana	1997	Yes	No	No	No
Kentucky	1992	Yes	No	No	No
Maryland	None	No	No	No	No
Baltimore	1994	Yes	No	No	Yes
Massachusetts	None	No	No	No	No
Amherst	1994*	No	Yes	No	No
Attleboro	1995*	Yes	Yes	No	No
Bellingham	1997*	No	Yes	No	No
Billerica	1995	No	Yes	No	No
Brockton	1994	No	Yes	No	No
Canton	1994	Yes	No	No	No
Dover	1994	No	Yes	No	No
Dudley	1994	Yes	No	No	No

State Community	Last Amend	Loc/ Zone	Public Transit	Retailer	Tomb- stone
Massachusetts (Cont.)					
Easthampton	1994	No	Yes	No	No
Foxborough	1993	No	Yes	No	No
Hingham	1993	No	Yes	No	No
Holliston	1994	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Holyoke	1994	Yes	Yes	No	No
Marlborough	1995	No	Yes	No	No
Medfield	1997*	No	Yes	No	No
Nahant	1995	No	Yes	No	No
Natick	1994	No	Yes	No	No
North Attleboro	1995	Yes	No	No	No
Northampton	1997*	No	Yes	No	No
Oak Bluffs	1993	No	Yes	No	No
Plainville	1993	No	Yes	No	No
Saugus	1994	No	Yes	Yes	No
Southwick	1992	No	Yes	No	No
Tewksbury	1994	No	Yes	No	No
Michigan	None	No	No	No	No
Lansing	1997	Yes	No	No	No
Warren	1998	Yes	No	No	No
Minnesota	None	No	No	No	No
Preston	1994	No	No	Yes	Yes
Missouri	None	No	No	No	No
Saint Louis	1999*	Yes	No	Yes	No
New Jersey	None	No	No	No	No
Clifton	1997	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Deptford	1997	No	No	Yes	No
Irvington	1997	Yes	No	Yes	No
Paterson	1998	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
New York	None	No	No	No	No
Albany	1997	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Buffalo	1998	Yes	No	Yes	No
New York City	1998*	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Rochester	1998	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Suffolk Co.	1995	No	No	No	No
Yonkers	1996	Yes	No	No	No
Ohio	None	No	No	No	No
Cincinnati	1994	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Cleveland	1998	Yes	No	No	Yes

Section II: State Laws and Local Ordinances

State Community	Last Amend	Loc/ Zone	Public Transit	Retailer	Tomb- stone
Pennsylvania	None	No	No	No	No
Allentown	1998	Yes	No	No	Yes
Texas	1996	Yes	No	No	No
Fort Worth	1997	Yes	No	No	No
Utah	1998*	No	Yes	No	No
Washington	None	No	No	No	No
Clark Co.	1998	Yes	No	No	No
King Co.	1998*	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Skamania Co.	1998	Yes	No	No	No
Snohomish Co.	1998	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
Tacoma-Pierce Co.	1996	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
West Virginia	1987	No	No	No	No
Wisconsin	None	No	No	No	No
Milwaukee	1998	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Appendix to Section II:

**Summary of State Tobacco
Control Laws**

APPENDIX TO SECTION II

This appendix presents four tables summarizing information on state tobacco control laws. The tables cover state laws that restrict smoking in public places; age restrictions for the sale of tobacco products; state laws that restrict tobacco sales through vending machines; and state restrictions on the distribution of tobacco product samples.

APPENDIX TABLE 1 This table is a quick reference to the state laws restricting smoking in public places. There are 49 states, as well as the District of Columbia, that restrict smoking in public places. There are 15 public places listed in this table:

Arts/Cultural Facilities	Public Transit
Child Care Centers	Restaurants
Elevators	Restrooms
Government Buildings	Retail/Grocery Stores
Gymnasiums/Arenas	Schools
Health Facilities	Shopping Centers
Jury/Courtrooms	Workplaces (Private Sector)
Public Meetings	

Each state will have an entry for each public place in the table as follows:

- Smoking is prohibited in this place.
- V Smoking areas in this place must be enclosed and separately ventilated. If this condition cannot be met, then smoking is banned entirely.
- X Smoking restrictions are required in this public place, but smoking is not prohibited.
- E Smoking restrictions are encouraged, but are not required by law.
- Blank No smoking restrictions for this public place.
- Cell

For two places listed in the table, Retail/Grocery Stores and Schools, there is additional information given through footnotes.

There are two types of preemption listed in this table. The first type preempts all local regulations; there are nine states with this type. The second preempts local regulations but grandfathers existing ordinances; there are three states with this type. Both types are footnoted.

APPENDIX TABLE 2 This table is a summary of the state age restrictions for the sale of tobacco products. All 50 states and the District of Columbia have laws restricting the sale of tobacco to persons of at least 18 years of age.

Minimum Age for Cigarettes—This column lists the minimum age allowed for the purchase of cigarettes and cigarette products, such as cigarette papers.

Minimum Age for Smokeless Tobacco—This column lists the minimum age allowed for the purchase of smokeless tobacco, such as snuff and chewing tobacco.

Minimum Age for Cigars—This column lists the minimum age allowed for the purchase of cigars.

APPENDIX TABLE 3 This table is a summary of the state restrictions on tobacco vending machines. There are 44 states and the District of Columbia that have tobacco vending machine restrictions listed here. Some states require lockout devices; this information is footnoted for each state it applies to. Fifteen states preempt localities from passing stronger vending machine ordinances; these states are footnoted.

Sign Posting—This column indicates whether state law requires vending machines to have a sign posted stating that is against the law to sell tobacco to minors. Sign posting requirements other than this are footnoted.

Restrictions on Placement—This column indicates whether state law requires restrictions on tobacco vending machine placement. Vending machines are often restricted to areas where minors are not permitted by law, such as bars and taverns. The law may require vending machines to be at least a certain distance from exit doors or in the line of sight of clerks.

APPENDIX TABLE 4 This table summarizes state laws regarding the distribution of low-cost or free tobacco product samples. There are 44 states and the District of Columbia that have tobacco sample laws listed here.

Date Enacted—This column gives the date the tobacco sample law was enacted.

Total Ban—A "Yes" in this column indicates that the distribution of free or low-cost tobacco product samples is completely banned in the state.

Public Places Only—A "Yes" in this column indicates that the distribution of free or low-cost tobacco product samples is banned in public places only. Public places do not include places where minors are not allowed by law, such as bars. A "Restrictions" in this column indicates that tobacco sample distribution is allowed in public places, with some restrictions.

Minors Only—A "Yes" in this column indicates that tobacco sample distribution is only prohibited for minors; adults may still obtain tobacco samples.

Smokeless Tobacco Only—A "Yes" in this column indicates that the tobacco sample law applies only to smokeless tobacco, such as snuff and chewing tobacco.

Appendix Table 1
State Laws Restricting Smoking in Public Places¹

	Date First Enacted	Arts/Cultural Facilities	Child Care Centers	Elevators	Government Buildings	Gymnasium/Arenas	Health Facilities	Jury/Courtrooms	Public Meetings	Public Transit	Restaurants	Restrooms	Retail/Grocery Stores	Schools	Shopping Centers	Workplaces (Private)
Alabama	None															
Alaska	1975	X	•	•	X	X	X	X			X		X ²	• ³		X
Arizona	1987	X		X	X		X							X		
Arkansas	1977		•		X		X							X		
California	1976	V	•	•	•	X	V		•	•	V		V	V		V
Colorado	1977	•	•	•	X	X	X			X	E			• ⁴		E
Connecticut ⁵	1973		X	X	X		X			X	X		X ²	• ⁴		X
Delaware ⁵	1960	X	•	•	X	X	X	X	•	•	X		X ²	X		X
District of Columbia	1975		X	•	X		X		•	•	X			X ⁶		X
Florida ⁵	1985	X	•	•	X	X	X	X	X	•	X	•	X	• ⁴		X
Georgia	1975		•	•						•						
Hawaii	1987	•	•	•	X	X	X		•		X	X	X	• ⁴		
Idaho	1925			•	•	X	X		X	X	X		X	X		
Illinois ⁷	1961	X	•		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	•		X
Indiana	1987		X		X		X							X		
Iowa ⁵	1987	X		•	X	X	X		X	•	X		X	X	X	X
Kansas	1987	X	•	•	X	X	X	X		•	X	X	X	• ⁴		
Kentucky	1972				X									X		
Louisiana ⁷	1992	X	X	•	E	X	X		X	•	X			• ⁴		E
Maine	1983	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	•	X	X	X	X
Maryland	1957		V	•	•		V			•	X		X	•		V
Massachusetts	1946	X	X	•	X		X	X	•	•	X		• ²	X		
Michigan	1967	X	•	•	X	X	X		X	X	X		X ²	•		
Minnesota	1975		•		•	X	X		X	X	X		X	• ⁴		X
Mississippi	1964									•						
Missouri	1992	X	•	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	• ⁴	X	X
Montana	1979	•	•	•	X	X	X		X	•	X		X	X		X

¹E = restrictions encouraged; X = restrictions required; • = smoking prohibited; V = enclosed, separately ventilated areas required, or smoking is banned entirely; Blank cell = no smoking restrictions.

²Regulation governs only grocery stores.

³Does not apply to areas designated through collective bargaining agreements made prior to 8/14/90.

⁴Regulation includes school buses.

⁵Preempts local regulation.

⁶Designated smoking areas are permitted only in private schools, smoking is banned entirely in public schools.

⁷Preempts local regulation but grandfathers existing ordinances.

Source: State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues, American Lung Association, 1998.

Appendix Table 1 (Continued)

	Date First Enacted	Arts/Cultural Facilities	Child Care Centers	Elevators	Government Buildings	Gymnasium/Arenas	Health Facilities	Jury/Courtrooms	Public Meetings	Public Transit	Restaurants	Restrooms	Retail/Grocery Stores	Schools	Shopping Centers	Workplaces (Private)
Nebraska	1979					X	X		X	X	X		X	X		X
Nevada ⁵	1991		X	•	X		X			X	X		X ²	X ⁴		
New Hampshire	1990	X	•	•	X	X	X		X	•	X		X	•	X	X
New Jersey ⁵	1979	X	X	•	X		X		•	•	E		•	X ⁴		X
New Mexico	1985				X				X					•		
New York	1989	X	•	•	X	X	X			•	X	X	X	• ⁴		X
North Carolina	1993				X											
North Dakota	1978	X	•	X	X	X	X			X	X			X		
Ohio	1981	X	V	X	X	X	X			X				X		
Oklahoma ⁵	1987	X	•	•	X	X	X			X	E			X		
Oregon	1973			•	X	X	X	X	•	•	X		X	X		
Pennsylvania	1927	X			X	X	X			•	X			X ⁴		X
Rhode Island	1977	X		•	X		X		X	•	X		X ²	• ⁴		X
South Carolina ⁵	1937	X	•	•	X	X	X			•				X ⁴		
South Dakota	1974	X	X	X	X		X	X		X				X		
Tennessee	1990	X	X		E		X							•		
Texas	1975	X		X			X			X				X		
Utah ⁵	1976	•	•	•	•	•	X	•		•	•	•	•	X ⁶	•	X
Vermont ⁷	1987	•	•	•	X	•	X	•		•	•	•	•	•	•	X
Virginia	1990		X	•	X	X	X				X		X	X ⁴		
Washington	1985	X	V	•	V	X	X		•	•	X	X	X	•	X	V
West Virginia	1913													X		
Wisconsin	1983	X	•	X	X		X			X	X		X	•		X
Wyoming	1989				X											

¹E = restrictions encouraged; X = restrictions required; • = smoking prohibited; V = enclosed, separately ventilated areas required, or smoking is banned entirely; Blank cell = no smoking restrictions.

²Regulation governs only grocery stores.

³Does not apply to areas designated through collective bargaining agreements made prior to 8/14/90.

⁴Regulation includes school buses.

⁵Preempts local regulation.

⁶Designated smoking areas are permitted only in private schools, smoking is banned entirely in public schools.

⁷Preempts local regulation but grandfathers existing ordinances.

Source: State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues, American Lung Association, 1998.

Appendix Table 2

Age Restrictions for Sale of Tobacco Products by State

	Minimum Age for Cigarettes	Minimum Age for Smokeless Tobacco	Minimum Age for Cigars
Alabama	19	19	19
Alaska	19	19	19
Arizona	18	18	18
Arkansas	18	18	18
California	18	18	18
Colorado	18	18	18
Connecticut	18	18	18
Delaware	18	18	18
District of Columbia	18	18	18
Florida	18	18	18
Georgia	18	18	18
Hawaii	18	18	18
Idaho	18	18	18
Illinois	18	18	18
Indiana	18	18	18
Iowa	18	18	18
Kansas	18	18	18
Kentucky	18	18	18
Louisiana	18	18	18
Maine	18	18	18
Maryland	18	18	18
Massachusetts	18	18	18
Michigan	18	18	18
Minnesota	18	18	18
Mississippi	18	18	18
Missouri	18	18	18
Montana	18	18	18
Nebraska	18	18	18
Nevada	18	18	18
New Hampshire	18	18	18
New Jersey	18	18	18
New Mexico	18	18	18
New York	18	18	18
North Carolina	18	18	18
North Dakota	18	18	18
Ohio	18	18	18
Oklahoma	18	18	18
Oregon	18	18	18
Pennsylvania	21	18	18
Rhode Island	18	18	18

Appendix Table 2 (Continued)

	Minimum Age for Cigarettes	Minimum Age for Smokeless Tobacco	Minimum Age for Cigars
South Carolina	18	18	18
South Dakota	18	18	18
Tennessee	18	18	18
Texas	18	18	18
Utah	19	19	19
Vermont	18	18	18
Virginia	18	18	18
Washington	18	18	18
West Virginia	18	18	18
Wisconsin	18	18	18
Wyoming	18	18	18

Source: State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues, American Lung Association, 1998.

Appendix Table 3
**Restrictions on Tobacco Sales through Vending
 Machines by State¹**

	Sign Posting	Placement Restrictions
Alaska		Yes
Arkansas	Yes	Yes
California		Yes
Colorado	Yes	Yes ²
Connecticut	Yes	Yes
Delaware		Yes ³
District of Columbia		Yes
Florida		Yes ²
Georgia	Yes	Yes
Hawaii	Yes	Yes
Idaho		Yes ⁶
Illinois	Yes ⁴	Yes
Indiana	Yes	Yes ²
Iowa		Yes ³
Kansas		Yes ²
Kentucky		Yes ³
Louisiana	Yes ³	Yes ³
Maine	Yes	Yes
Maryland	Yes ⁵	
Massachusetts	Yes ⁵	
Michigan		Yes
Minnesota	Yes	Yes
Mississippi		Yes ³
Missouri	Yes ⁵	
Montana		Yes ³
Nebraska		Yes
Nevada		Yes ³
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes ²
New Jersey	Yes ²	
New Mexico	Yes ³	Yes ³
New York	Yes	Yes
North Carolina		Yes ²
Ohio		Yes
Oklahoma		Yes ^{2,3}
Oregon		Yes ³
Rhode Island	Yes	Yes
South Dakota	Yes	Yes ³
Tennessee		Yes ^{2,3}
Texas	Yes	Yes
Utah		Yes ³
Vermont	Yes	Yes
Virginia	Yes	Yes
Washington		Yes ³
Wisconsin	Yes ³	Yes ³
Wyoming	Yes	Yes

¹ There are no states that ban vending machines completely.

² Lock-out devices are required on machines in areas accessible to youth. In Tennessee and New Hampshire, a device is only required if the machine is not under continuous supervision.

³ Preempts power of localities to pass stronger ordinances.

⁴ Mandates signs warning of the dangers of cigarette smoking during pregnancy.

⁵ No restrictions on placement, but owners or operators are made specifically liable for sales to minors, except Maryland and Missouri absolve owners of any liability if they have the required warning sign posted on the machine.

⁶ Vending machines are prohibited in any establishment where people under age 19 are permitted. After January 1, 2000, tobacco vending machines will be banned. Source: State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues, American Lung Association, 1998.

Appendix Table 4

Restrictions on Distribution of Tobacco Product Samples by State

	Date Enacted	Total Ban	Public Places Only¹	Minors Only	Smokeless Tobacco Only
Arkansas	1991	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
California	1991	—	Yes	Yes	—
Connecticut	1996	—	—	Yes	—
Delaware	1996	—	—	Yes	—
District of Columbia	1991	—	Yes	Yes	—
Florida	1997	—	—	Yes	—
Georgia	1993	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
Hawaii	1996	—	—	Yes	—
Idaho	1998	Yes	—	—	—
Illinois	1993	—	—	Yes	—
Indiana	1988	—	—	Yes	—
Iowa	1991	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
Kansas	1996	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
Kentucky	1996	—	—	Yes	—
Louisiana	1988	—	—	Yes	—
Maine	1996	—	—	Yes	—
Maryland	1994	—	—	Yes	—
Michigan	1988	—	—	Yes	—
Minnesota	1987	Yes	—	—	—
Mississippi	1994	—	—	Yes	—
Missouri	1992	—	—	Yes	—
Montana	1995	—	—	Yes	—
Nebraska	1989	Yes	—	—	Yes
Nevada	1995	—	—	Yes	—
New Hampshire	1997	—	Yes	No	—
New Jersey	1995	—	—	Yes	—
New Mexico	1993	—	—	Yes	—
New York	1992	—	Yes	Yes	—
North Carolina	1995	—	—	Yes	—
North Dakota	1973	—	—	Yes	—

Appendix Table 4 (Continued)

	Date Enacted	Total Ban	Public Places Only¹	Minors Only	Smokeless Tobacco Only
Ohio	1991	—	—	Yes	—
Oklahoma	1996	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
Oregon	1991	—	—	Yes	—
Pennsylvania	1990	—	—	Yes	—
Rhode Island	1996	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
South Carolina	1996	—	—	Yes	—
South Dakota	1994	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
Tennessee	1994	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
Texas	1997	—	—	Yes	—
Utah	1989	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
Vermont	1991	—	—	Yes	—
Washington	1996	—	Restrictions	Yes	—
West Virginia	1987	—	—	Yes	—
Wisconsin	1988	—	Restrictions	—	—

¹ Yes = Sampling is not allowed in any public place. Restrictions = Sampling is allowed in public places, with some restrictions.

Source: State Legislated Actions on Tobacco Issues, American Lung Association, 1998.

Section III:

**Workplace Smoking Restrictions, Rules
About Smoking in the Home, and
Attitudes Toward Smoking Restrictions
in Public Places.**

***National and State-Specific Estimates
from the Current Population Survey***

*Kathryn B. Gower, David M. Burns, Thomas G. Shanks,
Jerry W. Vaughn, Christy M. Anderson, Donald R. Shopland,
Anne M. Hartman*

THE CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY

INTRODUCTION The Current Population Survey (CPS) is a continuous monthly survey that has been conducted by the Bureau of the Census since 1940, focusing on labor force indicators for the civilian noninstitutionalized U.S. population aged 15 years and older. In 1992, a 40-item Tobacco Use Supplement was developed by NCI staff and pre-tested by trained Census Bureau interviewers prior to full field implementation. Among other measures, questions on tobacco use practices, presence and characteristics of workplace smoking policies, rules about smoking in the home, and attitudes toward smoking restrictions in public places were added to the CPS for the September 1992, January 1993, and May 1993 surveys and repeated in September 1995, January 1996, and May 1996. In the text and tables that follow, these groupings are often referred to simply as 1992/93 and 1995/96. A third round of the Tobacco Use Supplement was recently conducted by the Census Bureau for the period September 1998, January 1999, and May 1999.

CPS METHODOLOGY The complete CPS methodology is published in detail elsewhere (Hansen, 1985). Briefly, the CPS sample is based on household addresses. The three main sources are: households listed in the most recent decennial census, updated building permits, and area sampling where no address lists exist from the Bureau of the Census.

Individuals eligible for CPS interview are the civilian noninstitutionalized population of the United States 15 years of age and older¹. For the purposes of this monograph, however, data are presented for adults ages 18 years or older at time of interview. All strata are defined within state boundaries, and the sample is allocated among the states to produce state, census region and division, and national labor force estimates, keeping the total sample size to a minimum. (Also included are demographic data for approximately 30,000 children 0-14 years old and between 450 and 550 Armed Forces members living with civilians either on or off base within households).

Normally for the CPS, interviews are conducted with a knowledgeable household respondent who responds for all eligible household members. Typically, slightly more than half of all interviews are self-respondents, and the remainder are proxy (Marcus *et al.*, 1989). For the NCI Tobacco Use Supplement, however, an attempt was made to minimize the proportion of proxy responses because answers to many questions of interest to the NCI would only be known by the person to be interviewed. Thus, the 1992/93 Supplement questionnaire was administered "off document" on a form sep-

¹ Due to a computer error, information for 15-year-old-only respondents is not available from the January 1996 CPS.

arate from the standard labor force core questionnaire, so that data collection was not constrained by the 1-week limit for labor statistics collection. This procedure reduced proxy responses to under 20 percent. For the purpose of this analysis, however, only self-responses were utilized. Starting in 1995, the Census Bureau began administering the CPS using a Computer Assisted Personal Interviewing (CAPI) technique wherein all responses to questions are recorded directly into preprogrammed computer software.

Sample size, primary sampling units (PSU), total number of interviews conducted (ages 15 and older), and number of eligible and interviewed households for the 1992/93 and 1995/96 CPS are provided in the table below.

Changes in Current Population Survey study design over time

Time period	Total # of interviews*	PSU's	Households eligible for interview		Number visited but determined not eligible
			# interviewed	# not interviewed	
Sept 1992	111,964	729	57,400	2,600	11,800
Jan 1993	111,156	729	57,400	2,600	11,800
May 1993	110,789	729	57,400	2,600	11,800
Sept 1995	103,676	792	52,900	3,400	9,700
Jan 1996	92,405	754	46,800	3,200	9,000
May 1996	92,965	754	46,800	3,200	9,000

* Approximate number responding to the CPS core each month

Response rates to the CPS labor force core are typically around 95 percent, and the corresponding response rates for the Tobacco Use Supplement of those responding to the CPS core range between 84 and 89 percent. Approximately 25 percent of all interviews were conducted in person and 75 percent by telephone, however, all initial household contacts for the CPS are done in person. For Spanish-language interviews, a fully translated Tobacco Use Supplement was utilized. In all cases where estimates for Whites and Blacks are presented, they are non-Hispanic.

Determination of Smoking Status Questions for determining smoking status are identical to those adopted in 1992 by the National Center for Health Statistics and currently in use on other national surveys. All respondents were asked "Have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your entire life?" Those responding "no" were considered never-smokers; those responding "yes" were asked "Do you now smoke cigarettes every day, some days, or not at all?" Respondents answering either "every day" or "some days" were considered current smokers; those responding "not at all" were considered former smokers.

Occupational and Workplace Definitions Routine labor force questions from the CPS core were used to determine each respondent's employment status (including those who were self-employed) and to categorize each worker into a standard occupational group. In the CPS, there are 500 categories for the employed, which the Census Bureau aggregates into 45 detailed groups.

The classification uses a three digit system (000-905) developed from the 1980 Standard Occupational Classification (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1993).

Because NCI was primarily interested in measuring the extent of official workplace smoking policies for indoor working environments, additional questions from the Tobacco Use Supplement were used to identify eligible employees. To be included in the analysis, an individual must have been (1) 18 years of age or older at the time of interview; (2) currently employed outside the home but not self-employed; (3) not working outdoors or in a motor vehicle; (4) not traveling to different buildings or sites; and (5) not working in someone else's home.

All eligible respondents were asked "Does your place of work have an official policy that restricts smoking in any way?" Those who responded "yes" were further asked "Which of these best describes your place of work's smoking policy for indoor public or common areas, such as lobbies, rest rooms, and lunch rooms?" and "Which of these best describes your place of work's smoking policy for work areas?" Response choices for each were: "Not allowed in ANY.....," "Allowed in SOME.....," or "Allowed in ALL....."

Based on this algorithm, the most restrictive policies were those in which the worker reported an official workplace policy that did not allow smoking in any public or common areas of the workplace nor in the work areas of the workplace. In Tables 3 and 4, such a policy is labeled "Smoke-free." Beginning in 1995 the question "During the past 2 weeks has anyone smoked in the area in which you work?" was asked of workers in an effort to gauge the level of compliance with workplace smoking policies (see Section I, Figure 7b).

Rules About Smoking in the Home For the 1992/93 and 1995/96 CPS, only one question was asked to determine the degree to which smoking is restricted in the home. Respondents were asked "Which statement best describes the rules about smoking in YOUR HOME?" If asked, "home" was defined as where the respondent lived at the time of interview. Three response choices were possible: "No one is allowed to smoke anywhere," "Smoking is allowed in some places or at some times," and "Smoking is permitted anywhere."

Attitudes Toward Smoking Restrictions in Public Places The NCI was also interested in measuring the general public's attitudes and beliefs about smoking restrictions in various public settings. The question regarding attitudes toward smoking in public places asked "In (*read place*) do you THINK that smoking should be allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all?" Six specific indoor settings were identified: restaurants, hospitals, indoor work areas, bars and cocktail lounges, indoor sporting events, and indoor shopping malls.

DATA ORGANIZATION AND ANALYSIS This section contains a variety of state-specific and national estimates from NCI's Tobacco Use Supplement to the Current Population Survey (CPS) for the survey periods 1992/93 and 1995/96. The data are presented for various demographic subgroups and by

state. Where appropriate, the data are also presented separately for current smokers, former smokers, and never-smokers. Results from the 1992/93 and 1995/96 surveys are presented to show trends over time. Data are presented in both tabular form and in 24 state maps designed to present shifting public opinion in a more visual and comprehensive format.

Tables 1 through 4 present detailed data on workplace smoking restrictions for the nation and for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia; Table 5 presents data on the national prevalence of smoking restrictions in the home, while Table 6 presents this information by state. Table 7 presents national data pertaining to smoking restrictions in the home and their association with different levels of workplace smoking policies. Table 8 provides national estimates about public support for smoking restrictions in various public settings such as restaurants, hospitals, work areas, bars/cocktail lounges, indoor sporting events, and shopping malls; and Table 9 provides this same information by state.

The Tables Percentages from the tables that are used in the text are rounded to the nearest whole number to simplify comparisons. The basic universe for all tables includes only self-respondent adults (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined.

Table 1 Individuals included in this table must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must respond that an official workplace smoking policy exists.

Table 2 Individuals included in this table must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must respond that an official workplace smoking policy exists.

Table 3 Individuals included in this table must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must know if an official workplace smoking policy exists or does not exist, and define that policy for both work and public areas (*i.e.*, smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all).

Table 4 Individuals included in this table must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must know if an official workplace smoking policy exists or does not exist, and define that policy for both work and public areas (*i.e.*, smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all).

Table 5 This table reflects what individuals report about the smoking rules in their homes. It does not show the rules for whole households, but rather the rules as reported by each individual. To be included in the table, each individual must define the smoking rules for his or her home (*i.e.*, smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some places or at some times, or not allowed at all). For the “homes with children” insert, only individuals who live in a home where at least one child under the age of 13 also lives are included.

- Table 6* This table reflects what individuals report about the smoking rules in their home. It does not show the rules for households, but rather the rules as reported by each individual. To be included in the table, each individual must define the smoking rules for his or her home (*i.e.*, smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some places or at some times, or not allowed at all).
- Table 7* Individuals included in this table must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must know if an official workplace smoking policy exists or does not exist, and define that policy for both work and public areas (*i.e.*, smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all). Each individual must also define the smoking rules for his or her home (*i.e.*, smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some places or at some times, or not allowed at all).
- Table 8* To be included in the tables, individuals must give their opinion about smoking in public places (*i.e.*, smoking should be allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all). This is required for each public place separately; if an individual does not give an opinion about one public place, he or she will still be included in other public places for which an opinion was given.
- Table 9* To be included in the tables, individuals must give their opinion about smoking in public places (*i.e.*, smoking should be allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all). This is required for each public place separately; if an individual does not give an opinion about one public place, he or she will still be included in other public places for which an opinion was given.

Variable Descriptions for Tables 1-4 Workplace smoking policies are characterized by the extent of the restriction in the workplace based on the answers to two questions, one asking about restrictions on smoking in indoor public or common areas in the workplace and the other asking about the policy for work areas. These workplace smoking policies are then classified into five categories, reflecting the relative strength of the policies.

Category	Strength of Workplace Smoking Policies
1. Smoke-free	Smoking is not allowed in either work or public areas
2. Strong	Smoking is not allowed in work areas and is only allowed in some public areas
3. Moderate	Smoking is not allowed in work areas but is allowed in all public areas, or Smoking is allowed in some work areas but not allowed in public areas, or Smoking is allowed in some work areas and some public areas

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| 4. Weak | Smoking is allowed in some work areas and all public areas, or
Smoking is allowed in all work areas but not allowed in public areas, or
Smoking is allowed in all work areas and allowed in some public areas |
| 5. No Restrictions | Workplace does not have an official smoking policy, or
Smoking is allowed in all work and public areas |

All analyses are limited to self-respondents over 18 years of age and are further restricted to indoor workers for the workplace policy tables.

Variable Descriptions for Tables 5-9 The three major variable categories used in Tables 5 through 9—Smoking Status, Education Level, and Race/Ethnicity—are defined as follows:

Smoking Status

Never	Never smoked 100 cigarettes in lifetime
Current	Smoked 100 cigarettes and smokes now
Former	Smoked 100 cigarettes but does not smoke now

Maximum Level of Education

<12 years	Up to and including 11th grade
12 years	12th grade, with or without diploma
13-15 years	Some college without a degree or Associates degree
16+ years	Bachelor's degree and higher

Race/Ethnicity

Non-Hispanic White	White, no Hispanic origin
Hispanic	All Hispanic origin
African-American	Black, no Hispanic origin
Asian/Pacific Islander	Asian or Pacific Island, no Hispanic origin
Native American	American Indian or Aleut Eskimo, no Hispanic origin
Other	All others, no Hispanic origin

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES IN SECTION III

List of Tables

Table 1a	Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Workplace for Public and Work Areas for the Nation by Smoking Status, Demographic Characteristics, and by State—1992/1993202
Table 1b	Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Workplace for Public and Work Areas for the Nation by Smoking Status, Demographic Characteristics, and by State—1995/1996206
Table 2	National Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Workplace for Public and Work Areas with Age- and Gender-Specific Rates for Each Race and Ethnic Group—1992/93 and 1995/96212
Table 3	Strength of Workplace Smoking Policies by Smoking Status and Demographic Characteristics for the Nation—1992/93 and 1995/96218
Table 4	Strength of Workplace Smoking Policies by Smoking Status for Each State—1992/93 and 1995/96222
Table 5	National Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Home as Reported by Individuals with Different Smoking Status, with Children under Age 13 in the Home, and with Different Demographic Characteristics—1992/93 and 1995/96234
Table 6	State-specific Prevalence of Reported Smoking Restrictions in the Home by Smoking Status—1992/93 and 1995/96241
Table 7a	Prevalence of Reported Smoking Restrictions in the Home for Different Levels of Workplace Smoking Policies for the Nation—1992/93254

Table 7b	Prevalence of Reported Smoking Restrictions in the Home for Different Levels of Workplace Smoking Policies for the Nation—1995/96	255
Table 8	National Attitudes About Smoking in Indoor Places (Restaurants, Hospitals, Indoor Work Areas, Bars and Cocktail Lounges, Indoor Sporting Events, and Indoor Shopping Malls) by Smoking Status and Demographic Characteristics—1992/93 and 1995/96	258
Table 9a	State-Specific Attitudes about Smoking in Indoor Public Places (Restaurants, Hospitals, Indoor Work Areas, Bars and Cocktail Lounges, Indoor Sporting Events, and Indoor Shopping Malls) by Smoking Status—1992/93	289
Table 9b	State-Specific Attitudes about Smoking in Indoor Public Places (Restaurants, Hospitals, Indoor Work Areas, Bars and Cocktail Lounges, Indoor Sporting Events, and Indoor Shopping Malls) by Smoking Status—1995/96	315

List of Figures

Figure 1	Workplace Smoking Restrictions: 1992/93	199
Figure 2	Workplace Smoking Restrictions: 1995/96	200
Figure 3	Change in Workplace Smoking Restrictions: 1992/93 to 1995/96	201
Figure 4	Smoking Rules in the Home: 1992/93	238
Figure 5	Smoking Rules in the Home: 1995/96	239
Figure 6	Change in Smoking Rules in the Home: 1992/93 to 1995/96	240
Figure 7	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Restaurants: 1992/93	271
Figure 8	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Restaurants: 1995/96	272
Figure 9	Change in Smoking in Restaurants: 1992/93 to 1995/96	273

Figure 10	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Hospitals: 1992/93274
Figure 11	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Hospitals: 1995/96275
Figure 12	Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Hospitals: 1992/93 to 1995/96276
Figure 13	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Work Areas: 1992/93277
Figure 14	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Work Areas: 1995/96278
Figure 15	Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Work Areas: 1992/93 to 1995/96279
Figure 16	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Bars and Cocktail Lounges: 1992/93280
Figure 17	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Bars and Cocktail Lounges: 1995/96281
Figure 18	Change in Attitude Regarding Smoking in Bars and Cocktail Lounges: 1992/93 to 1995/96282
Figure 19	Attitudes Regarding Smoking During Indoor Sporting Events: 1992/93283
Figure 20	Attitudes Regarding Smoking During Indoor Sporting Events: 1995/96284
Figure 21	Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking During Indoor Sporting Events: 1992/93 to 1995/96285
Figure 22	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Shopping Malls: 1992/93286
Figure 23	Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Shopping Malls: 1995/96287
Figure 24	Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Shopping Malls: 1992/93 to 1995/96288

RESULTS

TABLES 1A AND 1B Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Workplace for Public and Work Areas for the Nation by Smoking Status, Demographic Characteristics, and by State

This table presents the level of workplace smoking restrictions reported by indoor workers for the nation as a whole and for demographic subgroups. The prevalence of restrictions in public areas and work areas of the workplace are presented separately.

Overall—Restrictions on smoking in the workplace increased between the 1992/93 CPS and 1995/96 CPS. In the 1995/96 CPS, 88 percent of immediate work areas and 77 percent of public areas in the workplace were reported to be smoke-free, compared to 82 percent of work areas and 62 percent of public areas in the 1992/93 CPS. While public areas in the workplace were reported to be smoke-free less often than work areas, the difference between the two decreased, from 20 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 11 percent in the 1995/96 CPS.

The increase in work areas reported to be smoke-free from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS is presented by smoking status and for all demographic groups: smoking status, gender, age, race/ethnicity, education level, and income level. This supports the conclusion of a relatively uniform increase in the fraction of workers with smoke-free work areas. Change for public areas was not as uniform.

Smoking Status—Former smokers generally reported smoke-free public and work areas in their workplaces at about the national rate, while never-smokers reported higher rates than former smokers, and current smokers reported rates below the national average.

Demographic Subgroups—Females were more likely to report working in a workplace with smoke-free work and public areas than were males. As age increases, the fraction of workers reporting smoke-free work and public areas increases. Similar trends hold for increasing education and income levels. Asian/Pacific Islanders were more likely to report working in workplaces with smoke-free work and public areas than other racial/ethnic groups, and Native Americans generally reported the lowest rates of working in workplaces with smoke-free work and public areas.

States—Coverage of workers by no-smoking regulations in the workplace varies from state to state; however, every state showed an increase for both public and work areas between the 1992/93 CPS and 1995/96 CPS. In the 1992/93 CPS, only 4 states reported smoke-free public areas at a rate of at least 75 percent; that number increased to 32 in the 1995/96 CPS. The percentage of people reporting smoke-free public areas ranges from 44 per-

cent (Kentucky) to 80 percent (Washington) in the 1992/93 CPS. For the 1995/96 CPS, the percentage of people reporting smoke-free public areas ranges from 53 percent (Nevada) to 92 percent (Utah). The state with the largest absolute change from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS was Rhode Island, with an increase of 25 percent, from 57 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 82 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. North Carolina had the largest relative change, with an increase of 50 percent, from 45 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 68 percent in the 1995/96 CPS.

The fraction of workers who reported smoke-free immediate work areas for the individual states ranged from 72 to 90 percent in the 1992/93 CPS and from 77 to 96 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. Most states reported smoke-free work areas in the 80-90 percent range for both years. Only 1 state reported at least 90 percent of the work areas to be smoke-free in the 1992/93 CPS, compared to 11 in the 1995/96 CPS. Utah reported the highest fraction of smoke-free work areas in both the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS, while Nevada reported the lowest fraction of smoke-free work areas in both survey years. The state with the largest absolute change from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS was Kentucky, with an increase of 11 percent, from 73 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 84 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. Kentucky also had the largest relative change, an increase of 16 percent, from 73 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 84 percent in the 1995/96 CPS.

Maps depicting the prevalence of smoke-free workplaces by state for the 1992/93 CPS and 1995/96 CPS and for the change between survey years are presented as Figures 1 through 3.

Figure 1: Workplace Smoking Restrictions: 1992/93






Figure 2: Workplace Smoking Restrictions: 1995/96



Data Source: 1995/96 Current Population Survey
Note: States categorized by quintiles

**Figure 3: Change in Workplace Smoking Restrictions:
1992/93 to 1995/96**



Data Source: 1992/93 and 1995/96 Current Population Surveys
Note: States categorized by quintiles

Table 1a
Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Workplace for Public and Work Areas for the Nation by Smoking Status, Demographic Characteristics, and by State* - 1992/93

	Reported Workplace Smoking Rules															
	Public Areas				Not Allowed at All				Work Areas							
	%	CI	Allowed in Some Areas	Allowed in All Areas	%	CI	Don't Know	%	CI	Allowed in Some Areas	Allowed in All Areas	Don't Know				
Nation Overall	61.5	0.4	35.4	0.4	2.7	0.1	0.5	0.1	81.7	0.3	16.6	0.3	1.4	0.1	0.3	0.0
Smoking Status																
Never	63.8	0.5	33.3	0.5	2.3	0.2	0.6	0.1	84.3	0.4	14.2	0.4	1.1	0.1	0.4	0.1
Current	53.6	0.9	42.5	0.9	3.7	0.3	0.3	0.1	75.8	0.7	22.0	0.7	2.0	0.2	0.2	0.1
Former	64.2	0.9	32.8	0.9	2.5	0.3	0.6	0.1	81.5	0.7	16.7	0.7	1.5	0.2	0.3	0.1
Gender																
Male	56.8	0.6	39.3	0.6	3.4	0.2	0.5	0.1	77.0	0.5	20.7	0.5	2.0	0.2	0.3	0.1
Female	65.4	0.5	32.1	0.5	2.0	0.2	0.5	0.1	85.6	0.4	13.1	0.4	1.0	0.1	0.3	0.1
Age (Years)																
18-24	55.8	1.1	40.3	1.1	3.4	0.4	0.5	0.2	81.0	0.9	17.5	0.8	1.2	0.2	0.3	0.1
25-44	62.2	0.5	34.7	0.5	2.6	0.2	0.5	0.1	81.7	0.4	16.6	0.4	1.4	0.1	0.3	0.1
45-64	62.7	0.8	34.3	0.8	2.4	0.2	0.6	0.1	82.0	0.6	16.1	0.6	1.5	0.2	0.4	0.1
65+	64.7	3.0	30.7	2.9	3.5	1.1	1.1	0.7	82.8	2.3	14.8	2.2	1.8	0.8	0.6	0.5
Race/Ethnicity																
White	62.2	0.5	34.7	0.5	2.6	0.2	0.5	0.1	81.3	0.4	16.9	0.4	1.5	0.1	0.3	0.0
Hispanic	61.4	2.0	34.5	2.0	3.5	0.8	0.7	0.3	83.3	1.6	14.8	1.5	1.5	0.5	0.5	0.3
African-American	55.8	1.3	41.4	1.3	2.1	0.4	0.7	0.2	81.7	1.0	16.6	1.0	1.3	0.3	0.4	0.2
Asian/Pacific																
Islander	64.5	2.2	31.9	2.2	3.0	0.8	0.6	0.4	86.6	1.6	12.0	1.5	0.8	0.4	0.6	0.3
Native American	58.0	5.6	36.7	5.5	4.9	2.4	0.3	0.6	80.4	4.5	18.6	4.4	0.7	0.9	0.4	0.7
Other	65.3	10.5	33.7	10.4			1.0	2.2	80.4	8.8	18.2	8.5	1.4	2.6		

Table 1a (Continued)

	Reported Workplace Smoking Rules															
	Not Allowed at All				Public Areas				Work Areas							
	%	CI	%	CI	Allowed in Some Areas	Allowed in All Areas	Don't Know	Not Allowed at All	Allowed in Some Areas	Allowed in All Areas	Don't Know					
Education (Years)																
<12	46.0	1.6	48.6	1.6	4.7	0.7	0.7	0.3	76.3	1.3	20.5	1.3	2.5	0.5	0.7	0.3
12	54.0	0.7	42.0	0.7	3.5	0.3	0.5	0.1	78.9	0.6	19.0	0.6	1.8	0.2	0.3	0.1
13-15	63.1	0.8	34.1	0.7	2.4	0.2	0.4	0.1	81.8	0.6	16.6	0.6	1.4	0.2	0.2	0.1
16+	71.4	0.7	26.5	0.7	1.6	0.2	0.6	0.1	85.7	0.5	13.1	0.5	0.9	0.1	0.3	0.1
Household Income																
<\$10,000	52.0	1.8	44.1	1.7	3.0	0.6	0.8	0.3	78.3	1.4	19.4	1.4	1.5	0.4	0.8	0.3
\$10,000-\$19,999	54.6	1.2	41.3	1.1	3.5	0.4	0.7	0.2	80.4	0.9	17.3	0.9	1.8	0.3	0.5	0.2
\$20,000-\$29,999	59.3	1.0	37.1	1.0	3.0	0.4	0.5	0.2	81.5	0.8	16.8	0.8	1.5	0.3	0.2	0.1
\$30,000-\$49,999	60.8	0.8	35.9	0.7	2.8	0.3	0.5	0.1	81.3	0.6	17.0	0.6	1.5	0.2	0.3	0.1
\$50,000-\$74,999	65.8	0.9	31.6	0.9	2.2	0.3	0.4	0.1	82.7	0.7	15.8	0.7	1.3	0.2	0.2	0.1
\$75,000 +	71.0	1.1	27.0	1.1	1.6	0.3	0.4	0.2	84.2	0.9	14.6	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.2	0.1
Unknown	61.9	2.1	35.1	2.0	2.3	0.6	0.8	0.4	82.3	1.6	16.0	1.6	1.3	0.5	0.3	0.2
By State																
Alabama	53.2	4.0	42.2	4.0	3.8	1.6	0.8	0.7	80.9	3.2	16.4	3.0	2.3	1.2	0.3	0.4
Alaska	74.5	2.9	24.2	2.9	1.0	0.6	0.4	0.4	82.6	2.5	16.9	2.5	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.3
Arizona	69.8	3.3	27.7	3.2	2.1	1.0	0.4	0.5	87.3	2.4	11.0	2.3	1.1	0.7	0.6	0.6
Arkansas	47.7	4.2	47.4	4.2	4.3	1.7	0.5	0.6	79.3	3.4	18.5	3.2	1.8	1.1	0.4	0.5
California	71.9	1.3	25.0	1.2	2.5	0.4	0.6	0.2	87.6	0.9	11.3	0.9	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.2
Colorado	67.9	3.4	29.7	3.3	1.9	1.0	0.5	0.5	86.8	2.5	12.2	2.4	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.4
Connecticut	62.8	3.6	35.3	3.5	1.5	0.9	0.4	0.5	80.3	2.9	18.2	2.9	1.2	0.8	0.3	0.4
Delaware	64.6	3.5	32.0	3.4	2.9	1.2	0.5	0.5	82.2	2.8	16.7	2.7	1.0	0.7	0.1	0.2
District of Columbia	61.2	3.7	34.7	3.6	3.1	1.3	1.0	0.7	83.3	2.8	15.8	2.7	0.8	0.7	0.1	0.3
Florida	70.1	1.7	27.0	1.6	2.4	0.6	0.6	0.3	85.3	1.3	13.1	1.2	1.2	0.4	0.4	0.2

Table 1a (Continued)

	Reported Workplace Smoking Rules														
	Public Areas				Not Allowed at All				Work Areas						
	%	CI	Allowed in Some Areas	Allowed in All Areas	%	CI	Don't Know	Not Allowed at All	%	CI	Allowed in Some Areas	Allowed in All Areas	%	CI	Don't Know
Georgia	63.0	3.4	34.3	2.3	1.1	0.4	0.4	85.1	2.5	13.5	2.4	1.4	0.8		
Hawaii	57.7	3.5	38.7	3.3	1.3	0.3	0.4	82.0	2.7	16.5	2.6	1.2	0.8	0.3	0.4
Idaho	76.3	3.1	21.7	3.0	1.4	0.6	0.6	87.3	2.4	11.9	2.4	0.6	0.6	0.2	0.3
Illinois	54.1	1.9	42.9	1.8	2.4	0.7	0.3	78.5	1.5	20.1	1.5	1.2	0.4	0.2	0.2
Indiana	50.6	3.7	44.6	3.7	4.9	1.6		76.0	3.1	22.0	3.0	2.0	1.0		
Iowa	59.6	3.4	37.3	3.4	2.9	1.2	0.2	80.0	2.8	18.5	2.7	1.5	0.8	0.1	0.2
Kansas	62.6	3.3	35.1	3.2	1.8	0.9	0.5	82.4	2.6	15.9	2.5	1.2	0.7	0.4	0.4
Kentucky	43.6	4.2	50.8	4.2	4.7	1.8	0.8	72.9	3.7	25.0	3.6	1.8	1.1	0.4	0.5
Louisiana	60.2	4.5	35.0	4.4	4.2	1.9	0.5	80.0	3.7	16.8	3.4	2.5	1.4	0.8	0.8
Maine	69.1	3.3	29.7	3.3	1.2	0.8		84.9	2.6	14.2	2.5	0.9	0.7		
Maryland	65.1	3.3	31.7	3.2	2.7	1.1	0.5	86.4	2.4	13.0	2.3	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4
Massachusetts	62.2	1.7	35.3	1.7	2.1	0.5	0.4	82.2	1.4	16.5	1.3	1.1	0.4	0.2	0.1
Michigan	54.2	1.8	42.7	1.8	2.9	0.6	0.3	76.1	1.6	21.5	1.5	2.3	0.5	0.2	0.1
Minnesota	66.7	3.1	31.6	3.1	1.5	0.8	0.2	84.9	2.4	13.9	2.3	1.2	0.7	0.1	0.2
Mississippi	56.3	4.2	40.6	4.1	2.5	1.3	0.6	83.6	3.1	14.5	3.0	1.4	1.0	0.4	0.6
Missouri	53.4	3.8	42.4	3.7	4.0	1.5	0.2	75.9	3.2	20.6	3.0	3.4	1.4	0.2	0.4
Montana	62.1	4.1	33.6	4.0	3.3	1.5	0.9	83.7	3.1	15.5	3.0	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.3
Nebraska	60.0	3.3	37.0	3.3	2.4	1.0	0.7	82.6	2.6	16.5	2.5	0.9	0.6	0.1	0.3
Nevada	47.7	3.6	42.6	3.6	9.1	2.1	0.5	71.5	3.2	26.6	3.2	1.5	0.9	0.4	0.4
New Hampshire	66.3	3.6	31.5	3.5	1.7	1.0	0.5	86.4	2.6	12.7	2.5	0.9	0.7		
New Jersey	61.9	1.8	35.1	1.7	2.4	0.6	0.5	82.8	1.4	15.6	1.3	1.4	0.4	0.2	0.2
New Mexico	71.7	3.6	26.2	3.5	2.0	1.1	0.1	86.3	2.7	12.8	2.6	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.3
New York	59.0	1.4	38.3	1.4	1.6	0.4	1.1	76.3	1.2	21.9	1.2	1.2	0.3	0.6	0.2
North Carolina	45.3	1.8	50.0	1.8	4.2	0.7	0.4	77.6	1.5	19.8	1.5	2.2	0.5	0.4	0.2
North Dakota	64.2	3.7	31.5	3.6	4.0	1.5	0.2	83.0	2.9	15.2	2.8	1.5	1.0	0.3	0.4

Table 1a (Continued)

	Reported Workplace Smoking Rules															
	Not Allowed at All				Public Areas				Work Areas							
	%	CI	%	CI	Allowed in All Areas	Allowed in Some Areas	Not Allowed at All	Don't Know	Allowed in All Areas	Allowed in Some Areas	Not Allowed at All	Don't Know				
Ohio	52.8	1.8	43.4	1.8	3.4	0.7	0.3	0.2	77.0	1.5	20.5	1.5	2.2	0.5	0.3	0.2
Oklahoma	57.7	3.7	38.4	3.7	3.6	1.4	0.3	0.4	75.4	3.2	23.3	3.2	1.1	0.8	0.2	0.3
Oregon	75.3	3.3	22.7	3.2	1.9	1.0	0.2	0.3	86.7	2.6	11.6	2.5	1.3	0.9	0.4	0.5
Pennsylvania	58.3	1.8	38.9	1.8	2.4	0.6	0.3	0.2	79.7	1.5	18.7	1.4	1.5	0.4	0.1	0.1
Rhode Island	56.6	3.8	40.4	3.8	1.9	1.0	1.1	0.8	85.3	2.7	12.8	2.6	1.2	0.8	0.6	0.6
South Carolina	52.8	3.3	45.2	3.3	1.9	0.9	0.1	0.2	79.7	2.7	18.8	2.6	1.2	0.7	0.3	0.3
South Dakota	61.5	3.5	34.5	3.5	3.7	1.4	0.3	0.4	82.1	2.8	16.9	2.7	0.8	0.7	0.3	0.4
Tennessee	50.7	3.7	45.9	3.7	2.9	1.2	0.5	0.5	81.5	2.9	16.0	2.7	1.9	1.0	0.7	0.6
Texas	65.7	1.8	31.0	1.8	2.8	0.6	0.5	0.3	83.4	1.4	14.5	1.3	1.7	0.5	0.5	0.3
Utah	75.9	2.8	23.4	2.8	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.3	89.9	2.0	9.3	1.9	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.3
Vermont	71.3	3.3	26.2	3.2	2.1	1.1	0.4	0.5	85.8	2.6	12.2	2.4	1.9	1.0	0.2	0.3
Virginia	59.2	3.0	37.5	3.0	2.4	0.9	1.0	0.6	77.5	2.6	19.9	2.5	2.1	0.9	0.6	0.5
Washington	80.4	2.7	18.0	2.6	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.6	89.1	2.1	10.6	2.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
West Virginia	57.3	4.6	38.8	4.6	3.3	1.7	0.6	0.7	79.1	3.8	19.1	3.7	1.4	1.1	0.4	0.6
Wisconsin	58.0	3.3	37.7	3.2	4.2	1.3	0.1	0.2	82.4	2.5	15.4	2.4	2.2	1.0	0.1	0.2
Wyoming	66.4	4.3	31.7	4.2	2.0	1.3	.	.	79.3	3.7	19.5	3.6	0.9	0.9	0.3	0.5

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval; "." = insufficient data.

Source: 1992/93 Current Population Survey.

*Universe: Individuals included in this table are self-reported adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must respond that an official workplace smoking policy exists.

Table 1b
Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Workplace for Public and Work Areas by Smoking Status, Demographic Characteristics, and by State* - 1995/96

	Reported Workplace Smoking Rules															
	Public Areas				Not Allowed at All				Work Areas							
	Not Allowed at All %	CI	Allowed in Some Areas %	CI	Allowed in All Areas %	CI	Don't Know %	CI	Not Allowed at All %	CI	Allowed in Some Areas %	CI	Allowed in All Areas %	CI	Don't Know %	CI
Nation Overall	77.0	0.4	20.5	0.3	2.3	0.1	0.2	0.0	87.8	0.3	10.1	0.3	1.9	0.1	0.1	0.0
Smoking Status																
Never	79.3	0.4	18.5	0.4	2.0	0.2	0.3	0.1	89.8	0.3	8.5	0.3	1.7	0.1	0.1	0.0
Current	70.0	0.8	27.1	0.8	2.9	0.3	0.1	0.0	82.9	0.7	14.7	0.6	2.3	0.3	0.0	0.0
Former	78.2	0.8	19.1	0.7	2.6	0.3	0.1	0.1	87.8	0.6	9.8	0.6	2.2	0.3	0.1	0.1
Gender																
Male	73.0	0.5	24.1	0.5	2.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	84.3	0.4	13.2	0.4	2.4	0.2	0.1	0.0
Female	80.4	0.5	17.5	0.4	2.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	90.9	0.3	7.5	0.3	1.5	0.1	0.1	0.0
Age (Years)																
18-24	72.2	1.0	25.4	1.0	2.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	86.7	0.8	11.6	0.7	1.7	0.3	0.0	0.0
25-44	76.8	0.5	20.7	0.5	2.3	0.2	0.2	0.0	87.7	0.4	10.3	0.3	1.9	0.2	0.1	0.0
45-64	79.2	0.6	18.3	0.6	2.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	88.5	0.5	9.4	0.5	2.0	0.2	0.1	0.1
65+	81.4	2.3	15.6	2.1	2.5	0.9	0.5	0.4	89.4	1.8	7.9	1.6	2.2	0.9	0.5	0.4
Race/Ethnicity																
White	77.4	0.4	20.2	0.4	2.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	87.9	0.3	10.2	0.3	1.9	0.1	0.1	0.0
Hispanic	75.0	1.7	21.5	1.6	3.1	0.7	0.4	0.2	86.9	1.3	10.6	1.2	2.3	0.6	0.2	0.2
African-American	74.9	1.1	22.8	1.0	2.0	0.3	0.2	0.1	88.0	0.8	10.0	0.7	1.9	0.3	0.1	0.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	80.3	1.7	16.7	1.6	2.5	0.7	0.6	0.3	89.4	1.3	8.4	1.2	2.0	0.6	0.2	0.2
Native American	74.0	4.5	23.8	4.4	2.3	1.5	.	.	84.7	3.7	12.9	3.5	2.4	1.6	.	.

Table 1b (Continued)

	Reported Workplace Smoking Rules															
	Not Allowed at All				Allowed in Some Areas				Allowed in All Areas				Don't Know			
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Education (Years)																
<12	63.7	1.5	33.0	1.5	2.9	0.5	0.4	0.2	81.9	1.2	15.4	1.1	2.5	0.5	0.2	0.1
12	70.9	0.7	26.3	0.7	2.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	84.4	0.5	13.1	0.5	2.4	0.2	0.1	0.0
13-15	77.8	0.6	19.7	0.6	2.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	88.3	0.5	9.9	0.4	1.8	0.2	0.1	0.0
16+	85.1	0.5	13.0	0.5	1.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	92.1	0.4	6.4	0.4	1.4	0.2	0.1	0.0
Household Income																
<\$10,000	69.4	1.7	27.4	1.6	3.0	0.6	0.2	0.2	84.6	1.3	13.2	1.2	2.1	0.5	0.1	0.1
\$10,000-\$19,999	70.3	1.2	26.7	1.1	2.8	0.4	0.2	0.1	85.4	0.9	12.4	0.8	2.0	0.4	0.2	0.1
\$20,000-\$29,999	73.8	1.0	23.4	0.9	2.5	0.3	0.2	0.1	86.5	0.7	11.1	0.7	2.3	0.3	0.1	0.1
\$30,000-\$49,999	75.9	0.7	21.6	0.7	2.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	87.4	0.5	10.6	0.5	2.0	0.2	0.1	0.0
\$50,000-\$74,999	80.2	0.7	17.7	0.7	2.0	0.3	0.2	0.1	88.9	0.6	9.3	0.5	1.7	0.2	0.0	0.0
\$75,000 +	84.4	0.8	13.8	0.7	1.7	0.3	0.1	0.1	91.1	0.6	7.2	0.5	1.6	0.3	0.1	0.1
Unknown	77.4	1.4	19.7	1.4	2.7	0.6	0.2	0.2	88.0	1.1	9.9	1.0	2.0	0.5	0.2	0.1
States																
Alabama	68.9	3.3	28.3	3.2	2.6	1.2	0.2	0.3	83.6	2.7	14.1	2.5	2.2	1.1	0.1	0.2
Alaska	84.4	2.5	14.4	2.4	1.1	0.7	0.1	0.2	88.7	2.2	10.1	2.1	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.4
Arizona	79.4	2.8	16.7	2.5	3.7	1.3	0.2	0.3	88.1	2.2	9.3	2.0	2.6	1.1	0.1	0.2
Arkansas	63.4	3.4	33.9	3.4	2.6	1.1	0.1	0.2	81.4	2.8	15.1	2.6	3.4	1.3	.	.
California	86.4	1.0	11.4	0.9	1.9	0.4	0.3	0.2	92.9	0.7	5.1	0.6	1.8	0.4	0.2	0.1
Colorado	81.9	2.5	15.5	2.4	2.1	0.9	0.6	0.5	92.5	1.7	6.1	1.6	1.1	0.7	0.2	0.3
Connecticut	80.2	2.9	18.2	2.8	1.4	0.9	0.2	0.3	89.1	2.3	9.7	2.1	1.3	0.8	.	.
Delaware	79.1	2.9	17.1	2.7	3.7	1.4	0.1	0.2	88.3	2.3	8.5	2.0	3.2	1.3	.	.
District of Columbia	84.2	2.7	13.9	2.5	1.4	0.9	0.5	0.5	91.4	2.1	7.6	1.9	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.3
Florida	80.8	1.4	17.5	1.4	1.7	0.5	0.1	0.1	89.9	1.1	9.1	1.0	1.0	0.4	0.0	0.1

Table 1b (Continued)

	Reported Workplace Smoking Rules														
	Public Areas						Work Areas								
	Not Allowed at All		Allowed in Some Areas		Allowed in All Areas		Not Allowed at All		Allowed in Some Areas		Allowed in All Areas		Don't Know		
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	
Georgia	70.0	2.8	28.0	2.8	2.1	0.9	. .	86.9	2.1	11.7	2.0	1.4	0.7	. .	
Hawaii	70.8	3.4	25.4	3.3	3.7	1.4	0.2	86.0	2.6	12.3	2.5	1.6	0.9	0.2	0.3
Idaho	83.9	2.5	14.3	2.4	1.7	0.9	0.1	89.2	2.1	9.7	2.1	0.9	0.7	0.1	0.2
Illinois	72.7	1.7	25.1	1.6	2.1	0.5	0.1	86.0	1.3	12.2	1.2	1.9	0.5	. .	
Indiana	66.0	3.2	31.3	3.1	2.6	1.1	0.1	83.0	2.5	14.7	2.4	2.4	1.0	. .	
Iowa	75.8	2.9	21.6	2.8	2.2	1.0	0.4	88.1	2.2	9.9	2.0	1.6	0.8	0.4	0.4
Kansas	77.4	2.9	20.3	2.8	2.2	1.0	. .	85.9	2.4	12.1	2.3	1.9	1.0	. .	
Kentucky	64.6	3.6	31.8	3.5	3.4	1.4	0.1	84.3	2.7	12.9	2.5	2.7	1.2	0.1	0.2
Louisiana	74.3	3.3	21.7	3.1	3.9	1.5	0.1	86.0	2.6	12.5	2.5	1.4	0.9	. .	
Maine	83.1	2.7	15.0	2.6	1.9	1.0	. .	89.0	2.3	10.5	2.2	0.5	0.5	. .	
Maryland	88.8	2.0	9.7	1.9	1.4	0.7	0.1	93.4	1.6	5.0	1.4	1.5	0.8	0.2	0.3
Massachusetts	82.9	1.6	15.0	1.5	1.8	0.6	0.3	90.6	1.2	8.2	1.2	1.2	0.5	0.1	0.1
Michigan	67.8	1.9	29.1	1.8	2.9	0.7	0.1	81.8	1.5	14.8	1.4	3.3	0.7	0.1	0.1
Minnesota	79.8	2.6	18.8	2.5	1.3	0.7	0.1	89.3	2.0	9.9	1.9	0.7	0.6	0.1	0.2
Mississippi	73.5	3.4	22.4	3.2	4.0	1.5	. .	87.4	2.5	9.8	2.3	2.8	1.3	. .	
Missouri	71.3	3.0	26.8	2.9	1.8	0.9	0.1	85.7	2.3	12.7	2.2	1.6	0.8	. .	
Montana	78.2	3.2	18.5	3.1	3.3	1.4	. .	88.6	2.5	10.3	2.4	1.1	0.8	. .	
Nebraska	78.4	2.7	19.8	2.6	1.8	0.9	0.1	87.1	2.2	11.6	2.1	1.2	0.7	0.1	0.2
Nevada	52.5	3.4	38.1	3.3	9.1	2.0	0.2	77.3	2.9	20.9	2.8	1.8	0.9	. .	
New Hampshire	82.7	2.8	15.6	2.6	1.4	0.9	0.3	92.0	2.0	5.5	1.7	2.4	1.1	0.2	0.3
New Jersey	81.5	1.5	15.9	1.4	2.4	0.6	0.3	89.0	1.2	9.0	1.1	1.7	0.5	0.3	0.2
New Mexico	79.2	3.1	18.8	2.9	1.8	1.0	0.2	88.6	2.4	10.3	2.3	1.1	0.8	. .	
New York	79.0	1.2	18.4	1.2	2.2	0.4	0.4	86.9	1.0	11.0	0.9	1.9	0.4	0.2	0.1
North Carolina	68.0	2.1	29.0	2.0	2.8	0.7	0.2	83.9	1.7	13.6	1.5	2.4	0.7	0.1	0.1
North Dakota	81.4	3.0	15.3	2.8	3.2	1.4	0.1	88.4	2.5	10.1	2.3	1.5	0.9	. .	

Table 1b (Continued)

Nation	Reported Workplace Smoking Rules															
	Not Allowed at All				Public Areas				Work Areas							
	%	CI	Allowed in Some Areas	Allowed in All Areas	Don't Know	%	CI	Not Allowed at All	Allowed in Some Areas	Allowed in All Areas	Don't Know	%	CI			
Ohio	71.1	1.7	26.1	1.7	2.6	0.6	0.2	0.2	0.2	12.4	1.3	2.7	0.6	0.0	0.1	
Oklahoma	73.2	3.1	24.5	3.0	2.3	1.1	.	.	83.2	2.6	14.2	2.5	2.7	1.1	.	
Oregon	78.5	2.9	19.1	2.8	2.3	1.1	0.1	0.2	89.0	2.2	9.6	2.1	1.3	0.8	0.1	0.2
Pennsylvania	74.2	1.7	23.5	1.6	2.1	0.5	0.3	0.2	85.5	1.3	12.3	1.2	2.2	0.5	0.1	0.1
Rhode Island	81.5	2.8	14.9	2.6	3.5	1.3	0.1	0.2	90.1	2.2	7.2	1.9	2.7	1.2	.	.
South Carolina	70.8	3.1	27.0	3.0	2.1	1.0	0.1	0.2	87.8	2.2	10.3	2.0	1.8	0.9	0.1	0.2
South Dakota	77.4	2.9	20.9	2.8	1.7	0.9	.	.	87.6	2.3	10.9	2.1	1.6	0.8	.	.
Tennessee	68.3	3.2	28.4	3.1	3.1	1.2	0.1	0.2	85.5	2.4	11.5	2.2	2.9	1.2	.	.
Texas	78.5	1.5	18.6	1.4	2.7	0.6	0.2	0.2	88.2	1.2	9.2	1.0	2.5	0.6	0.1	0.1
Utah	91.6	1.7	7.4	1.6	0.9	0.6	0.1	0.2	95.6	1.3	3.2	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.1	0.2
Vermont	88.5	2.2	9.9	2.1	1.4	0.8	0.2	0.3	92.4	1.8	6.6	1.7	0.8	0.6	0.1	0.2
Virginia	75.1	2.7	22.3	2.6	2.6	1.0	0.1	0.2	87.9	2.0	10.5	1.9	1.6	0.8	.	.
Washington	85.1	2.6	12.8	2.4	2.2	1.1	.	.	91.5	2.0	6.4	1.8	2.0	1.0	0.1	0.3
West Virginia	72.8	3.4	24.2	3.2	3.0	1.3	.	.	84.4	2.7	12.5	2.5	3.0	1.3	.	.
Wisconsin	75.8	2.7	22.6	2.7	1.5	0.8	0.2	0.3	88.2	2.1	10.5	2.0	1.2	0.7	0.1	0.2
Wyoming	78.1	3.3	20.3	3.2	1.5	1.0	0.1	0.3	85.6	2.8	12.7	2.7	1.6	1.0	0.1	0.3

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval; "." = insufficient data.

Source: 1995/96 Current Population Survey.

*Universe: Individuals included in this table are self-respondent adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must respond that an official workplace smoking policy exists.

TABLE 2 National Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Workplace for Public and Work Areas with Age- and Gender-Specific Rates for Each Race and Ethnic Group

This table presents age- and gender-specific prevalences of working in workplaces with different levels of restriction in public areas and work areas for the major race and ethnic groups for the 1992/93 and 1995/96 CPS. For all race/ethnic groups, the percentage of reported smoke-free work areas was higher than the percentage of smoke-free public areas. Workers reported greater percentages of smoke-free work and public areas in the 1995/96 CPS than in the 1992/93 CPS. Females generally had higher levels of smoke-free work and public areas than males.

Non-Hispanic White—Non-Hispanic Whites reported increased protection for all groups, for both work and public areas between the 1992/93 and 1995/96 surveys. Generally, as age increases, the percentage of people whose workplaces have smoke-free public areas increases, but the effect of age on the likelihood of having a smoke-free work area is less pronounced. This trend holds for both males and females in both survey years. Public areas showed the greatest changes for males and females at the lowest age level, 18-24 years. For this group, females increased 26 percent and males increased 33 percent from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS.

Hispanic—Hispanics workers, particularly younger Hispanic workers, were more likely to work in workplaces with smoke-free work areas than were non-Hispanic White workers. Perhaps because of the higher rates of protection reported by younger Hispanic workers, the effect of increasing protection with increasing age found for non-Hispanic White workers is less evident. The percentage of Hispanic workers who reported smoke-free public areas and work areas actually decreased in the 1992/93 CPS with increasing age.

African-American—Of all the racial/ethnic groups, African-American workers showed the most change in level of workplace smoking restrictions between the 1992/93 CPS and 1995/96 CPS, particularly for restrictions in public areas. Restrictions on smoking in public areas showed the greatest changes for males and females at the lowest age level, 18-24 years, and the level of protection generally increased with increasing age. Among the different age groups, there was little change from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS in the percentage of African-American workers who reported working in smoke-free work areas. For public areas, the percentage of people who reported smoke-free public areas was slightly lower among those in the youngest age category, 18-24 years.

Asian/Pacific Islander—Asian/Pacific Islander workers report the highest levels of protection among racial/ethnic groups.

Native American—Native American workers show the lowest levels of protection among the racial/ethnic groups.

Table 2
 National Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Workplace for Public and Work Areas with Age- and Gender-Specific Rates for Each Race and Ethnic Group*—1992/93 and 1995/96

Age	In the Work- place, Smoking is allowed	1992/93						1995/96									
		Male			Female			Male			Female						
		Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI				
Non-Hispanic White																	
18-24																	
	Not at all	76.2	1.6	50.6	1.9	83.2	1.3	60.4	1.7	83.4	1.5	67.3	1.9	88.3	1.2	75.9	1.6
	Some areas	22.0	1.6	44.7	1.9	15.8	1.2	36.8	1.6	14.7	1.4	30.2	1.8	10.2	1.1	22.2	1.5
	All areas	1.7	0.5	4.2	0.8	0.7	0.3	2.6	0.5	1.8	0.5	2.2	0.6	1.4	0.4	1.8	0.5
	Don't know	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1
25-44																	
	Not at all	76.2	0.8	58.0	0.9	85.7	0.6	67.3	0.8	84.2	0.7	73.1	0.8	91.1	0.5	80.9	0.7
	Some areas	21.5	0.8	38.2	0.9	13.0	0.6	30.2	0.8	13.3	0.7	24.0	0.8	7.5	0.5	17.1	0.7
	All areas	2.0	0.3	3.3	0.3	1.1	0.2	2.0	0.2	2.5	0.3	2.7	0.3	1.3	0.2	1.9	0.2
	Don't know	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.1
45-64																	
	Not at all	76.4	1.1	59.3	1.3	86.3	0.8	66.6	1.1	84.2	0.9	75.6	1.1	92.1	0.6	82.8	0.9
	Some areas	21.1	1.1	37.6	1.3	12.3	0.8	30.9	1.1	13.0	0.9	21.6	1.1	6.5	0.6	15.1	0.8
	All areas	2.3	0.4	2.7	0.4	0.9	0.2	1.9	0.3	2.7	0.4	2.6	0.4	1.3	0.3	1.9	0.3
	Don't know	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
65+																	
	Not at all	77.5	4.5	64.1	5.2	86.0	3.0	67.9	4.1	87.1	3.3	78.1	4.1	90.6	2.4	82.7	3.1
	Some areas	19.6	4.2	29.5	4.9	12.0	2.8	28.9	4.0	10.0	3.0	18.9	3.9	6.6	2.0	14.1	2.9
	All areas	2.7	1.7	5.1	2.4	1.2	0.9	2.1	1.3	2.6	1.6	2.7	1.6	2.1	1.2	2.5	1.3
	Don't know	0.2	0.5	1.2	1.2	0.8	0.8	1.1	0.9	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7

Table 2 (Continued)

Age	In the Work- place, Smoking is allowed	1992/93						1995/96								
		Male			Female			Male			Female					
		Work Areas %	Public Areas %	CI	Work Areas %	Public Areas %	CI	Work Areas %	Public Areas %	CI	Work Areas %	Public Areas %	CI			
Hispanic																
18-24																
Not at all	82.5	4.5	54.0	5.9	87.4	4.5	67.2	6.4	86.0	4.2	68.0	5.6	91.2	3.8	78.6	5.5
Some areas	15.9	4.3	36.7	5.7	11.7	4.4	30.1	6.3	.	.	27.6	5.4	5.6	3.1	17.6	5.1
All areas	1.2	1.3	8.0	3.2	0.9	1.3	2.3	2.0	1.8	1.6	4.1	2.4	2.9	2.2	3.3	2.4
Don't know	.	.	1.3	1.4	—	—	0.4	0.9	—	—	.	.	0.3	0.7	0.5	1.0
25-44																
Not at all	80.3	3.1	59.0	3.9	85.7	2.8	65.9	3.8	82.0	2.7	69.6	3.2	89.8	2.2	79.3	3.0
Some areas	16.9	2.9	37.7	3.8	13.0	2.7	32.0	3.7	15.2	2.5	26.6	3.1	8.4	2.1	17.7	2.8
All areas	2.2	1.1	3.0	1.3	1.1	0.8	1.6	1.0	2.5	1.1	3.3	1.2	1.5	0.9	2.6	1.2
Don't know	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.5	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5
45-64																
Not at all	79.9	5.2	55.7	6.5	85.8	4.7	65.8	6.4	85.5	4.4	77.8	5.3	91.8	3.4	80.3	4.9
Some areas	17.6	5.0	38.5	6.3	12.5	4.4	29.6	6.1	.	.	17.7	4.8	5.9	2.9	18.0	4.7
All areas	2.1	1.9	4.9	2.8	0.7	1.1	3.0	2.3	4.5	2.6	4.3	2.6	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6
Don't know	.	.	0.9	1.2	0.9	1.3	1.6	1.7	—	—	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.9	0.1	0.5
65+																
Not at all	96.1	12.4	.	.	96.7	9.6
Some areas
All areas
Don't know	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table 2 (Continued)

Age	In the Work- place, Smoking is allowed	1992/93						1995/96									
		Male			Female			Male			Female						
		Work Areas %	Public Areas %	CI	Work Areas %	Public Areas %	CI	Work Areas %	Public Areas %	CI	Work Areas %	Public Areas %	CI				
African-American																	
18-24	Not at all	80.8	4.2	41.4	5.2	83.2	3.5	56.0	4.6	85.7	3.8	66.5	5.1	90.9	2.6	74.7	4.0
	Some areas	16.5	3.9	55.2	5.3	14.2	3.2	41.9	4.6	.	.	31.4	5.0	.	.	23.4	3.9
	All areas	.	.	3.4	1.9	2.2	1.4	1.7	1.2	0.7	0.9	.	.	1.8	1.2	1.6	1.1
	Don't know	.	.	—	—	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.3	0.5
25-44	Not at all	77.4	2.1	51.4	2.5	85.2	1.5	60.1	2.1	84.5	1.7	71.4	2.1	90.3	1.2	77.8	1.7
	Some areas	21.0	2.1	45.1	2.5	13.6	1.5	37.8	2.1	12.8	1.6	26.5	2.1	7.8	1.1	20.1	1.7
	All areas	1.2	0.6	3.1	0.9	1.0	0.4	1.4	0.5	2.5	0.7	2.0	0.7	1.9	0.6	1.8	0.6
	Don't know	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.7	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.2
45-64	Not at all	75.1	3.6	53.6	4.2	84.5	2.5	60.8	3.4	83.8	2.9	71.2	3.6	90.7	1.9	79.5	2.6
	Some areas	22.0	3.5	43.2	4.2	14.4	2.5	36.5	3.4	14.0	2.8	25.6	3.5	7.6	1.7	17.9	2.5
	All areas	2.4	1.3	2.0	1.2	0.7	0.6	1.7	0.9	1.7	1.0	2.6	1.3	1.7	0.8	2.2	1.0
	Don't know	0.6	0.6	1.2	0.9	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.4
65+	Not at all	84.1	9.8	95.1	7.1	85.1	11.9
	Some areas
	All areas	.	.	—	—	—	—	—	—	.	.
	Don't know	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Table 2 (Continued)

Age	In the Work- place, Smoking is allowed	1992/93						1995/96										
		Male			Female			Male			Female							
		Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI					
Asian/Pacific Islander																		
18-24	Not at all	82.6	7.8	.	.	89.1	6.2	69.6	9.2	.	.	79.5	7.8	91.0	4.8	80.7	6.6	
	Some areas
	All areas
	Don't know	—	—	—	—	—	—	.	.	—	—	—	—	—
25-44	Not at all	82.8	3.0	60.7	3.9	89.3	2.6	69.7	3.8	88.5	2.4	79.2	3.1	90.1	2.4	80.6	3.2	
	Some areas	15.3	2.9	34.7	3.8	9.4	2.4	27.4	3.7	.	.	17.8	2.9	7.1	2.1	16.4	3.0	
	All areas	1.5	1.0	3.7	1.5	0.4	0.5	2.4	1.3	1.9	1.0	2.6	1.2	2.4	1.2	2.7	1.3	
	Don't know	0.4	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.6	—	—	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.4	
45-64	Not at all	86.0	4.5	64.2	6.3	91.6	3.7	67.9	6.3	89.4	3.8	82.2	4.7	90.7	3.5	81.7	4.7	
	Some areas	13.0	4.4	32.4	6.1	7.7	3.6	28.5	6.1	7.9	3.3	14.3	4.3	7.7	3.2	15.9	4.4	
	All areas	.	.	3.1	2.3	0.1	0.3	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4	
	Don't know	.	.	0.3	0.7	0.6	1.1	0.6	1.1	
65+	Not at all
	Some areas
	All areas	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	
	Don't know	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	

Table 2 (Continued)

Age	In the Work- place, Smoking is allowed	1992/93						1995/96							
		Male			Female			Male			Female				
		Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI	Work Areas % CI	Public Areas % CI				
Native American															
18-24	Not at all	95.4	8.6	.	.	85.8	13.6	88.7	11.2	.	.
	Some areas
	All areas	—	—	.	.	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Don't know	—	—	—	—	.	.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
25-44	Not at all	72.9	10.5	.	.	76.8	8.0	62.2	9.2	86.3	7.3	75.6	9.1	86.8	5.9
	Some areas	33.4	8.9
	All areas	—	—	0.0	0.4	.	.
	Don't know	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
45-64	Not at all	85.6	9.2	67.3	12.2	86.8	9.0
	Some areas
	All areas	—	—
	Don't know	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
65+	Not at all
	Some areas	—	—
	All areas	—	—	.	.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
	Don't know	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval; "." = insufficient data; "—" = no data.

Source: 1992/93 and 1995/96 Current Population Surveys.

*Universe: Individuals included in this table are self-responder adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must respond that an official workplace smoking policy exists.

TABLE 3 Strength of Workplace Smoking Policies by Smoking Status and Demographic Characteristics for the Nation

This table classifies workplaces by the strength of the reported smoking restrictions. The national prevalence of working in workplaces with each level of restriction is reported by smoking status and demographic subgroup.

Overall—The fraction of workers working in 100 percent smoke-free workplaces (no smoking indoors at all) increased dramatically from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS. Only 47 percent of indoor workers reported a smoke-free workplace in the 1992/93 CPS, while nearly 64 percent report a smoke-free workplace in the 1995/96 CPS, an increase of 37 percent. The increase of 100 percent smoke-free workplaces is similar for each smoking status, gender, age, education, and income. Racial/ethnic groups also show comparable increases.

Smoking Status—More than 50 percent of current smokers report working in smoke-free workplaces in the 1995/96 CPS, a lower percent than for former and never-smokers.

Race and Ethnicity—Asian/Pacific Islanders report the highest rates of working in smoke-free workplaces, and Native Americans report the lowest rates.

Table 3
Strength of Workplace Smoking Policies by Smoking Status and Demographic Characteristics for the Nation*—1992/93 and 1995/96

Nation	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																				
	1992/93				1995/96				1995/96												
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI						
Overall	46.5	0.4	19.1	0.3	13.8	0.3	1.6	0.1	19.1	0.3	63.7	0.4	11.1	0.2	9.1	0.2	1.2	0.1	14.8	0.3	
Smoking Status																					
Never	49.9	0.5	19.1	0.4	12.2	0.3	1.2	0.1	17.6	0.4	67.2	0.5	10.5	0.3	7.8	0.3	1.0	0.1	13.6	0.4	
Current	36.9	0.7	20.2	0.6	17.2	0.6	2.2	0.2	23.5	0.6	53.7	0.8	13.2	0.5	12.2	0.5	1.8	0.2	19.2	0.6	
Former	49.2	0.8	17.5	0.6	14.0	0.6	1.7	0.2	17.6	0.6	66.0	0.8	10.4	0.5	9.1	0.5	1.3	0.2	13.1	0.6	
Gender																					
Male	40.6	0.5	19.2	0.4	16.5	0.4	2.1	0.2	21.6	0.5	58.2	0.6	11.9	0.4	11.3	0.4	1.8	0.1	16.8	0.4	
Female	51.8	0.5	18.9	0.4	11.4	0.3	1.1	0.1	16.8	0.4	68.7	0.5	10.4	0.3	7.1	0.3	0.8	0.1	13.0	0.4	
Age (Years)																					
18-24	39.3	0.9	20.9	0.8	14.0	0.7	1.4	0.2	24.4	0.8	55.5	1.0	13.1	0.7	9.6	0.6	1.0	0.2	20.7	0.8	
25-44	47.4	0.5	18.7	0.4	13.9	0.4	1.6	0.1	18.3	0.4	64.1	0.5	11.3	0.3	9.3	0.3	1.3	0.1	14.0	0.4	
45-64	48.9	0.7	18.9	0.6	13.7	0.5	1.6	0.2	17.0	0.6	67.2	0.7	10.0	0.4	8.6	0.4	1.2	0.2	13.0	0.5	
65+	46.3	2.7	15.4	2.0	12.1	1.8	1.0	0.6	25.5	2.4	63.5	2.6	8.3	1.5	6.8	1.3	1.1	0.5	20.4	2.1	
Race/Ethnicity																					
White	46.8	0.4	18.5	0.3	13.9	0.3	1.7	0.1	19.0	0.3	64.0	0.4	11.0	0.3	9.1	0.3	1.3	0.1	14.7	0.3	
Hispanic	45.3	1.9	18.0	1.4	12.7	1.2	1.1	0.4	23.0	1.6	60.4	1.8	10.7	1.1	9.4	1.0	1.2	0.4	18.3	1.4	
African-																					
American	43.5	1.2	23.5	1.0	14.3	0.8	1.4	0.3	17.4	0.9	64.1	1.1	12.9	0.8	9.4	0.7	1.2	0.3	12.4	0.8	
Asian/Pacific																					
Islander	52.9	2.1	19.3	1.7	11.4	1.4	0.9	0.4	15.4	1.5	67.0	1.9	8.6	1.1	7.5	1.1	1.1	0.4	15.7	1.5	
Native																					
American	42.1	5.0	19.2	4.0	15.9	3.7	1.8	1.3	21.0	4.1	57.2	4.6	10.2	2.8	10.6	2.9	1.5	1.1	20.5	3.8	
Other†	50.9	10.0	14.5	7.0	14.0	6.9	1.1	2.1	19.5	7.9											

Table 3 (Continued)

Nation	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																			
	1992/93				1995/96				1995/96											
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI					
Education (Years)																				
<12	30.5	1.2	22.3	1.1	15.5	1.0	1.9	0.4	29.9	1.2	45.9	1.4	15.3	1.0	12.1	0.9	1.6	0.3	25.1	1.2
12	38.3	0.6	21.4	0.5	14.9	0.5	2.0	0.2	23.4	0.6	55.4	0.7	13.1	0.5	11.1	0.4	1.7	0.2	18.8	0.5
13-15	48.1	0.7	18.3	0.5	13.9	0.5	1.6	0.2	18.2	0.5	65.3	0.7	10.8	0.4	8.9	0.4	1.2	0.2	13.8	0.5
16+	59.5	0.7	16.1	0.5	11.9	0.5	1.0	0.1	11.6	0.5	76.1	0.6	8.2	0.4	6.2	0.3	0.7	0.1	8.8	0.4
Household Income																				
Unknown	45.7	1.9	18.1	1.5	13.1	1.3	1.3	0.4	21.9	1.6	62.8	1.5	10.2	1.0	8.7	0.9	1.0	0.3	17.3	1.2
<\$10,000	35.2	1.4	21.0	1.2	14.9	1.1	1.3	0.3	27.6	1.4	51.5	1.6	13.1	1.1	10.8	1.0	1.3	0.4	23.3	1.4
\$10,000-																				
\$19,999	38.8	1.0	21.2	0.8	13.7	0.7	1.7	0.3	24.6	0.9	54.4	1.1	13.6	0.8	10.4	0.7	1.4	0.3	20.2	0.9
\$20,000-																				
\$29,999	43.4	0.9	19.7	0.8	13.5	0.6	1.6	0.2	21.8	0.8	59.1	1.0	12.3	0.7	9.4	0.6	1.6	0.2	17.6	0.8
\$30,000-																				
\$49,999	46.8	0.7	19.3	0.6	14.3	0.5	1.8	0.2	17.8	0.5	63.3	0.7	11.7	0.5	9.5	0.4	1.3	0.2	14.1	0.5
\$50,000-																				
\$74,999	52.0	0.9	18.0	0.7	13.5	0.6	1.6	0.2	14.9	0.6	68.8	0.8	10.0	0.5	8.6	0.5	1.1	0.2	11.5	0.6
\$75,000 +	57.8	1.1	15.7	0.8	13.2	0.8	0.9	0.2	12.4	0.8	74.6	0.9	8.1	0.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	0.2	9.3	0.6

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval.

Source: 1992/93 and 1995/96 Current Population Surveys.

*Universe: Individuals included in this table are self-respondent adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must know if an official workplace smoking policy exists or does not exist, and define that policy for both work and public areas (i.e., smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all).

†No data for 1995/96; all racial/ethnic groups were classified for this survey series.

TABLE 4 Strength of Workplace Smoking Policies by Smoking Status for Each State

This table classifies workplaces by the strength of their smoking restrictions and presents the data by state and by smoking status for each state.

Overall—The fraction of workers with a 100 percent smoke-free workplace varies across the states, but all states had increases in the fraction of workplaces reported to be smoke-free between the 1992/93 and 1995/96 CPS. North Carolina, which had the largest change, increased 76 percent, from 31 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 55 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. All but three states report at least 50 percent of workplaces to be smoke-free in the 1995/96 CPS. No state reported a rate of smoke-free workplaces of 70 percent or more in the 1992/93 CPS, but 13 states reached that level in the 1995/96 CPS. The percentage of protected workers ranges from 29 percent (Kentucky) to 68 percent (Washington) in the 1992/93 CPS. For the 1995/96 CPS, the percentage of workers protected by a 100 percent smoke-free workplace ranges from 41 percent (Nevada) to 84 percent (Utah). The maps in Figures 1 and 2 show the fraction of indoor workers who reported a smoke-free workplace for each survey year for each state. The map in Figure 3 shows the absolute change in the fraction of workers who reported smoke-free workplaces from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS.

Table 4
Strength of Workplace Smoking Policies by Smoking Status for Each State*—1992/93 and 1995/96

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions														
	1992/93				1995/96										
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI
Alabama															
Overall	39.0	24.0	12.8	2.1	22.1	55.4	14.3	12.8	1.7	22.1	55.4	14.3	12.8	1.7	22.1
Never	43.9	24.4	11.1	1.6	18.9	59.2	14.2	11.6	1.3	18.9	59.2	14.2	11.6	1.3	18.9
Current	24.4	28.0	17.2	2.3	28.1	45.4	16.3	14.9	2.5	28.1	45.4	16.3	14.9	2.5	28.1
Former	43.6	16.9	12.0	3.4	24.1	55.6	12.0	14.1	1.8	24.1	55.6	12.0	14.1	1.8	24.1
Alaska															
Overall	58.7	12.4	14.4	0.7	13.8	69.9	7.8	8.9	1.0	13.8	69.9	7.8	8.9	1.0	13.8
Never	64.4	12.1	12.8	0.3	10.3	74.5	7.5	5.8	1.4	10.3	74.5	7.5	5.8	1.4	10.3
Current	53.1	10.5	16.1	2.0	18.3	56.5	11.5	13.6	1.2	18.3	56.5	11.5	13.6	1.2	18.3
Former	54.3	14.6	15.6	0.2	15.4	73.9	4.6	10.7	.	15.4	73.9	4.6	10.7	.	15.4
Arizona															
Overall	56.8	17.6	10.3	1.1	14.2	65.1	8.6	8.9	0.8	14.2	65.1	8.6	8.9	0.8	14.2
Never	57.2	20.1	8.1	0.8	13.7	68.4	7.5	7.7	1.1	13.7	68.4	7.5	7.7	1.1	13.7
Current	52.8	12.5	15.8	2.4	16.6	59.4	11.0	10.9	0.3	16.6	59.4	11.0	10.9	0.3	16.6
Former	61.7	16.6	9.7	.	12.1	62.7	8.5	9.7	0.8	12.1	62.7	8.5	9.7	0.8	12.1
Arkansas															
Overall	32.5	26.0	14.3	2.2	24.9	48.0	17.9	12.2	2.6	24.9	48.0	17.9	12.2	2.6	24.9
Never	34.1	28.1	12.5	2.2	23.1	51.8	18.5	10.2	1.6	23.1	51.8	18.5	10.2	1.6	23.1
Current	26.6	24.4	17.7	1.9	29.3	36.4	18.4	17.5	3.7	29.3	36.4	18.4	17.5	3.7	29.3
Former	37.4	22.1	14.5	2.6	23.5	55.2	14.8	9.8	4.1	23.5	55.2	14.8	9.8	4.1	23.5

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions														
	1992/93				1995/96										
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI
California															
Overall	58.4	14.4	10.4	0.9	15.8	76.1	6.8	4.9	0.6	0.7	0.2	11.6	0.8	0.7	0.2
Never	59.4	14.3	9.8	0.8	15.7	76.9	6.5	4.4	0.7	0.5	0.2	11.6	1.1	0.5	0.2
Current	51.5	15.7	13.4	2.0	18.0	70.2	7.5	7.2	1.6	1.3	0.7	13.7	2.2	1.3	0.7
Former	62.0	13.5	9.5	1.7	14.3	78.7	6.8	4.5	1.2	0.7	0.5	9.3	1.7	0.7	0.5
Colorado															
Overall	53.5	19.1	11.7	2.2	15.0	71.5	9.5	6.3	1.5	0.4	0.4	12.3	2.0	0.4	0.4
Never	56.9	18.8	10.8	2.9	12.9	77.3	9.7	2.7	1.4	0.6	0.6	9.6	2.5	0.6	0.6
Current	38.1	22.4	16.3	5.2	22.6	59.3	8.8	12.5	4.1	.	.	19.4	4.9	.	.
Former	60.7	16.7	9.1	4.0	12.4	71.0	9.8	7.9	3.5	0.6	1.0	10.7	4.1	0.6	1.0
Connecticut															
Overall	48.3	18.9	15.4	2.5	15.9	67.3	10.7	8.5	1.9	0.7	0.6	12.8	2.3	0.7	0.6
Never	50.3	21.2	13.1	3.2	14.0	71.5	9.9	8.2	2.5	0.9	0.8	9.6	2.7	0.9	0.8
Current	38.7	15.7	23.5	5.9	19.1	56.1	13.7	10.5	4.6	.	.	19.7	5.9	.	.
Former	53.4	17.0	12.5	4.6	16.9	67.2	9.8	7.5	3.7	0.8	1.2	14.7	5.0	0.8	1.2
Delaware															
Overall	50.3	17.3	14.5	2.3	17.1	66.0	8.5	8.3	1.9	0.9	0.6	16.3	2.5	0.9	0.6
Never	50.7	18.8	13.7	3.1	16.6	72.0	7.7	5.1	2.1	1.0	0.9	14.1	3.3	1.0	0.9
Current	41.0	16.8	20.8	5.6	18.9	55.9	10.5	11.3	4.0	0.9	1.2	21.4	5.2	0.9	1.2
Former	58.5	14.6	10.2	4.1	16.4	64.7	7.7	12.2	4.9	0.5	1.0	14.9	5.3	0.5	1.0
District of Columbia															
Overall	51.9	20.4	14.8	2.5	11.5	74.7	8.6	7.2	1.8	0.8	0.6	8.7	2.0	0.8	0.6
Never	52.1	22.2	14.4	3.2	10.3	76.5	8.6	5.9	2.1	0.8	0.8	8.2	2.4	0.8	0.8
Current	53.9	16.0	13.9	5.5	14.9	66.7	9.5	11.6	5.1	0.5	1.1	11.7	5.1	0.5	1.1
Former	49.1	19.5	17.3	6.1	11.5	77.3	7.5	7.0	4.3	1.0	1.7	7.1	4.4	1.0	1.7

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions														
	1992/93				1995/96										
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI
Florida															
Overall	53.6	14.4	11.0	1.1	19.9	66.5	9.1	8.0	0.9	19.9	66.5	9.1	8.0	0.9	19.9
Never	55.8	14.8	10.0	1.2	18.2	68.9	8.9	7.0	1.1	18.2	68.9	8.9	7.0	1.1	18.2
Current	45.9	14.6	13.0	0.9	25.5	58.4	11.0	10.7	2.1	25.5	58.4	11.0	10.7	2.1	25.5
Former	58.5	12.9	10.6	1.2	16.7	69.2	7.4	7.7	2.0	16.7	69.2	7.4	7.7	2.0	16.7
Georgia															
Overall	47.4	19.3	10.9	1.7	20.7	56.7	15.1	10.3	1.7	20.7	56.7	15.1	10.3	1.7	20.7
Never	47.9	20.4	9.5	1.3	20.9	58.9	15.7	9.4	2.1	20.9	58.9	15.7	9.4	2.1	20.9
Current	39.8	18.1	13.4	2.7	26.0	43.8	18.0	15.2	4.4	26.0	43.8	18.0	15.2	4.4	26.0
Former	55.5	17.5	12.3	1.4	13.3	65.2	9.5	7.5	3.6	13.3	65.2	9.5	7.5	3.6	13.3
Hawaii															
Overall	47.1	21.4	15.6	1.0	14.8	61.3	15.2	12.2	2.3	14.8	61.3	15.2	12.2	2.3	14.8
Never	50.3	21.1	14.5	0.8	13.4	59.8	17.0	11.7	3.0	13.4	59.8	17.0	11.7	3.0	13.4
Current	38.1	20.3	18.3	1.9	21.4	67.1	9.4	14.4	5.7	21.4	67.1	9.4	14.4	5.7	21.4
Former	46.4	23.6	16.7	1.0	12.3	60.1	15.2	11.6	5.0	12.3	60.1	15.2	11.6	5.0	12.3
Idaho															
Overall	59.5	12.3	9.9	0.9	17.4	70.9	5.9	8.9	1.8	17.4	70.9	5.9	8.9	1.8	17.4
Never	63.2	11.6	7.5	1.0	16.8	75.2	4.9	7.3	2.1	16.8	75.2	4.9	7.3	2.1	16.8
Current	47.6	15.5	15.9	0.8	20.2	57.5	9.6	13.5	4.8	20.2	57.5	9.6	13.5	4.8	20.2
Former	63.4	10.5	9.4	0.9	15.8	71.8	5.2	8.8	4.3	15.8	71.8	5.2	8.8	4.3	15.8
Illinois															
Overall	40.0	22.8	16.1	1.5	19.6	60.8	13.5	10.5	1.1	19.6	60.8	13.5	10.5	1.1	19.6
Never	42.8	23.9	13.4	1.3	18.6	65.2	13.8	7.5	1.2	18.6	65.2	13.8	7.5	1.2	18.6
Current	31.0	23.5	20.2	2.1	23.3	49.1	13.6	15.7	2.6	23.3	49.1	13.6	15.7	2.6	23.3
Former	44.9	19.3	17.3	1.0	17.5	63.0	12.5	12.6	2.7	17.5	63.0	12.5	12.6	2.7	17.5

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																			
	1992/93						1995/96													
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI										
Indiana																				
Overall	35.1	3.1	22.8	2.7	16.0	2.4	3.1	1.1	22.9	2.7	51.3	3.0	15.9	2.2	11.4	1.9	2.9	1.0	18.6	2.4
Never	38.4	4.4	24.7	3.9	15.3	3.3	2.3	1.4	19.3	3.6	58.3	4.1	12.7	2.8	10.1	2.5	2.6	1.3	16.3	3.1
Current	29.1	5.5	20.3	4.8	20.2	4.8	4.0	2.4	26.3	5.3	39.6	5.5	22.0	4.7	12.2	3.7	2.8	1.9	23.4	4.8
Former	35.5	7.1	21.8	6.0	11.7	4.7	3.7	2.8	27.3	6.5	49.3	7.5	15.3	5.4	14.5	5.3	3.7	2.8	17.3	5.6
Iowa																				
Overall	45.1	3.1	19.4	2.5	14.6	2.2	1.8	0.8	19.2	2.5	62.2	3.1	12.2	2.1	8.8	1.8	1.2	0.7	15.6	2.3
Never	50.8	4.2	18.0	3.3	12.5	2.8	1.6	1.1	17.1	3.2	66.8	4.0	12.0	2.8	7.2	2.2	0.8	0.8	13.1	2.9
Current	32.6	5.9	23.5	5.3	18.9	4.9	2.1	1.8	22.9	5.3	47.3	6.3	14.7	4.4	13.7	4.3	2.1	1.8	22.3	5.2
Former	44.8	7.1	17.9	5.4	14.9	5.1	1.7	1.9	20.7	5.8	68.5	6.7	9.4	4.2	6.9	3.7	1.1	1.5	14.1	5.0
Kansas																				
Overall	49.4	3.1	19.4	2.4	13.4	2.1	1.0	0.6	16.8	2.3	63.2	3.1	9.7	1.9	10.9	2.0	1.5	0.8	14.6	2.2
Never	55.1	4.2	17.2	3.2	12.1	2.7	0.6	0.6	15.1	3.0	65.1	4.1	9.6	2.5	9.2	2.5	1.8	1.1	14.3	3.0
Current	36.2	5.8	21.8	5.0	18.3	4.7	1.8	1.6	21.8	5.0	55.4	6.2	11.5	3.9	13.3	4.2	1.1	1.3	18.7	4.8
Former	51.3	6.9	22.0	5.8	10.5	4.3	1.3	1.6	14.9	4.9	68.9	7.2	7.4	4.0	13.0	5.2	1.4	1.8	9.3	4.5
Kentucky																				
Overall	28.6	3.2	22.3	3.0	18.9	2.8	2.1	1.0	28.1	3.2	49.3	3.3	16.4	2.5	10.5	2.0	2.0	0.9	21.8	2.7
Never	33.1	4.8	24.4	4.4	16.0	3.8	1.7	1.3	24.8	4.4	51.9	4.6	16.9	3.5	9.7	2.7	1.7	1.2	19.8	3.7
Current	19.2	5.1	22.6	5.4	24.0	5.5	2.1	1.8	32.1	6.0	43.1	6.1	17.1	4.7	11.0	3.9	2.3	1.9	26.4	5.4
Former	32.3	7.4	17..	6.0	18.0	6.1	2.8	2.6	29.8	7.3	51.3	7.4	14.2	5.2	11.7	4.8	2.4	2.3	20.5	6.0
Louisiana																				
Overall	39.3	3.8	15.9	2.9	13.0	2.6	2.0	1.1	29.7	3.6	56.6	3.3	10.7	2.1	10.5	2.1	1.6	0.8	20.7	2.7
Never	43.1	5.2	16.5	3.9	11.3	3.3	1.9	1.4	27.1	4.6	60.1	4.4	10.3	2.7	8.7	2.5	0.6	0.7	20.2	3.6
Current	31.6	7.1	16.4	5.6	16.2	5.6	2.4	2.3	33.5	7.2	45.2	6.5	13.1	4.4	12.8	4.4	3.3	2.3	25.6	5.7
Former	39.0	9.0	13.3	6.3	13.6	6.3	1.6	2.3	32.5	8.7	62.4	8.1	8.4	4.7	13.1	5.6	2.0	2.3	14.1	5.8

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																			
	1992/93				1995/96															
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI					
Maine																				
Overall	55.7	3.3	17.3	2.5	12.1	2.2	0.5	0.5	14.4	2.3	73.4	3.1	7.9	1.9	10.0	2.1	0.8	0.6	7.8	1.8
Never	63.5	4.7	14.0	3.4	9.3	2.8	.	.	13.2	3.3	78.5	4.0	5.2	2.2	9.7	2.9	0.7	0.8	5.9	2.3
Current	41.7	6.0	24.2	5.2	14.9	4.4	1.3	1.4	17.9	4.7	60.8	6.7	14.0	4.8	13.5	4.7	.	.	11.8	4.4
Former	58.2	6.9	14.9	5.0	14.1	4.9	0.5	1.0	12.4	4.6	76.3	6.0	7.1	3.6	7.2	3.6	2.1	2.0	7.4	3.6
Maryland																				
Overall	52.9	3.2	19.4	2.5	11.6	2.1	0.9	0.6	15.2	2.3	83.2	2.3	5.7	1.4	5.0	1.3	0.4	0.4	5.7	1.4
Never	56.5	4.3	21.3	3.5	8.5	2.4	1.2	0.9	12.5	2.9	83.5	3.0	6.5	2.0	4.5	1.7	0.6	0.6	4.9	1.7
Current	44.1	6.5	19.5	5.2	14.9	4.6	0.9	1.2	20.6	5.3	79.2	5.6	4.2	2.8	7.8	3.7	.	.	8.8	3.9
Former	53.8	7.1	14.2	5.0	16.1	5.2	.	.	15.9	5.2	86.2	4.5	4.6	2.8	3.8	2.5	.	.	5.1	2.9
Massachusetts																				
Overall	48.7	1.6	19.8	1.3	14.2	1.1	1.4	0.4	15.9	1.2	71.1	1.8	8.3	1.1	7.6	1.1	0.6	0.3	12.4	1.3
Never	52.4	2.3	19.3	1.8	13.3	1.6	0.9	0.4	14.1	1.6	73.8	2.4	6.6	1.4	7.1	1.4	0.8	0.5	11.7	1.8
Current	40.0	3.4	21.7	2.8	15.8	2.5	2.3	1.0	20.2	2.8	63.3	4.3	10.3	2.7	10.5	2.7	0.3	0.5	15.5	3.2
Former	49.2	3.2	18.9	2.5	14.6	2.2	1.6	0.8	15.7	2.3	71.5	3.6	10.3	2.4	6.4	1.9	0.4	0.5	11.4	2.5
Michigan																				
Overall	39.6	1.6	21.8	1.4	17.0	1.3	2.7	0.5	18.9	1.3	53.1	1.8	14.0	1.3	12.4	1.2	2.3	0.5	18.0	1.4
Never	44.8	2.4	22.4	2.0	15.7	1.7	1.6	0.6	15.5	1.7	58.4	2.5	13.1	1.7	11.3	1.6	1.6	0.6	15.7	1.8
Current	29.4	2.9	22.2	2.6	19.9	2.5	4.1	1.2	24.5	2.7	43.6	3.4	15.8	2.5	14.2	2.4	3.4	1.2	23.1	3.2
Former	41.0	3.5	19.9	2.8	16.3	2.6	3.3	1.3	19.5	2.8	52.9	3.9	14.0	2.7	12.8	2.6	2.9	1.3	17.3	3.0
Minnesota																				
Overall	54.5	3.1	18.1	2.4	11.5	2.0	1.5	0.8	14.4	2.2	67.9	2.8	11.0	1.9	8.6	1.7	0.6	0.5	12.0	2.0
Never	60.1	4.2	15.4	3.1	10.8	2.6	1.3	1.0	12.4	2.8	72.6	3.7	10.5	2.5	5.9	1.9	0.4	0.5	10.7	2.6
Current	40.0	5.9	25.0	5.2	14.5	4.2	1.5	1.5	19.0	4.7	55.7	6.1	12.2	4.0	13.1	4.2	1.2	1.4	17.7	4.7
Former	59.0	6.6	16.0	4.9	9.5	4.0	2.0	1.9	13.5	4.6	69.6	5.8	10.8	3.9	10.1	3.8	0.6	1.0	9.0	3.6

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																			
	1992/93				1995/96															
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI					
Mississippi																				
Overall	40.3	3.6	21.0	3.0	10.8	2.3	1.8	1.0	26.2	3.2	54.2	3.3	11.1	2.1	7.8	1.8	1.4	0.8	25.6	2.9
Never	44.0	4.6	20.1	3.7	9.9	2.8	1.5	1.1	24.5	4.0	58.2	4.2	10.7	2.6	6.2	2.0	0.8	0.8	24.1	3.6
Current	28.3	6.5	25.7	6.3	12.8	4.8	2.6	2.3	30.6	6.7	43.6	6.9	11.3	4.4	10.0	4.2	3.5	2.6	31.7	6.5
Former	45.6	9.8	16.0	7.2	10.7	6.1	1.5	2.4	26.2	8.7	53.3	8.3	12.5	5.5	10.9	5.2	0.7	1.4	22.6	7.0
Missouri																				
Overall	39.1	3.4	22.4	2.9	16.9	2.6	3.3	1.2	18.3	2.7	58.5	3.0	15.1	2.2	10.8	1.9	1.2	0.7	14.4	2.2
Never	45.4	4.7	24.5	4.1	11.7	3.0	3.0	1.6	15.3	3.4	65.5	4.0	12.9	2.8	8.9	2.4	0.6	0.7	12.1	2.8
Current	27.5	5.9	20.2	5.3	23.8	5.6	5.0	2.9	23.4	5.6	45.5	5.9	19.3	4.7	13.2	4.0	3.1	2.1	18.9	4.6
Former	38.0	7.4	20.0	6.1	21.1	6.3	2.0	2.1	19.0	6.0	57.6	6.8	14.9	4.9	12.5	4.6	0.4	0.8	14.6	4.9
Montana																				
Overall	43.7	3.6	17.3	2.7	11.6	2.3	1.5	0.9	26.0	3.2	58.8	3.4	9.5	2.1	8.6	2.0	1.6	0.9	21.5	2.9
Never	46.6	4.9	18.5	3.8	9.7	2.9	1.4	1.2	23.8	4.2	63.0	4.7	9.8	2.9	6.5	2.4	1.5	1.2	19.2	3.8
Current	36.2	6.9	14.0	5.0	17.7	5.5	1.0	1.5	31.0	6.7	48.8	6.9	10.1	4.2	10.0	4.1	2.5	2.1	28.5	6.2
Former	45.1	7.8	18.1	6.1	8.9	4.5	2.2	2.3	25.7	6.9	60.5	7.3	8.2	4.1	11.7	4.8	1.0	1.5	18.7	5.9
Nebraska																				
Overall	44.4	3.0	20.9	2.5	13.2	2.1	1.3	0.7	20.2	2.4	63.6	2.9	9.7	1.8	10.4	1.9	0.8	0.5	15.5	2.2
Never	47.8	4.0	19.6	3.2	12.0	2.6	0.7	0.7	19.9	3.2	66.6	3.7	8.4	2.2	9.3	2.3	0.6	0.6	15.1	2.8
Current	33.6	5.9	25.9	5.4	17.9	4.8	2.6	2.0	20.1	5.0	55.4	6.2	10.1	3.8	14.0	4.3	0.6	0.9	20.0	5.0
Former	47.6	7.0	18.7	5.4	11.2	4.4	1.6	1.7	21.0	5.7	64.3	6.9	13.3	4.9	9.6	4.3	1.8	1.9	11.1	4.5
Nevada																				
Overall	33.8	3.0	18.6	2.5	20.7	2.6	4.4	1.3	22.5	2.7	40.5	3.1	20.8	2.6	17.5	2.4	4.1	1.2	17.1	2.4
Never	35.8	4.3	19.8	3.6	19.3	3.6	4.4	1.8	20.7	3.6	41.1	4.2	21.7	3.5	17.2	3.2	3.9	1.7	16.0	3.1
Current	23.6	4.9	18.2	4.5	25.9	5.1	5.5	2.7	26.8	5.1	33.3	5.7	23.3	5.1	17.4	4.6	5.2	2.7	20.9	4.9
Former	44.7	7.2	15.8	5.3	16.2	5.4	2.9	2.4	20.3	5.8	49.7	7.5	14.4	5.3	18.5	5.9	2.8	2.5	14.5	5.3

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																			
	1992/93				1995/96															
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI					
New Hampshire																				
Overall	53.3	3.5	18.3	2.7	10.7	2.1	1.0	0.7	16.7	2.6	72.9	3.1	9.6	2.0	5.3	1.6	1.4	0.8	10.8	2.2
Never	52.7	5.0	18.9	3.9	10.7	3.1	0.7	0.9	16.9	3.8	75.8	4.3	8.9	2.8	3.3	1.8	1.0	1.0	11.0	3.1
Current	49.4	7.0	22.1	5.8	10.4	4.3	0.5	1.0	17.6	5.3	64.0	6.3	13.6	4.5	9.7	3.9	1.9	1.8	10.9	4.1
Former	57.9	6.5	13.8	4.6	11.0	4.1	1.8	1.7	15.5	4.8	77.5	6.0	6.5	3.5	4.2	2.9	1.4	1.7	10.4	4.3
New Jersey																				
Overall	46.3	1.6	18.2	1.3	13.0	1.1	1.1	0.3	21.4	1.3	68.0	1.7	8.4	1.0	8.2	1.0	1.0	0.4	14.5	1.3
Never	47.7	2.2	18.5	1.7	12.0	1.4	0.7	0.4	21.3	1.8	68.8	2.2	8.6	1.3	7.6	1.3	0.9	0.5	14.2	1.7
Current	39.9	3.4	19.5	2.8	15.1	2.5	1.9	1.0	23.5	3.0	61.2	3.9	9.8	2.4	10.5	2.5	1.0	0.8	17.5	3.0
Former	49.7	3.4	16.3	2.5	13.2	2.3	1.3	0.8	19.6	2.7	72.2	3.5	6.5	1.9	7.5	2.1	1.5	0.9	12.3	2.6
New Mexico																				
Overall	55.3	3.5	13.9	2.5	10.7	2.2	1.2	0.8	19.0	2.8	65.5	3.3	10.2	2.1	9.5	2.1	0.9	0.6	13.9	2.4
Never	59.4	4.7	14.9	3.4	10.1	2.9	0.4	0.6	15.3	3.5	66.7	4.4	11.6	3.0	7.4	2.4	0.8	0.8	13.5	3.2
Current	42.3	7.2	13.3	5.0	12.1	4.8	2.8	2.4	29.5	6.7	58.4	6.8	7.8	3.7	13.4	4.7	1.1	1.4	19.4	5.5
Former	59.1	7.4	12.1	4.9	10.4	4.6	1.5	1.8	16.9	5.6	72.0	7.6	9.5	5.0	11.1	5.3	0.6	1.3	6.7	4.2
New York																				
Overall	42.7	1.3	19.9	1.0	18.4	1.0	0.9	0.2	18.2	1.0	64.6	1.3	9.3	0.8	10.0	0.8	1.0	0.3	15.2	1.0
Never	44.5	1.8	19.6	1.4	16.3	1.3	0.7	0.3	18.8	1.4	66.5	1.7	8.4	1.0	9.3	1.1	0.9	0.4	14.9	1.3
Current	37.7	2.6	20.4	2.2	21.3	2.2	1.1	0.6	19.6	2.1	58.2	2.9	10.8	1.9	11.6	1.9	1.0	0.6	18.3	2.3
Former	43.7	2.7	19.9	2.2	20.1	2.2	1.0	0.5	15.2	2.0	65.9	2.9	10.2	1.8	10.3	1.9	0.9	0.6	12.8	2.0
North Carolina																				
Overall	31.0	1.5	25.7	1.4	15.7	1.2	2.1	0.5	25.5	1.4	54.7	2.1	15.4	1.5	12.1	1.4	1.7	0.5	16.1	1.5
Never	34.8	2.1	26.4	1.9	14.4	1.5	1.4	0.5	23.1	1.9	59.1	2.7	14.0	1.9	11.5	1.8	1.5	0.7	13.9	1.9
Current	22.4	2.5	26.8	2.6	18.3	2.3	3.2	1.0	29.2	2.7	42.3	4.1	18.6	3.2	16.4	3.1	2.6	1.3	20.2	3.3
Former	33.6	3.4	22.3	3.0	15.3	2.6	2.3	1.1	26.5	3.2	58.4	4.9	15.7	3.6	7.7	2.6	1.0	1.0	17.3	3.7

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																			
	1992/93				1995/96															
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI					
North Dakota																				
Overall	47.5	3.4	15.4	2.5	12.1	2.2	2.1	1.0	22.9	2.9	61.0	3.3	7.1	1.7	8.8	1.9	1.4	0.8	21.8	2.8
Never	50.9	4.6	15.0	3.3	11.1	2.9	1.5	1.1	21.6	3.8	64.7	4.4	6.8	2.3	6.3	2.2	0.8	0.8	21.5	3.8
Current	39.6	6.5	16.7	5.0	13.5	4.6	3.7	2.5	26.6	5.9	50.8	6.7	9.5	3.9	13.0	4.5	1.5	1.6	25.2	5.8
Former	48.6	7.6	14.8	5.4	13.3	5.2	1.6	1.9	21.8	6.3	64.0	7.5	4.5	3.2	10.5	4.8	2.8	2.6	18.1	6.0
Ohio																				
Overall	37.9	1.6	21.9	1.3	16.6	1.2	2.4	0.5	21.2	1.3	56.6	1.7	13.7	1.2	10.5	1.1	2.2	0.5	17.0	1.3
Never	42.0	2.2	20.9	1.8	15.7	1.6	2.0	0.6	19.3	1.8	61.9	2.3	11.6	1.5	9.5	1.4	1.8	0.6	15.2	1.7
Current	29.1	2.8	23.9	2.7	18.4	2.4	3.0	1.1	25.5	2.7	46.1	3.4	17.4	2.6	11.8	2.2	2.5	1.1	22.2	2.8
Former	38.8	3.5	21.8	3.0	16.3	2.6	2.9	1.2	20.3	2.9	56.9	4.0	14.3	2.8	11.4	2.5	2.4	1.2	14.9	2.8
Oklahoma																				
Overall	41.5	3.3	16.8	2.5	19.4	2.7	1.6	0.8	20.7	2.7	58.0	3.2	10.8	2.0	12.7	2.2	1.5	0.8	17.0	2.4
Never	47.2	4.5	17.6	3.4	16.1	3.3	1.3	1.0	17.8	3.4	63.5	4.1	8.6	2.4	11.3	2.7	1.1	0.9	15.4	3.1
Current	29.3	6.0	16.8	5.0	23.9	5.7	2.9	2.2	27.2	5.9	48.6	6.3	15.4	4.5	14.9	4.5	2.4	1.9	18.8	4.9
Former	41.4	7.8	14.3	5.6	23.0	6.7	0.7	1.3	20.6	6.4	53.8	8.1	11.0	5.1	13.9	5.6	1.5	2.0	19.7	6.4
Oregon																				
Overall	59.9	3.5	13.0	2.4	10.1	2.1	0.9	0.7	16.2	2.6	66.9	3.2	11.8	2.2	9.1	1.9	0.6	0.5	11.6	2.2
Never	63.4	4.7	13.6	3.3	7.8	2.6	0.3	0.5	14.9	3.5	70.5	4.1	11.5	2.9	6.5	2.2	0.1	0.3	11.2	2.8
Current	51.7	7.3	12.2	4.8	13.2	5.0	1.6	1.9	21.3	6.0	56.9	7.2	11.4	4.6	16.0	5.3	1.5	1.8	14.2	5.1
Former	60.6	7.2	12.3	4.8	12.2	4.8	1.6	1.8	13.9	5.1	67.3	6.6	12.9	4.7	8.7	4.0	0.9	1.3	10.2	4.3
Pennsylvania																				
Overall	42.2	1.6	20.6	1.3	15.0	1.2	1.8	0.4	20.3	1.3	59.9	1.7	12.2	1.1	11.0	1.1	1.3	0.4	15.5	1.3
Never	47.9	2.3	19.0	1.8	13.3	1.5	1.4	0.5	18.4	1.8	63.2	2.4	12.3	1.6	9.1	1.4	1.4	0.6	14.1	1.7
Current	30.6	3.0	24.3	2.8	17.6	2.5	3.0	1.1	24.4	2.8	51.3	3.4	13.6	2.4	14.4	2.4	1.4	0.8	19.2	2.7
Former	41.6	3.5	20.5	2.9	16.2	2.6	1.5	0.9	20.2	2.8	62.4	3.6	10.6	2.3	11.5	2.3	1.1	0.8	14.3	2.6

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																			
	1992/93				1995/96															
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI					
Rhode Island																				
Overall	44.9	3.5	24.6	3.0	11.2	2.2	0.9	0.7	18.5	2.7	69.6	3.1	7.8	1.8	6.3	1.7	1.1	0.7	15.2	2.4
Never	49.2	4.9	23.5	4.2	9.5	2.9	0.4	0.7	17.3	3.7	70.5	4.3	6.6	2.3	4.7	2.0	0.3	0.5	17.9	3.6
Current	34.3	6.8	25.5	6.2	15.4	5.2	1.3	1.6	23.4	6.1	66.8	6.3	11.1	4.2	5.2	3.0	2.1	1.9	14.8	4.7
Former	46.2	6.8	25.6	5.9	10.4	4.1	1.3	1.5	16.5	5.0	70.7	6.7	6.7	3.7	11.8	4.8	1.7	1.9	9.2	4.3
South Carolina																				
Overall	37.7	2.8	23.9	2.5	14.8	2.1	1.6	0.7	22.0	2.4	58.8	3.1	16.0	2.3	9.7	1.8	1.1	0.6	14.5	2.2
Never	40.2	3.9	25.1	3.4	13.0	2.7	1.7	1.0	20.0	3.2	62.7	4.0	16.7	3.1	7.8	2.2	0.2	0.4	12.5	2.7
Current	30.7	5.2	22.5	4.7	18.5	4.4	0.8	1.0	27.5	5.1	49.2	5.9	18.1	4.6	11.4	3.8	2.8	2.0	18.4	4.6
Former	40.5	6.8	22.2	5.7	14.6	4.9	2.3	2.1	20.3	5.5	61.7	7.7	9.4	4.6	13.3	5.4	1.1	1.7	14.5	5.6
South Dakota																				
Overall	43.8	3.2	18.2	2.5	13.2	2.2	1.3	0.7	23.5	2.7	62.3	3.0	10.7	1.9	9.5	1.8	0.8	0.6	16.7	2.3
Never	46.6	4.4	19.1	3.5	13.3	3.0	1.3	1.0	19.7	3.5	68.2	3.9	7.6	2.2	8.8	2.4	0.6	0.6	14.9	3.0
Current	35.4	5.8	18.3	4.7	14.5	4.2	1.8	1.6	30.0	5.5	46.9	6.4	17.5	4.9	12.4	4.2	1.2	1.4	21.9	5.3
Former	48.4	7.5	15.8	5.4	11.0	4.7	0.7	1.2	24.3	6.4	64.0	6.8	11.3	4.5	7.9	3.8	1.1	1.5	15.8	5.2
Tennessee																				
Overall	36.2	3.1	25.9	2.9	12.7	2.2	2.4	1.0	22.8	2.7	53.5	3.1	15.8	2.3	9.4	1.8	2.0	0.9	19.3	2.4
Never	39.3	4.4	25.3	3.9	12.0	2.9	2.8	1.5	20.6	3.6	59.0	4.2	14.7	3.0	9.0	2.4	0.7	0.7	16.6	3.1
Current	31.4	5.6	25.3	5.2	14.5	4.2	0.9	1.1	28.0	5.4	42.2	5.8	17.1	4.4	10.5	3.6	3.7	2.2	26.5	5.2
Former	34.6	7.5	29.1	7.1	11.7	5.1	3.6	2.9	20.9	6.4	54.2	7.1	17.3	5.4	9.0	4.1	3.2	2.5	16.3	5.3
Texas																				
Overall	51.2	1.7	17.4	1.3	12.5	1.1	1.5	0.4	17.4	1.3	64.8	1.6	10.3	1.0	8.2	0.9	1.5	0.4	15.2	1.2
Never	54.8	2.3	17.0	1.7	11.3	1.4	1.1	0.5	15.8	1.7	67.6	2.0	10.4	1.3	6.8	1.1	1.4	0.5	13.8	1.5
Current	41.3	3.5	18.0	2.7	15.7	2.6	2.1	1.0	22.8	3.0	56.4	3.4	10.7	2.1	11.6	2.2	1.9	0.9	19.4	2.7
Former	52.5	4.1	17.7	3.1	12.3	2.7	2.2	1.2	15.2	2.9	67.2	3.9	9.5	2.4	8.0	2.3	1.2	0.9	14.1	2.9

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																			
	1992/93				1995/96															
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI					
Utah																				
Overall	65.4	3.0	15.1	2.2	8.8	1.8	0.5	0.4	10.3	1.9	83.7	2.2	4.3	1.2	3.2	1.1	0.4	0.4	8.4	1.7
Never	68.9	3.5	13.7	2.6	7.0	1.9	0.4	0.5	10.0	2.3	84.7	2.6	3.6	1.3	3.2	1.3	0.5	0.5	8.0	1.9
Current	48.7	7.6	20.4	6.1	14.1	5.3	0.9	1.4	15.9	5.6	78.0	6.3	7.7	4.1	3.0	2.6	.	.	11.3	4.8
Former	68.4	7.4	15.2	5.7	10.8	4.9	0.5	1.1	5.1	3.5	85.3	6.1	3.9	3.4	2.9	2.9	0.7	1.5	7.2	4.5
Vermont																				
Overall	58.7	3.4	14.4	2.4	11.3	2.2	1.2	0.7	14.4	2.4	78.9	2.7	5.6	1.5	6.5	1.6	0.6	0.5	8.4	1.9
Never	62.1	4.9	16.3	3.7	10.2	3.0	0.5	0.7	10.9	3.1	83.6	3.5	4.9	2.1	5.1	2.1	.	.	6.4	2.3
Current	46.3	6.7	15.0	4.8	15.0	4.8	2.3	2.0	21.5	5.5	72.7	6.1	7.7	3.6	7.5	3.6	1.5	1.6	10.6	4.2
Former	64.8	6.3	10.7	4.1	9.6	3.9	1.4	1.6	13.5	4.5	75.8	5.5	5.1	2.8	8.1	3.5	0.9	1.2	10.1	3.9
Virginia																				
Overall	43.8	2.8	18.3	2.2	16.5	2.1	1.8	0.7	19.7	2.2	62.6	2.8	12.6	1.9	9.3	1.7	1.2	0.6	14.2	2.0
Never	45.1	3.8	19.9	3.1	13.8	2.6	1.1	0.8	20.2	3.1	67.4	3.7	12.5	2.6	7.7	2.1	1.5	1.0	10.9	2.4
Current	36.9	5.2	18.5	4.2	19.8	4.3	1.5	1.3	22.3	4.6	52.3	5.9	13.8	4.1	11.6	3.8	0.5	0.8	21.8	4.9
Former	49.3	6.2	13.8	4.2	19.2	4.8	3.9	2.4	13.7	4.2	61.8	6.3	11.7	4.2	10.9	4.0	1.2	1.4	14.4	4.6
Washington																				
Overall	68.3	3.0	10.4	2.0	9.4	1.9	0.4	0.4	11.6	2.1	73.2	3.0	8.0	1.9	6.7	1.7	1.0	0.7	11.1	2.2
Never	73.7	4.0	10.7	2.8	6.2	2.2	0.2	0.4	9.2	2.6	76.2	3.9	6.6	2.3	6.1	2.2	0.8	0.8	10.3	2.8
Current	58.9	6.4	11.3	4.1	12.1	4.3	1.0	1.3	16.7	4.9	63.4	6.8	9.3	4.1	9.9	4.2	1.6	1.7	15.8	5.1
Former	66.6	6.1	8.9	3.7	13.3	4.4	.	.	11.3	4.1	76.2	6.4	10.3	4.6	4.7	3.2	1.0	1.5	7.7	4.0
West Virginia																				
Overall	38.6	3.9	18.8	3.1	14.1	2.8	1.7	1.1	26.8	3.6	58.9	3.4	12.7	2.3	11.2	2.2	1.3	0.8	15.9	2.6
Never	43.0	5.5	20.4	4.5	13.3	3.8	0.8	1.0	22.5	4.6	63.9	4.5	12.8	3.1	8.4	2.6	1.0	0.9	13.9	3.3
Current	28.3	6.4	17.2	5.4	13.2	4.8	2.8	2.3	38.6	6.9	48.7	6.9	13.0	4.6	15.8	5.0	2.1	2.0	20.3	5.5
Former	44.9	10.1	16.5	7.5	18.3	7.8	2.8	3.3	17.6	7.7	58.1	7.8	12.4	5.2	12.8	5.3	1.0	1.6	15.7	5.8

Table 4 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions																			
	1992/93				1995/96				1995/96											
	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI	Smoke-free % CI	Strong % CI	Moderate % CI	Weak % CI	None % CI					
Wisconsin																				
Overall	43.8	2.9	19.7	2.3	12.9	2.0	2.2	0.9	21.4	2.4	62.0	2.9	12.3	1.9	9.5	1.7	0.9	0.6	15.3	2.1
Never	49.3	4.2	18.0	3.2	11.3	2.7	1.7	1.1	19.7	3.3	63.7	3.9	11.6	2.6	8.2	2.2	0.5	0.6	16.0	3.0
Current	33.0	5.3	22.2	4.6	16.5	4.1	2.3	1.7	26.0	4.9	54.2	5.5	13.3	3.8	13.9	3.8	1.2	1.2	17.4	4.2
Former	45.1	6.1	20.1	4.9	12.0	4.0	3.1	2.1	19.7	4.8	68.7	6.1	12.8	4.4	6.5	3.3	1.4	1.5	10.6	4.1
Wyoming																				
Overall	48.4	4.0	12.7	2.7	15.1	2.9	1.1	0.8	22.7	3.4	61.2	3.6	7.9	2.0	10.9	2.3	1.0	0.7	18.9	2.9
Never	50.7	5.6	13.8	3.8	13.6	3.8	1.0	1.1	20.9	4.5	67.8	4.6	5.6	2.3	7.6	2.6	0.3	0.5	18.7	3.8
Current	43.1	8.0	10.5	4.9	18.0	6.2	1.6	2.0	26.8	7.1	52.3	6.9	11.0	4.3	15.8	5.0	1.2	1.5	19.8	5.5
Former	48.8	8.5	12.7	5.6	15.2	6.1	0.8	1.6	22.5	7.1	54.9	8.7	10.4	5.4	13.5	6.0	3.0	3.0	18.2	6.8

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval; " " = insufficient data.

Source: 1992/93 and 1995/96 Current Population Surveys.

*Universe: Individuals included in this table are self-respondent adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must know if an official workplace smoking policy exists or does not exist, and define that policy for both work and public areas (i.e., smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all).

TABLE 5 National Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Home as Reported by Individuals with Different Smoking Status, with Children under Age 13 in the Home, and with Different Demographic Characteristics

This table presents national percentages of individuals reporting smoking restrictions in the home nationally and by demographic subgroups.

Overall—The fraction of homes reported to be smoke-free increased substantially between the two surveys. The percentage of smoke-free homes rose from 43 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 53 percent in the 1995/96 CPS, an increase of nearly 25 percent. Similar increases were seen for all demographic subgroups. Seventeen percent of current smokers report smoke-free homes in the 1995/96 CPS, an increase from 11 percent in the 1992/93 CPS. Individuals with at least one child under the age of 13 living in the home report smoke-free homes at slightly higher rates than do those without. This difference related to a child under 13 years of age in the home is present for current smokers, former smokers, and never-smokers.

Smoking Status—Nationally, never-smokers report a higher prevalence of smoke-free homes than do former smokers. Current smokers report smoke-free homes at about 20 to 25 percent of the rate for never-smokers.

Demographic Subgroups—For all survey years, males and females report smoke-free homes at about the same rates. As education level increases, the fraction of smoke-free homes reported also increases. A similar relationship exists for level of income. Asian/Pacific Islanders report smoke-free homes more often than any other racial/ethnic group, while Native Americans report smoke-free homes least often.

Table 5
National Prevalence of Smoking Restrictions in the Home as Reported by Individuals with Different Smoking Status, with Children under Age 13 in the Home, and with Different Demographic Characteristics*—1992/93 and 1995/96

	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Nowhere		Some		Anywhere		Nowhere		Some		Anywhere	
	%	CI	Places/Times	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	
Overall	43.1	0.2	26.0	0.2	30.9	0.2	53.3	0.3	22.2	0.2	24.5	0.2
Smoking Status												
Never	57.3	0.3	24.9	0.3	17.9	0.3	68.0	0.3	19.2	0.3	12.8	0.2
Current	11.0	0.3	26.3	0.4	62.7	0.5	16.8	0.4	27.8	0.5	55.4	0.5
Former	45.0	0.5	28.2	0.5	26.8	0.5	56.2	0.5	23.6	0.5	20.2	0.4
In homes with a child <13 years of age	46.2	0.4	27.6	0.4	26.2	0.4	57.1	0.5	23.0	0.4	19.9	0.4
Smoking Status												
Never	61.0	0.6	24.3	0.5	14.7	0.4	71.9	0.5	17.8	0.5	10.3	0.4
Current	13.7	0.6	32.9	0.8	53.4	0.8	21.3	0.7	33.8	0.9	44.9	0.9
Former	49.5	1.0	29.5	0.9	21.1	0.8	61.6	1.1	24.0	0.9	14.4	0.8
Gender												
Male	42.7	0.4	24.8	0.3	32.4	0.3	52.6	0.4	21.4	0.3	26.0	0.3
Female	43.4	0.3	27.0	0.3	29.6	0.3	53.9	0.4	23.0	0.3	23.1	0.3
Age (Years)												
18-24	42.9	0.7	25.4	0.6	31.7	0.6	52.4	0.7	22.0	0.6	25.7	0.6
25-44	43.7	0.4	26.7	0.3	29.6	0.3	54.2	0.4	22.7	0.3	23.1	0.3
45-64	40.4	0.5	25.6	0.4	34.0	0.5	50.9	0.5	22.1	0.4	26.9	0.4
65+	45.9	0.6	25.1	0.5	28.9	0.6	55.5	0.6	21.4	0.5	23.0	0.5

Table 5 (Continued)

	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed												
	1992/93						1995/96						
	Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere		
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	
Race/Ethnicity													
Non-Hispanic White	41.4	0.3	25.5	0.2	33.0	0.3	51.6	0.3	22.0	0.2	26.4	0.3	
Hispanic	56.4	1.1	25.1	1.0	18.5	0.9	66.2	1.1	19.5	0.9	14.2	0.8	
African-American	39.2	0.7	30.5	0.7	30.2	0.7	49.6	0.8	26.6	0.7	23.8	0.7	
Asian/Pacific Islander	62.0	1.4	23.7	1.3	14.4	1.0	71.0	1.3	19.0	1.1	10.0	0.9	
Native American	34.8	3.0	25.6	2.7	39.6	3.1	41.9	2.9	26.3	2.6	31.7	2.7	
Other†	60.8	6.9	23.1	6.0	16.2	5.2	
Maximum Level of Education													
<12 Years	37.4	0.6	25.1	0.5	37.5	0.6	46.0	0.6	22.6	0.5	31.3	0.6	
12 Years	36.4	0.4	26.8	0.4	36.7	0.4	46.5	0.4	23.7	0.4	29.8	0.4	
13–15 Years	45.3	0.5	26.5	0.4	28.2	0.4	54.7	0.5	22.6	0.4	22.7	0.4	
16+ Years	56.6	0.5	24.7	0.5	18.7	0.4	67.2	0.5	19.3	0.4	13.6	0.4	
Household Income													
< \$10,000	36.9	0.6	25.5	0.6	37.6	0.7	45.8	0.8	22.8	0.6	31.4	0.7	
\$10,000–\$19,999	38.5	0.6	25.9	0.5	35.6	0.6	48.2	0.7	22.8	0.6	29.1	0.6	
\$20,000–\$29,999	40.8	0.6	25.9	0.5	33.3	0.6	49.1	0.7	23.2	0.6	27.7	0.6	
\$30,000–\$49,999	43.7	0.5	26.5	0.4	29.9	0.5	53.4	0.5	22.4	0.5	24.2	0.5	
\$50,000–\$74,999	48.5	0.7	26.6	0.6	24.9	0.6	57.7	0.7	22.4	0.6	19.8	0.5	
\$75,000 +	55.0	0.8	25.2	0.7	19.8	0.7	66.3	0.7	19.7	0.6	14.0	0.5	
Unknown	46.2	1.1	25.3	1.0	28.5	1.0	54.4	0.9	21.4	0.8	24.3	0.8	

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval.

Source: 1992/93 and 1995/96 Current Population Surveys.

*Universe: This table reflects what individuals report about the smoking rules in their home. It does not show the rules for whole households, but rather the rules as reported by each individual. Individuals included in this table are self-respondent adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must define the smoking rules for their home (i.e., smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some places or at some times, or not allowed at all). For the "homes with children" insert, only individuals who live in a home where at least one child under the age of 13 also lives are included.

†No data for 1995/96; all racial/ethnic groups were classified for this survey series.

TABLE 6 State-Specific Prevalence of Reported Smoking Restrictions in the Home by Smoking Status

This table presents the percentage of individuals reporting different levels of restrictions in their homes by state and by smoking status within each state.

Overall—All states showed increases in the percentage of homes reported to be smoke-free between the 1992/93 and 1995/96 CPS. This was also true for each smoking status group, although some states (Mississippi and Maine, for example) had very small increases for current smokers. Utah had the highest fraction of homes reported to be smoke-free, while Kentucky had the lowest fraction, for both survey years. Only one state reported at least 60 percent of homes to be smoke-free in the 1992/93 CPS, while 10 states could claim this rate in the 1995/96 CPS. The maps in Figures 4 and 5 show the percentages of people from each state who reported smoke-free homes. The map in Figure 6 shows the absolute change in percentages of people who reported smoke-free homes from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS. Tennessee has the greatest change in reported smoke-free homes, with an increase of 41 percent, from 32 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 45 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. In the 1992/93 CPS, Utah had a much higher percentage of smoke-free homes than any other state (71 percent); California was the next highest state with 59 percent. For the 1995/96 CPS, this large gap had shrunk and the other states appear to be catching up to Utah.

Current Smokers—While the current smokers in each state still report low levels of smoke-free homes in the 1995/96 survey, they changed considerably toward increased smoking restrictions in the home from the 1992/93 survey. Most states showed increases of 50 percent or more among current smokers; 7 states showed percentage increases of over 100 percent. Washington, D.C. had the greatest change, an increase of 191 percent, from 6 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 16 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. No state reported smoke-free homes at a rate of at least 25 percent for current smokers in the 1992/93 CPS, but 6 states did in the 1995/96 CPS. California and Arizona reported the highest percentages of smoke-free homes in the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS, respectively, and Kentucky reported the lowest rates of smoke-free homes for both survey years.

Figure 4: Smoking Rules in the Home: 1992/93





Figure 5: Smoking Rules in the Home: 1995/96



**Figure 6: Change in Smoking Rules in the Home:
1992/93 to 1995/96**




Table 6
 State-Specific Prevalence of Reported Smoking Restrictions in the Home by Smoking Status*—1992/93 and 1995/96

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed												
	1992/93						1995/96						
	Nowhere		Some		Anywhere		Nowhere		Some		Anywhere		
	%	CI	Places/Times	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	Places/Times	%	CI	
Alabama													
Overall	39.1	2.2	22.4	1.9	38.5	2.2	51.8	2.1	19.9	1.7	28.2	1.9	
Never	51.0	3.1	23.9	2.7	25.2	2.7	64.8	2.7	18.1	2.2	17.2	2.2	
Current	8.5	2.5	18.6	3.5	72.9	4.0	17.1	3.3	22.5	3.7	60.4	4.3	
Former	47.3	4.9	23.2	4.1	29.5	4.5	56.5	4.8	22.0	4.0	21.6	3.9	
Alaska													
Overall	52.5	2.1	23.0	1.8	24.6	1.8	60.6	2.2	21.2	1.8	18.1	1.7	
Never	70.9	2.9	18.5	2.5	10.6	1.9	77.2	2.6	15.4	2.3	7.5	1.6	
Current	17.6	3.0	28.9	3.6	53.5	4.0	20.1	3.5	36.1	4.2	43.8	4.3	
Former	58.9	4.1	24.1	3.6	17.0	3.1	69.4	4.1	17.5	3.4	13.0	3.0	
Arizona													
Overall	55.8	2.1	19.7	1.6	24.5	1.8	66.1	2.0	16.5	1.5	17.3	1.6	
Never	71.9	2.6	16.8	2.1	11.3	1.8	80.5	2.2	11.8	1.8	7.7	1.5	
Current	18.7	3.4	25.1	3.7	56.2	4.3	30.0	3.9	27.0	3.8	43.0	4.2	
Former	56.2	4.2	20.8	3.4	23.0	3.5	69.8	4.0	16.8	3.2	13.4	2.9	
Arkansas													
Overall	32.5	2.1	25.3	2.0	42.2	2.2	41.4	2.1	23.3	1.8	35.4	2.0	
Never	46.4	3.2	28.2	2.9	25.4	2.8	55.9	2.9	21.7	2.4	22.4	2.5	
Current	6.8	2.1	19.9	3.4	73.2	3.8	10.8	2.5	23.8	3.5	65.4	3.9	
Former	34.0	4.7	25.7	4.3	40.3	4.8	44.6	4.8	26.7	4.2	28.7	4.3	

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Nowhere		Some Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Some Places/Times		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
California												
Overall	58.9	0.8	22.2	0.7	18.8	0.6	68.6	0.8	17.5	0.6	13.9	0.6
Never	71.4	0.9	19.1	0.8	9.5	0.6	79.9	0.9	13.5	0.8	6.6	0.5
Current	21.4	1.5	30.4	1.7	48.2	1.8	30.0	1.8	29.7	1.8	40.3	2.0
Former	59.4	1.7	23.3	1.4	17.3	1.3	69.9	1.7	18.1	1.4	12.1	1.2
Colorado												
Overall	49.4	2.3	23.5	1.9	27.1	2.0	60.0	2.1	18.3	1.7	21.7	1.8
Never	65.4	3.1	21.6	2.7	13.0	2.2	74.8	2.6	14.7	2.1	10.5	1.8
Current	12.3	3.0	26.2	4.0	61.4	4.5	21.7	3.7	27.2	4.0	51.1	4.5
Former	54.2	4.4	24.4	3.8	21.4	3.6	65.0	4.3	17.4	3.4	17.5	3.4
Connecticut												
Overall	44.0	2.3	29.2	2.1	26.8	2.1	54.0	2.3	24.5	2.0	21.6	1.9
Never	56.7	3.2	27.7	2.9	15.6	2.4	67.6	3.0	19.7	2.6	12.7	2.2
Current	11.2	3.0	34.0	4.6	54.8	4.8	15.7	3.8	32.3	4.8	51.9	5.2
Former	49.1	4.7	27.7	4.2	23.2	4.0	56.8	4.4	27.5	4.0	15.7	3.3
Delaware												
Overall	40.6	2.2	28.7	2.0	30.8	2.1	50.3	2.3	22.8	1.9	27.0	2.0
Never	54.7	3.2	26.9	2.8	18.4	2.5	65.4	3.1	20.0	2.6	14.6	2.3
Current	11.6	3.0	27.3	4.1	61.1	4.5	14.3	3.1	27.5	4.0	58.2	4.4
Former	40.4	4.4	33.4	4.2	26.2	3.9	57.9	4.6	23.3	3.9	18.8	3.6
District of Columbia												
Overall	38.1	2.4	35.2	2.3	26.7	2.2	51.5	2.4	28.6	2.1	19.9	1.9
Never	50.5	3.2	34.4	3.1	15.1	2.3	65.2	3.0	24.6	2.7	10.2	1.9
Current	5.6	2.3	34.1	4.8	60.3	5.0	16.2	3.7	39.7	4.9	44.2	4.9
Former	39.8	5.3	38.7	5.3	21.5	4.4	52.1	5.3	27.4	4.8	20.5	4.3

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Florida												
Overall	49.2	1.0	22.9	0.8	27.9	0.9	60.5	1.0	17.9	0.8	21.6	0.9
Never	64.1	1.4	21.2	1.2	14.7	1.0	75.5	1.3	14.3	1.0	10.1	0.9
Current	14.0	1.4	25.7	1.8	60.3	2.0	20.9	1.8	25.7	1.9	53.4	2.2
Former	54.0	2.0	23.5	1.7	22.5	1.7	65.4	2.0	18.1	1.6	16.4	1.6
Georgia												
Overall	41.6	2.1	24.4	1.8	34.0	2.0	54.3	1.9	21.0	1.6	24.7	1.7
Never	54.9	2.9	24.2	2.5	20.8	2.3	67.9	2.4	19.2	2.0	12.9	1.7
Current	7.8	2.2	24.2	3.6	68.0	3.9	15.9	3.0	24.1	3.5	60.0	4.0
Former	48.4	4.6	25.1	4.0	26.5	4.1	59.0	4.3	22.6	3.6	18.5	3.4
Hawaii												
Overall	49.6	2.2	26.3	1.9	24.1	1.9	60.2	2.3	22.4	1.9	17.4	1.8
Never	62.8	2.9	24.1	2.5	13.0	2.0	71.0	2.8	19.4	2.4	9.5	1.8
Current	16.6	3.4	31.4	4.3	51.9	4.6	26.0	4.5	30.8	4.7	43.2	5.0
Former	50.3	4.6	26.3	4.1	23.4	3.9	64.3	4.7	22.2	4.1	13.6	3.4
Idaho												
Overall	51.4	2.1	20.1	1.7	28.5	1.9	62.9	2.0	17.5	1.6	19.6	1.7
Never	68.6	2.6	17.4	2.2	14.0	2.0	78.8	2.3	13.2	1.9	8.0	1.5
Current	13.2	2.9	23.6	3.6	63.2	4.1	20.8	3.7	25.4	3.9	53.8	4.5
Former	51.8	4.3	22.7	3.6	25.5	3.8	64.0	4.2	20.4	3.5	15.6	3.2
Illinois												
Overall	38.9	1.1	28.6	1.0	32.4	1.1	47.2	1.2	25.3	1.1	27.5	1.1
Never	53.2	1.6	27.5	1.4	19.3	1.2	62.5	1.6	22.2	1.4	15.3	1.2
Current	9.5	1.3	27.4	2.0	63.1	2.2	12.1	1.6	29.4	2.2	58.4	2.4
Former	38.7	2.3	32.5	2.2	28.9	2.1	49.4	2.6	28.2	2.3	22.4	2.1

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Indiana												
Overall	32.8	2.1	29.7	2.0	37.5	2.1	43.4	2.1	22.6	1.8	34.0	2.0
Never	45.6	3.1	31.4	2.9	23.0	2.6	60.3	3.0	23.1	2.5	16.6	2.2
Current	9.3	2.4	26.1	3.7	64.6	4.0	12.1	2.6	19.7	3.1	68.2	3.7
Former	32.9	4.4	30.2	4.3	36.8	4.6	46.7	4.7	25.5	4.1	27.7	4.2
Iowa												
Overall	36.4	2.1	27.0	1.9	36.6	2.1	49.8	2.2	22.2	1.8	28.0	1.9
Never	49.9	2.9	27.9	2.6	22.2	2.4	63.7	2.8	20.3	2.3	16.0	2.1
Current	6.5	2.1	24.6	3.8	68.9	4.0	12.5	3.0	25.4	4.0	62.0	4.4
Former	36.3	4.4	27.5	4.1	36.2	4.4	53.1	4.6	23.6	3.9	23.3	3.9
Kansas												
Overall	40.8	2.1	23.5	1.8	35.8	2.0	47.2	2.2	23.8	1.9	29.0	2.0
Never	57.0	2.9	23.9	2.5	19.1	2.3	63.6	2.9	21.2	2.5	15.2	2.2
Current	6.1	2.0	21.0	3.4	72.9	3.7	11.3	2.8	28.2	3.9	60.6	4.3
Former	42.0	4.3	25.2	3.8	32.8	4.1	49.8	4.9	25.0	4.2	25.2	4.2
Kentucky												
Overall	24.4	1.9	22.5	1.8	53.1	2.2	31.8	2.0	22.8	1.8	45.4	2.1
Never	38.7	3.2	25.2	2.8	36.1	3.1	47.7	3.1	22.6	2.6	29.7	2.8
Current	4.1	1.5	15.1	2.7	80.8	3.0	6.7	1.9	19.5	3.0	73.7	3.4
Former	25.5	4.1	28.1	4.2	46.4	4.7	32.3	4.2	27.9	4.1	39.8	4.4
Louisiana												
Overall	38.9	2.2	29.4	2.1	31.7	2.1	51.2	2.1	20.2	1.7	28.6	1.9
Never	51.0	3.2	30.2	2.9	18.8	2.5	64.0	2.7	19.8	2.3	16.2	2.1
Current	11.6	2.9	24.9	3.9	63.5	4.4	20.2	3.4	18.1	3.3	61.7	4.1
Former	42.4	4.9	32.8	4.6	24.8	4.2	55.2	4.8	23.8	4.1	20.9	3.9

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Nowhere		Some Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Some Places/Times		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Maine												
Overall	39.4	2.1	26.7	1.9	33.8	2.0	46.9	2.2	26.1	2.0	27.0	2.0
Never	57.8	3.3	23.6	2.8	18.6	2.6	66.7	3.1	20.4	2.7	12.9	2.2
Current	9.1	2.3	27.1	3.5	63.8	3.8	9.3	2.5	33.2	4.1	57.6	4.3
Former	44.0	4.1	31.2	3.8	24.8	3.6	50.9	4.2	28.4	3.8	20.7	3.4
Maryland												
Overall	44.2	2.2	26.5	1.9	29.3	2.0	57.3	2.2	23.3	1.9	19.4	1.8
Never	59.0	3.0	23.7	2.6	17.4	2.3	71.8	2.7	19.0	2.4	9.2	1.7
Current	8.1	2.5	27.8	4.0	64.1	4.3	16.9	3.6	32.2	4.5	50.9	4.8
Former	47.7	4.3	30.8	4.0	21.6	3.5	61.0	4.4	24.8	3.9	14.3	3.1
Massachusetts												
Overall	40.0	1.1	29.6	1.0	30.5	1.0	50.1	1.4	27.7	1.2	22.3	1.2
Never	52.5	1.6	27.8	1.4	19.6	1.3	63.7	1.9	23.9	1.7	12.4	1.3
Current	11.5	1.5	31.4	2.2	57.0	2.3	14.6	2.1	34.1	2.9	51.3	3.0
Former	41.0	2.0	31.0	1.9	28.0	1.8	52.0	2.6	29.7	2.4	18.4	2.0
Michigan												
Overall	34.3	1.1	32.2	1.0	33.5	1.1	45.2	1.2	28.4	1.1	26.4	1.1
Never	49.2	1.6	31.0	1.5	19.8	1.3	61.5	1.7	24.7	1.5	13.8	1.2
Current	7.4	1.1	31.5	2.0	61.1	2.1	11.0	1.5	33.8	2.3	55.3	2.4
Former	35.7	2.2	35.2	2.2	29.2	2.0	48.4	2.6	30.2	2.4	21.4	2.1
Minnesota												
Overall	39.0	2.1	29.2	2.0	31.8	2.1	53.9	2.2	22.5	1.8	23.6	1.9
Never	55.2	3.1	26.1	2.7	18.7	2.4	68.1	2.8	18.6	2.3	13.3	2.0
Current	7.3	2.3	32.1	4.1	60.6	4.3	19.6	3.6	30.4	4.2	50.0	4.5
Former	38.8	4.3	32.5	4.1	28.6	4.0	55.6	4.4	23.3	3.7	21.1	3.6

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Mississippi												
Overall	40.1	2.2	28.5	2.0	31.4	2.1	47.5	2.2	23.5	1.8	28.9	2.0
Never	52.3	3.0	30.4	2.8	17.3	2.3	61.6	2.8	23.5	2.4	14.9	2.0
Current	11.2	2.8	23.1	3.7	65.7	4.2	11.3	2.8	22.6	3.7	66.1	4.2
Former	44.7	5.3	30.4	4.9	24.9	4.6	49.5	5.0	24.9	4.3	25.7	4.4
Missouri												
Overall	33.6	2.1	24.4	1.9	42.0	2.2	40.6	2.1	26.9	1.9	32.6	2.0
Never	47.5	3.2	27.4	2.8	25.2	2.7	56.2	3.1	25.5	2.7	18.3	2.4
Current	7.9	2.3	15.2	3.1	76.9	3.7	9.3	2.5	26.0	3.7	64.6	4.1
Former	33.0	4.4	28.6	4.2	38.4	4.5	42.1	4.5	30.7	4.2	27.2	4.0
Montana												
Overall	41.7	2.2	26.7	2.0	31.6	2.1	49.6	2.1	23.5	1.8	26.9	1.9
Never	58.1	3.1	24.9	2.7	17.0	2.3	66.1	2.9	19.8	2.5	14.0	2.1
Current	8.0	2.4	25.5	3.9	66.5	4.2	13.6	2.9	30.4	3.9	55.9	4.2
Former	41.1	4.3	31.3	4.1	27.7	3.9	53.7	4.0	23.5	3.4	22.8	3.4
Nebraska												
Overall	39.6	2.0	27.4	1.8	33.0	1.9	49.9	2.1	22.0	1.8	28.1	1.9
Never	51.6	2.8	28.6	2.5	19.8	2.2	64.8	2.7	19.3	2.2	15.9	2.0
Current	9.7	2.6	23.2	3.7	67.1	4.1	13.6	3.1	24.8	3.9	61.7	4.4
Former	40.4	4.3	28.8	4.0	30.9	4.1	46.8	4.8	26.9	4.2	26.2	4.2
Nevada												
Overall	43.6	2.1	21.3	1.7	35.1	2.0	53.5	2.1	20.6	1.7	25.9	1.9
Never	59.6	2.9	20.8	2.4	19.6	2.4	70.3	2.7	19.3	2.4	10.4	1.8
Current	9.9	2.3	21.5	3.1	68.6	3.6	16.9	3.0	24.0	3.5	59.1	4.0
Former	53.2	4.3	21.9	3.6	24.8	3.7	61.0	4.5	19.5	3.6	19.5	3.6

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Nowhere		Some Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Some Places/Times		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
New Hampshire												
Overall	37.7	2.3	27.8	2.1	34.5	2.3	52.5	2.4	23.2	2.0	24.3	2.0
Never	53.3	3.5	26.7	3.1	20.1	2.8	70.3	3.2	18.5	2.8	11.2	2.2
Current	9.6	2.8	30.9	4.4	59.5	4.7	12.6	3.2	30.8	4.4	56.5	4.7
Former	37.5	4.1	26.9	3.8	35.6	4.1	58.9	4.2	23.9	3.6	17.2	3.2
New Jersey												
Overall	44.7	1.1	28.0	1.0	27.3	1.0	53.7	1.2	24.8	1.1	21.4	1.0
Never	58.5	1.5	24.9	1.3	16.7	1.1	66.3	1.6	22.4	1.4	11.4	1.1
Current	11.9	1.5	31.1	2.2	57.1	2.3	18.9	2.2	31.6	2.6	49.5	2.8
Former	43.3	2.1	32.0	2.0	24.7	1.9	54.9	2.5	24.7	2.2	20.4	2.1
New Mexico												
Overall	46.6	2.1	23.9	1.8	29.5	1.9	53.2	2.1	21.2	1.7	25.5	1.8
Never	61.1	2.9	22.3	2.5	16.6	2.2	68.2	2.7	17.8	2.2	14.0	2.0
Current	14.2	3.0	23.9	3.7	61.9	4.2	18.5	3.2	27.8	3.7	53.6	4.2
Former	48.8	4.2	27.0	3.8	24.3	3.6	57.3	4.3	21.7	3.6	21.0	3.5
New York												
Overall	40.6	0.8	31.4	0.8	28.0	0.7	51.1	0.9	26.1	0.8	22.8	0.8
Never	53.7	1.1	29.4	1.0	16.9	0.8	65.2	1.2	23.0	1.0	11.8	0.8
Current	9.1	1.0	33.8	1.7	57.2	1.7	15.0	1.4	33.3	1.8	51.7	1.9
Former	40.4	1.7	33.8	1.6	25.8	1.5	51.5	1.9	26.6	1.7	21.9	1.6
North Carolina												
Overall	34.0	1.0	25.0	0.9	41.1	1.0	44.1	1.4	24.2	1.2	31.7	1.3
Never	46.2	1.5	26.7	1.3	27.0	1.3	57.3	1.9	23.5	1.7	19.2	1.5
Current	9.3	1.2	20.2	1.6	70.5	1.8	12.6	1.8	25.3	2.4	62.1	2.7
Former	37.1	2.2	26.8	2.0	36.0	2.1	50.7	3.2	24.5	2.7	24.8	2.7

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
North Dakota												
Overall	37.5	2.1	30.5	2.0	32.0	2.0	49.5	2.2	25.3	1.9	25.2	1.9
Never	50.8	3.0	29.3	2.7	19.8	2.4	63.2	2.9	23.5	2.6	13.2	2.0
Current	8.9	2.6	29.6	4.2	61.5	4.4	14.8	3.3	28.0	4.1	57.2	4.5
Former	34.9	4.2	33.7	4.2	31.4	4.1	52.7	4.7	26.6	4.1	20.7	3.8
Ohio												
Overall	35.4	1.0	28.1	1.0	36.5	1.0	44.1	1.2	24.2	1.0	31.7	1.1
Never	48.8	1.5	29.4	1.4	21.8	1.3	61.2	1.7	22.0	1.4	16.8	1.3
Current	7.4	1.1	24.3	1.8	68.3	2.0	10.3	1.4	25.1	2.0	64.5	2.3
Former	38.0	2.2	29.7	2.1	32.3	2.1	46.4	2.5	27.6	2.3	26.0	2.2
Oklahoma												
Overall	40.5	2.1	20.9	1.8	38.5	2.1	46.9	2.1	22.1	1.8	31.0	2.0
Never	56.2	3.0	22.0	2.5	21.8	2.5	61.7	2.8	20.5	2.3	17.8	2.2
Current	6.3	2.0	18.2	3.2	75.5	3.6	13.2	2.8	24.1	3.6	62.7	4.0
Former	46.4	4.5	21.9	3.8	31.7	4.2	50.3	4.7	24.1	4.0	25.6	4.1
Oregon												
Overall	52.3	2.3	25.0	2.0	22.7	1.9	67.0	2.1	17.8	1.7	15.2	1.6
Never	69.6	3.0	21.4	2.6	9.1	1.8	82.0	2.4	13.1	2.1	4.8	1.3
Current	16.4	3.5	27.9	4.2	55.6	4.6	26.8	4.1	30.6	4.3	42.6	4.6
Former	51.8	4.3	29.1	3.9	19.1	3.4	72.0	3.9	16.0	3.2	11.9	2.8
Pennsylvania												
Overall	39.1	1.0	28.2	1.0	32.7	1.0	47.4	1.2	25.7	1.0	26.9	1.0
Never	52.3	1.5	26.6	1.3	21.1	1.2	62.5	1.6	22.7	1.4	14.8	1.2
Current	9.1	1.3	30.2	2.0	60.7	2.1	13.8	1.6	30.7	2.2	55.5	2.3
Former	41.3	2.1	29.3	2.0	29.4	2.0	50.0	2.3	26.9	2.0	23.1	1.9

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed													
	1992/93						1995/96							
	Nowhere		Some		Anywhere		Nowhere		Some		Anywhere			
	%	CI	Places/Times	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	Places/Times	%	CI		
Rhode Island														
Overall	39.4	2.3	30.8	2.1	29.8	2.1	29.8	2.1	29.8	2.3	26.7	2.1	25.8	2.0
Never	52.5	3.3	28.8	3.0	18.8	2.6	18.8	2.6	18.8	3.2	21.7	2.8	15.1	2.4
Current	8.3	2.6	33.7	4.5	58.0	4.7	33.7	4.5	58.0	3.2	33.8	4.4	52.0	4.6
Former	43.1	4.2	31.9	4.0	25.0	3.7	31.9	4.0	25.0	4.5	28.9	4.1	20.7	3.6
South Carolina														
Overall	38.1	1.9	25.4	1.7	36.5	1.9	25.4	1.7	36.5	2.1	25.5	1.9	26.4	1.9
Never	50.9	2.7	26.8	2.4	22.3	2.3	26.8	2.4	22.3	2.8	24.6	2.5	12.3	1.9
Current	9.2	2.2	21.4	3.2	69.4	3.6	21.4	3.2	69.4	2.8	27.3	3.7	60.0	4.1
Former	42.8	4.3	27.2	3.9	30.1	4.0	27.2	3.9	30.1	5.0	25.6	4.4	20.4	4.0
South Dakota														
Overall	36.9	2.0	26.6	1.8	36.5	2.0	26.6	1.8	36.5	2.1	25.0	1.8	26.5	1.8
Never	51.2	2.8	26.8	2.5	22.0	2.4	26.8	2.5	22.0	2.7	21.6	2.3	14.7	2.0
Current	6.6	2.0	24.3	3.5	69.1	3.8	24.3	3.5	69.1	3.1	27.5	3.9	57.3	4.3
Former	38.1	4.2	28.9	4.0	33.1	4.1	28.9	4.0	33.1	4.3	30.1	3.9	23.8	3.6
Tennessee														
Overall	32.2	1.9	25.0	1.8	42.8	2.1	25.0	1.8	42.8	2.1	22.3	1.7	32.3	1.9
Never	46.6	2.9	27.5	2.6	25.8	2.6	27.5	2.6	25.8	2.9	20.9	2.4	16.6	2.2
Current	5.5	1.7	18.3	2.9	76.2	3.2	18.3	2.9	76.2	2.4	24.3	3.4	65.7	3.8
Former	35.7	4.4	28.5	4.1	35.8	4.4	28.5	4.1	35.8	4.3	22.9	3.6	26.5	3.8
Texas														
Overall	47.0	1.1	23.3	1.0	29.6	1.0	23.3	1.0	29.6	1.1	18.2	0.9	23.6	0.9
Never	60.5	1.5	22.4	1.3	17.1	1.2	22.4	1.3	17.1	1.3	15.4	1.1	12.0	1.0
Current	12.8	1.6	23.8	2.0	63.4	2.2	23.8	2.0	63.4	1.8	24.8	2.0	55.1	2.3
Former	50.8	2.5	25.4	2.2	23.8	2.1	25.4	2.2	23.8	2.5	18.4	2.0	18.7	2.0

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed												
	1992/93						1995/96						
	Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere		
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	
Utah													
Overall	70.6	2.0	13.1	1.4	16.3	1.6	76.1	1.8	12.5	1.4	11.5	1.4	
Never	85.6	1.9	9.2	1.5	5.2	1.2	88.2	1.6	8.2	1.4	3.5	0.9	
Current	20.7	4.2	24.0	4.4	55.3	5.2	26.6	4.7	26.6	4.7	46.7	5.3	
Former	63.2	4.9	16.8	3.8	20.0	4.1	71.5	5.0	17.4	4.2	11.1	3.4	
Vermont													
Overall	38.1	2.3	28.3	2.1	33.6	2.2	50.1	2.3	24.5	2.0	25.4	2.0	
Never	52.0	3.6	27.1	3.2	20.9	2.9	67.2	3.2	19.0	2.7	13.8	2.4	
Current	8.7	2.5	30.3	4.1	60.9	4.3	16.9	3.4	31.0	4.3	52.1	4.6	
Former	44.8	4.2	28.2	3.8	27.0	3.7	52.4	4.3	27.4	3.9	20.3	3.5	
Virginia													
Overall	38.9	1.9	26.8	1.7	34.3	1.8	49.3	2.0	22.6	1.7	28.1	1.8	
Never	54.1	2.7	24.5	2.4	21.5	2.3	63.5	2.7	19.6	2.2	16.9	2.1	
Current	9.8	2.3	25.1	3.3	65.1	3.6	14.8	2.9	27.9	3.7	57.3	4.0	
Former	39.4	3.9	33.4	3.7	27.2	3.5	54.4	4.1	23.5	3.5	22.1	3.4	
Washington													
Overall	55.2	2.1	20.5	1.7	24.3	1.8	63.9	2.2	19.4	1.8	16.7	1.7	
Never	74.4	2.7	16.1	2.3	9.5	1.8	79.2	2.6	14.0	2.2	6.8	1.6	
Current	17.5	3.2	25.6	3.7	56.9	4.2	28.1	4.1	31.6	4.3	40.3	4.5	
Former	56.4	3.9	23.1	3.3	20.4	3.2	67.0	4.2	18.8	3.5	14.2	3.1	
West Virginia													
Overall	28.8	2.0	20.8	1.8	50.4	2.2	37.2	1.9	23.0	1.7	39.9	2.0	
Never	41.5	3.2	23.0	2.7	35.5	3.1	51.8	2.9	24.0	2.5	24.2	2.5	
Current	5.0	1.7	15.9	2.9	79.1	3.2	9.6	2.3	21.1	3.1	69.3	3.5	
Former	35.4	4.7	23.2	4.1	41.4	4.8	40.1	4.0	23.2	3.4	36.7	3.9	

Table 6 (Continued)

State/ Smoking Status	In the Home, Smoking Is Allowed											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere		Nowhere		Places/Times		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Wisconsin												
Overall	35.5	2.0	31.1	1.9	33.3	2.0	47.0	2.2	26.7	1.9	26.3	1.9
Never	48.4	3.0	32.1	2.8	19.5	2.4	62.2	3.0	23.9	2.6	13.9	2.1
Current	8.0	2.2	28.2	3.7	63.8	3.9	13.5	2.9	30.7	3.9	55.9	4.2
Former	39.3	4.0	32.3	3.9	28.4	3.7	51.0	4.4	28.2	4.0	20.8	3.6
Wyoming												
Overall	38.7	2.4	26.3	2.2	34.9	2.4	48.6	2.3	22.4	1.9	29.0	2.1
Never	55.4	3.5	26.5	3.1	18.1	2.7	68.0	3.0	18.4	2.5	13.6	2.2
Current	7.9	2.7	25.2	4.3	66.8	4.6	10.1	2.7	25.6	4.0	64.3	4.4
Former	37.8	4.8	27.2	4.4	35.0	4.8	47.5	4.8	27.7	4.3	24.8	4.1

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval.

Source: 1992/93 and 1995/96 Current Population Surveys.

*Universe: This table reflects what individuals report about the smoking rules in their home. It does not show the rules for households, but rather the rules as reported by each individual. Individuals included in this table are self-respondent adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must define the smoking rules for their home (i.e., smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some places or at some times, or not allowed at all).

TABLES 7A AND 7B Prevalence of Reported Smoking Restrictions in the Home for Different Levels of Workplace Smoking Policies for the Nation

This table presents the relationship between working in a workplace that restricts smoking and the likelihood of restricting smoking at home.

There is an association between working in smoke-free workplaces and the likelihood of reported smoking restrictions in the workers' homes. There does not appear to be a relationship between restrictions of less than a smoke-free workplace and the likelihood of having restrictions on smoking in the home. For workers not at smoke-free workplaces, the fraction who reported smoke-free homes is uniform across the various categories, ranging from 34 to 39 percent in the 1992/93 CPS and from 41 to 46 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. Workers at smoke-free workplaces, however, report much higher levels of smoke-free homes, at 51 percent in the 1992/93 CPS and 60 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. Working in a smoke-free workplace appears to increase the likelihood that individuals will restrict smoking at home as well. This relationship holds for never-, current, and former smokers.

Table 7a
Prevalence of Reported Smoking Restrictions in the Home for Different Levels of Workplace Smoking Policies for the Nation*—1992/93

Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions:	In the Home, Smoking is Allowed:	Nation		Never Smokers		Current Smokers		Former Smokers	
		%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
100% Smoke-Free	Nowhere	51.1	0.6	63.7	0.7	14.8	0.9	50.7	1.2
	Some Places/Times	25.0	0.5	22.7	0.6	28.8	1.1	27.7	1.1
	Anywhere	23.9	0.5	13.7	0.5	56.4	1.3	21.6	1.0
Strong Restrictions	Nowhere	39.1	0.9	52.6	1.2	10.0	1.0	40.9	2.0
	Some Places/Times	28.4	0.8	27.8	1.1	27.1	1.5	31.9	1.9
	Anywhere	32.5	0.8	19.6	0.9	62.9	1.6	27.2	1.8
Moderate Restrictions	Nowhere	36.8	1.0	51.4	1.5	10.9	1.2	42.0	2.2
	Some Places/Times	27.1	0.9	27.5	1.3	24.7	1.6	29.7	2.1
	Anywhere	36.1	1.0	21.1	1.2	64.4	1.8	28.3	2.0
Weak Restrictions	Nowhere	34.4	2.9	49.8	4.7	11.0	3.3	40.6	6.4
	Some Places/Times	24.3	2.6	23.7	4.0	22.1	4.3	28.7	5.9
	Anywhere	41.4	3.0	26.4	4.1	66.8	4.9	30.7	6.0
No Restrictions	Nowhere	36.1	0.8	51.0	1.2	10.4	1.0	38.5	2.0
	Some Places/Times	25.6	0.8	25.5	1.1	23.8	1.3	28.9	1.8
	Anywhere	38.3	0.9	23.5	1.1	65.8	1.5	32.6	1.9

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval.

Source: 1992/93 Current Population Survey.

*Universe: Individuals included in this table are self-respondent adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must know if an official workplace smoking policy exists or does not exist, and define that policy for both work and public areas (i.e., smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all). They must also define the smoking rules for their home (i.e., smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some places or at some times, or not allowed at all).

Table 7b
Prevalence of Reported Smoking Restrictions in the Home for Different Levels of Workplace Smoking Policies for the Nation*—1995/96

Extent of Workplace Smoking Restrictions:	In the Home, Smoking is Allowed:	Nation		Never Smokers		Current Smokers		Former Smokers	
		%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
100% Smoke-Free	Nowhere	59.6	0.5	72.4	0.6	19.5	0.9	61.5	1.1
	Some Places/Times	21.1	0.4	17.4	0.5	30.0	1.0	23.0	0.9
	Anywhere	19.3	0.4	10.2	0.4	50.5	1.1	15.5	0.8
Strong Restrictions	Nowhere	45.5	1.2	61.4	1.6	13.2	1.5	48.6	2.7
	Some Places/Times	25.7	1.0	23.5	1.4	28.1	2.0	28.6	2.5
	Anywhere	28.8	1.1	15.1	1.2	58.7	2.2	22.8	2.3
Moderate Restrictions	Nowhere	45.4	1.3	62.1	1.8	15.8	1.7	52.3	2.9
	Some Places/Times	25.3	1.1	23.0	1.6	28.4	2.1	25.8	2.6
	Anywhere	29.3	1.2	14.9	1.3	55.8	2.3	21.9	2.4
Weak Restrictions	Nowhere	41.0	3.5	55.6	5.2	17.6	4.6	47.6	7.8
	Some Places/Times	24.9	3.0	22.3	4.3	27.1	5.4	.	.
	Anywhere	34.1	3.3	22.1	4.3	55.3	6.0	25.5	6.8
No Restrictions	Nowhere	45.6	1.0	60.9	1.4	16.8	1.4	51.3	2.4
	Some Places/Times	22.4	0.9	20.8	1.2	24.3	1.6	23.9	2.1
	Anywhere	32.0	1.0	18.3	1.1	59.0	1.8	24.8	2.1

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval; "." = insufficient data.

Source: 1995/96 Current Population Survey.

*Universe: Individuals included in this table are self-resident adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must work indoors and be employed privately or by local, state, or federal government. They must know if an official workplace smoking policy exists or does not exist, and define that policy for both work and public areas (i.e., smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all). They must also define the smoking rules for their home (i.e., smoking is allowed in all areas, allowed in some places or at some times, or not allowed at all).

TABLE 8 National Attitudes About Smoking in Indoor Places (Restaurants, Hospitals, Indoor Work Areas, Bars and Cocktail Lounges, Indoor Sporting Events, and Indoor Shopping Malls) by Smoking Status and Demographic Characteristics

This table presents national attitudes about restrictions on smoking in various public places for the 1992/93 CPS and 1995/96 CPS by smoking status and demographic characteristics.

Overall—The fraction of people who think indoor public places should be smoke-free increased from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS for most indoor locations, and the fraction of people who think smoking should be allowed in all places decreased over this same time period. Bars and restaurants have the lowest percentage of people who think these public places should be smoke-free, and hospitals have the highest percentage. For each of these public places—hospitals, indoor work areas, sporting events and shopping malls—over one half of the population believes that smoking should be banned, and 49 percent believe that smoking should be banned in all restaurants. Within all smoking status, gender, age, race/ethnicity, education level, and income level groups, public opinion supporting restrictions on smoking in public places increased between surveys.

Smoking Status—For each classification of indoor places, never-smokers are more likely to agree that "smoking should not be allowed at all," than former smokers, and both are much more likely to agree than current smokers. In the 1992/93 CPS, nearly half of all current smokers thought indoor sporting events should be smoke-free, over half thought hospitals should be smoke-free, and these percentages increased in the 1995/96 CPS. In the 1995/96 CPS, the percentage of never- and former smokers who think that each indoor place should be smoke-free is very close to or above 50 percent, with one exception, all groups fall well below 50 percent for bars and cocktail lounges.

Demographic Subgroups—More females think indoor public places should be smoke-free than do males. For most locations, including bars and cocktail lounges, as age increases so does the percentage of people who think indoor public places should be smoke-free. The exception is restaurants, where there is little change with age in the opinion that restaurants should be smoke-free. Hispanics and Asian/Pacific Islanders have the highest percentage of people who think indoor public places should be smoke-free. Native Americans usually have the lowest support for smoking bans, except for indoor sporting events, where African-Americans and non-Hispanic Whites are the lowest. Support for banning smoking in hospitals, indoor work areas, and indoor sporting events increases with increasing level of education. Similar patterns are noted for increasing level of income.

Table 8
National Attitudes About Smoking in Indoor Places (Restaurants, Hospitals, Indoor Work Areas, Bars and Cocktail Lounges, Indoor Sporting Events, and Indoor Shopping Malls) by Smoking Status and Demographic Characteristics*—1992/93 and 1995/96

Restaurants	Smoking Should Be Allowed:													
	1992/93				1995/96									
	Not at All		In Some Areas		Not at All		In Some Areas		Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere	
%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	
Overall	45.2	0.2	51.7	0.2	3.2	0.1	48.8	0.3	47.7	0.3	3.5	0.1		
Smoking Status														
Never	57.7	0.3	41.0	0.3	1.3	0.1	61.3	0.3	37.0	0.3	1.6	0.1		
Current	16.7	0.4	76.4	0.4	7.0	0.3	19.5	0.4	72.8	0.5	7.7	0.3		
Former	47.0	0.5	49.6	0.5	3.3	0.2	49.4	0.5	47.1	0.5	3.6	0.2		
Gender														
Male	43.8	0.4	52.0	0.4	4.2	0.1	46.3	0.4	49.2	0.4	4.5	0.2		
Female	46.4	0.3	51.3	0.3	2.2	0.1	51.0	0.4	46.4	0.4	2.5	0.1		
Age (Years)														
18-24	39.5	0.7	57.9	0.7	2.6	0.2	45.1	0.7	52.0	0.7	3.0	0.3		
25-44	44.4	0.4	52.9	0.4	2.6	0.1	48.2	0.4	48.9	0.4	2.9	0.1		
45-64	46.3	0.5	49.8	0.5	3.9	0.2	49.4	0.5	46.6	0.5	4.0	0.2		
65+	50.1	0.6	45.9	0.6	4.0	0.2	52.1	0.6	43.3	0.6	4.6	0.3		
Race/Ethnicity														
Non-Hispanic White	43.2	0.3	53.5	0.3	3.4	0.1	46.3	0.3	50.0	0.3	3.7	0.1		
Hispanic	58.4	1.1	39.3	1.1	2.3	0.3	64.5	1.1	33.2	1.1	2.3	0.3		
African-American	45.7	0.8	51.5	0.8	2.8	0.2	48.4	0.8	48.1	0.8	3.4	0.3		
Asian/Pacific Islander	55.7	1.5	42.3	1.5	2.0	0.4	63.9	1.4	34.4	1.4	1.7	0.4		
Native American	41.3	3.1	53.9	3.1	4.9	1.3	42.5	2.9	52.7	2.9	4.8	1.3		
Other†	60.1	6.9	38.5	6.9	1.4	1.7								
Education (Years)														
<12	45.8	0.6	49.2	0.6	5.0	0.3	48.5	0.6	46.0	0.6	5.5	0.3		
12	40.1	0.4	56.2	0.4	3.7	0.2	43.8	0.4	51.9	0.4	4.2	0.2		
13-15	45.0	0.5	52.7	0.5	2.4	0.2	48.5	0.5	48.8	0.5	2.7	0.2		
16+	53.6	0.5	44.7	0.5	1.7	0.1	56.6	0.5	41.5	0.5	1.9	0.1		

Table 8 (Continued)

Restaurants (cont.)	Smoking Should Be Allowed:											
	1992/93				1995/96							
	Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere		Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere	
%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	
Household Income												
< \$10,000	43.0	0.7	52.5	0.7	4.5	0.3	47.5	0.8	47.3	0.8	5.3	0.3
\$10,000-\$19,999	42.2	0.6	54.1	0.6	3.7	0.2	46.1	0.7	49.7	0.7	4.3	0.3
\$20,000-\$29,999	42.7	0.6	54.0	0.6	3.3	0.2	45.0	0.7	51.2	0.7	3.7	0.3
\$30,000-\$49,999	44.8	0.5	52.4	0.5	2.8	0.2	47.2	0.5	49.7	0.5	3.1	0.2
\$50,000-\$74,999	48.6	0.7	49.2	0.7	2.2	0.2	51.1	0.7	46.5	0.7	2.4	0.2
\$75,000 +	54.8	0.8	43.5	0.8	1.7	0.2	57.4	0.7	40.8	0.7	1.8	0.2
Unknown	45.9	1.1	50.0	1.1	4.2	0.4	50.3	0.9	44.9	0.9	4.7	0.4
Hospitals												
Overall	74.8	0.2	24.2	0.2	1.0	0.0	78.5	0.2	20.4	0.2	1.1	0.1
Smoking Status												
Never	84.0	0.3	15.6	0.3	0.4	0.0	86.1	0.2	13.3	0.2	0.6	0.1
Current	54.6	0.5	43.2	0.5	2.3	0.1	60.7	0.5	36.9	0.5	2.4	0.2
Former	75.6	0.4	23.4	0.4	1.0	0.1	78.8	0.4	20.1	0.4	1.1	0.1
Gender												
Male	73.4	0.3	25.3	0.3	1.4	0.1	76.7	0.3	21.8	0.3	1.5	0.1
Female	76.2	0.3	23.2	0.3	0.6	0.1	80.0	0.3	19.1	0.3	0.8	0.1
Age (Years)												
18-24	79.3	0.5	20.1	0.5	0.6	0.1	83.9	0.5	15.3	0.5	0.7	0.1
25-44	73.9	0.3	25.4	0.3	0.8	0.1	78.2	0.3	20.8	0.3	1.0	0.1
45-64	72.3	0.4	26.4	0.4	1.3	0.1	75.6	0.4	23.0	0.4	1.4	0.1
65+	77.8	0.5	20.9	0.5	1.3	0.1	79.8	0.5	18.8	0.5	1.4	0.2
Race/Ethnicity												
Non-Hispanic White	73.0	0.3	26.0	0.2	1.0	0.1	76.8	0.3	22.1	0.2	1.2	0.1
Hispanic	86.1	0.8	13.4	0.8	0.5	0.2	88.3	0.7	10.9	0.7	0.7	0.2
African-American	76.0	0.6	23.0	0.6	1.0	0.1	78.8	0.6	19.9	0.6	1.3	0.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	86.6	1.0	12.9	1.0	0.5	0.2	89.9	0.9	9.5	0.9	0.6	0.2
Native American	70.6	2.9	27.4	2.8	1.9	0.9	70.8	2.7	26.9	2.6	2.3	0.9
Other†	88.2	4.6	11.8	4.6								

Table 8 (Continued)

	Smoking Should Be Allowed:											
	1992/93				1995/96							
	Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere		Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Hospitals (cont.)												
Education (Years)												
<12	72.9	0.5	25.4	0.5	1.7	0.2	76.3	0.5	21.7	0.5	2.0	0.2
12	71.9	0.4	27.0	0.4	1.1	0.1	75.8	0.4	23.0	0.4	1.3	0.1
13-15	75.7	0.4	23.6	0.4	0.7	0.1	79.1	0.4	20.0	0.4	0.9	0.1
16+	80.3	0.4	19.2	0.4	0.5	0.1	83.3	0.4	16.1	0.4	0.6	0.1
Household Income												
<\$10,000	72.1	0.6	26.3	0.6	1.6	0.2	76.7	0.6	21.7	0.6	1.6	0.2
\$10,000-\$19,999	72.9	0.5	26.0	0.5	1.2	0.1	76.7	0.6	21.8	0.5	1.5	0.2
\$20,000-\$29,999	73.5	0.5	25.5	0.5	1.0	0.1	76.9	0.6	21.9	0.6	1.2	0.1
\$30,000-\$49,999	74.8	0.4	24.4	0.4	0.8	0.1	77.9	0.5	21.1	0.4	0.9	0.1
\$50,000-\$74,999	77.5	0.6	21.9	0.5	0.6	0.1	80.4	0.5	18.8	0.5	0.7	0.1
\$75,000 +	81.2	0.7	18.3	0.7	0.5	0.1	83.8	0.6	15.6	0.5	0.5	0.1
Unknown	75.3	1.0	23.5	0.9	1.2	0.2	77.4	0.8	21.0	0.8	1.7	0.2
Indoor Work Areas												
Overall	58.1	0.2	39.6	0.2	2.3	0.1	62.6	0.3	35.1	0.2	2.3	0.1
Smoking Status												
Never	70.3	0.3	28.8	0.3	0.9	0.1	74.1	0.3	24.9	0.3	1.0	0.1
Current	30.8	0.5	64.0	0.5	5.3	0.2	35.6	0.5	59.0	0.5	5.4	0.2
Former	59.6	0.5	38.1	0.5	2.3	0.2	63.2	0.5	34.6	0.5	2.1	0.2
Gender												
Male	53.8	0.4	42.9	0.4	3.3	0.1	58.3	0.4	38.5	0.4	3.3	0.1
Female	62.1	0.3	36.5	0.3	1.4	0.1	66.6	0.3	32.0	0.3	1.4	0.1
Age (Years)												
18-24	55.0	0.7	43.1	0.7	1.8	0.2	61.2	0.7	36.9	0.7	1.9	0.2
25-44	56.9	0.4	41.1	0.4	2.0	0.1	62.2	0.4	35.8	0.4	2.0	0.1
45-64	58.8	0.5	38.4	0.5	2.8	0.2	62.7	0.5	34.7	0.5	2.6	0.2
65+	63.0	0.6	34.3	0.6	2.8	0.2	64.7	0.6	32.5	0.6	2.8	0.2

Table 8 (Continued)

Indoor Work Areas (cont.)	Smoking Should Be Allowed:													
	1992/93				1995/96									
	Not at All	In Some	Anywhere	Not at All	In Some	Anywhere	Not at All	In Some	Anywhere	Not at All	In Some	Anywhere		
%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%		
Race/Ethnicity														
Non-Hispanic White	56.1	41.4	2.5	0.3	60.3	37.2	0.3	0.3	75.7	22.9	1.0	1.4	0.3	0.3
Hispanic	71.4	27.0	1.6	1.0	62.9	34.8	0.7	0.8	79.0	20.1	1.2	0.9	0.3	0.3
African-American	57.8	40.2	2.0	0.7	54.4	41.6	2.9	1.2	74.8	24.1	6.1	1.1	1.5	1.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	73.8	25.0	1.3	1.3	58.2	38.0	0.6	0.6	56.8	40.3	0.4	2.9	0.2	0.2
Native American	51.3	45.2	3.1	3.6	63.9	34.5	0.5	0.5	63.9	34.5	0.5	1.7	0.1	0.1
Other†	74.8	24.1	6.1	1.1	73.0	25.9	0.5	0.5	73.0	25.9	0.5	1.1	0.1	0.1
Education (Years)														
<12	54.8	41.4	3.8	0.6	58.2	38.0	0.6	0.6	58.2	38.0	0.6	3.8	0.2	0.2
12	52.7	44.5	2.8	0.4	56.8	40.3	0.4	0.4	56.8	40.3	0.4	2.9	0.2	0.2
13-15	59.5	38.8	1.7	0.5	63.9	34.5	0.5	0.5	63.9	34.5	0.5	1.7	0.1	0.1
16+	68.5	30.4	1.1	0.5	73.0	25.9	0.5	0.5	73.0	25.9	0.5	1.1	0.1	0.1
Household Income														
< \$10,000"	54.2	42.5	3.3	0.7	58.9	37.9	0.7	0.8	58.9	37.9	0.7	3.2	0.3	0.3
\$10,000-\$19,999	54.5	42.8	2.7	0.6	58.9	38.1	0.6	0.6	58.9	38.1	0.6	3.0	0.2	0.2
\$20,000-\$29,999	55.7	41.8	2.5	0.6	58.6	38.9	0.7	0.7	58.6	38.9	0.7	2.5	0.2	0.2
\$30,000-\$49,999	58.1	39.8	2.1	0.5	61.8	36.2	0.5	0.5	61.8	36.2	0.5	2.0	0.2	0.2
\$50,000-\$74,999	62.5	35.9	1.6	0.6	66.7	31.7	0.6	0.6	66.7	31.7	0.6	1.6	0.2	0.2
\$75,000 +	69.2	29.7	1.2	0.8	72.8	26.1	0.7	0.7	72.8	26.1	0.7	1.1	0.2	0.2
Unknown	58.6	38.6	2.8	1.1	62.2	34.7	0.9	0.9	62.2	34.7	0.9	3.1	0.3	0.3
Bars and Cocktail Lounges														
Overall	24.1	44.2	31.7	0.2	26.8	43.1	0.3	0.2	26.8	43.1	0.3	30.1	0.2	0.2
Smoking Status														
Never	32.7	44.8	22.4	0.3	35.8	43.7	0.4	0.3	35.8	43.7	0.4	20.5	0.3	0.3
Current	5.3	41.7	53.0	0.5	6.9	40.3	0.5	0.3	6.9	40.3	0.5	52.8	0.5	0.5
Former	24.8	45.3	29.9	0.5	26.1	44.6	0.5	0.5	26.1	44.6	0.5	29.3	0.5	0.5
Gender														
Male	22.1	42.2	35.7	0.3	24.2	41.6	0.4	0.3	24.2	41.6	0.4	34.2	0.4	0.4
Female	26.0	46.0	28.0	0.3	29.2	44.4	0.4	0.3	29.2	44.4	0.4	26.4	0.3	0.3

Table 8 (Continued)

Bars and Cocktail Lounges (cont.)	Smoking Should Be Allowed:													
	1992/93				1995/96									
	Not at All		In Some Areas		Not at All		In Some Areas		Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Age (Years)														
18-24	15.9	0.5	46.3	0.7	37.8	0.7	19.2	0.6	44.0	0.7	36.7	0.7		
25-44	21.2	0.3	46.4	0.4	32.4	0.4	23.7	0.3	45.5	0.4	30.9	0.4		
45-64	27.0	0.4	42.5	0.5	30.5	0.5	29.7	0.5	42.0	0.5	28.3	0.5		
65+	34.7	0.6	38.8	0.6	26.5	0.6	36.5	0.6	37.6	0.6	25.8	0.6		
Race/Ethnicity														
Non-Hispanic White	22.9	0.2	44.5	0.3	32.6	0.3	24.7	0.3	43.6	0.3	31.6	0.3		
Hispanic	31.1	1.1	39.4	1.1	29.5	1.0	36.4	1.1	36.8	1.1	26.8	1.0		
African-American	25.7	0.7	45.3	0.8	29.0	0.7	30.1	0.7	44.7	0.8	25.2	0.7		
Asian/Pacific Islander	31.0	1.4	46.8	1.5	22.2	1.2	36.6	1.4	44.0	1.5	19.4	1.2		
Native American	20.9	2.6	37.1	3.0	42.0	3.1	21.0	2.4	38.5	2.9	40.5	2.9		
Other†	39.7	6.9	38.0	6.9	22.3	5.9		
Education (Years)														
<12	29.4	0.5	36.9	0.6	33.7	0.6	32.7	0.6	34.8	0.6	32.5	0.6		
12	21.7	0.3	42.7	0.4	35.7	0.4	24.4	0.4	41.2	0.4	34.4	0.4		
13-15	21.5	0.4	46.4	0.5	32.1	0.5	24.0	0.4	45.3	0.5	30.6	0.5		
16+	27.3	0.5	50.1	0.5	22.6	0.5	29.4	0.5	49.0	0.5	21.6	0.5		
Household Income														
< \$10,000	25.5	0.6	38.7	0.7	35.8	0.6	29.1	0.7	37.5	0.7	33.3	0.7		
\$10,000-\$19,999	23.9	0.5	41.2	0.6	34.9	0.6	27.4	0.6	38.7	0.7	33.9	0.6		
\$20,000-\$29,999	22.6	0.5	43.8	0.6	33.7	0.6	24.3	0.6	42.0	0.7	33.7	0.6		
\$30,000-\$49,999	22.7	0.4	45.9	0.5	31.4	0.5	24.0	0.5	44.8	0.5	31.2	0.5		
\$50,000-\$74,999	24.1	0.6	47.8	0.7	28.0	0.6	25.1	0.6	48.1	0.7	26.8	0.6		
\$75,000 +	27.6	0.8	50.4	0.9	22.0	0.7	30.2	0.7	48.4	0.8	21.4	0.6		
Unknown	27.5	1.0	42.3	1.1	30.2	1.0	32.8	0.9	39.3	0.9	27.9	0.8		

Table 8 (Continued)

Indoor Sporting Events (cont.)	Smoking Should Be Allowed:											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere		Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Overall	66.9	0.2	28.6	0.2	4.4	0.1	68.6	0.2	27.5	0.2	3.9	0.1
Smoking Status												
Never	74.1	0.3	23.3	0.3	2.6	0.1	75.8	0.3	22.0	0.3	2.2	0.1
Current	48.7	0.5	42.4	0.5	8.9	0.3	49.5	0.5	42.2	0.5	8.3	0.3
Former	69.9	0.5	26.2	0.5	3.9	0.2	71.0	0.5	25.4	0.5	3.6	0.2
Gender												
Male	63.5	0.3	30.3	0.3	6.2	0.2	64.8	0.4	29.7	0.3	5.5	0.2
Female	70.1	0.3	27.2	0.3	2.8	0.1	72.0	0.3	25.5	0.3	2.5	0.1
Age (Years)												
18-24	64.0	0.7	30.7	0.6	5.3	0.3	67.3	0.7	28.6	0.7	4.1	0.3
25-44	65.5	0.4	30.3	0.3	4.3	0.2	66.7	0.4	29.6	0.4	3.7	0.1
45-64	68.5	0.5	27.3	0.4	4.3	0.2	69.8	0.5	26.2	0.4	4.0	0.2
65+	71.0	0.6	24.6	0.5	4.3	0.3	72.5	0.6	23.3	0.6	4.2	0.3
Race/Ethnicity												
Non-Hispanic White	66.2	0.3	29.2	0.3	4.6	0.1	67.6	0.3	28.2	0.3	4.2	0.1
Hispanic	72.7	1.0	23.4	1.0	3.9	0.4	76.7	1.0	20.4	0.9	2.9	0.4
African-American	65.5	0.7	30.5	0.7	4.0	0.3	66.2	0.7	30.4	0.7	3.4	0.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	74.2	1.3	23.1	1.3	2.7	0.5	77.1	1.2	21.0	1.2	1.9	0.4
Native American	67.8	2.9	26.2	2.8	6.0	1.5	63.8	2.8	31.2	2.7	4.9	1.3
Other†	75.2	6.1	21.3	5.8	3.5	2.6
Education (Years)												
<12	65.0	0.6	29.3	0.5	5.7	0.3	66.4	0.6	28.2	0.6	5.4	0.3
12	64.6	0.4	30.4	0.4	5.1	0.2	65.8	0.4	29.4	0.4	4.8	0.2
13-15	66.9	0.5	28.9	0.4	4.1	0.2	68.7	0.5	28.0	0.5	3.3	0.2
16+	72.6	0.5	24.8	0.5	2.6	0.2	74.0	0.5	23.7	0.5	2.3	0.2
Household Income												
< \$10,000	64.3	0.6	30.2	0.6	5.5	0.3	66.3	0.7	28.6	0.7	5.1	0.3
\$10,000-\$19,999	64.7	0.6	30.1	0.5	5.2	0.3	66.4	0.6	28.9	0.6	4.7	0.3
\$20,000-\$29,999	65.6	0.6	29.8	0.6	4.6	0.3	66.4	0.6	29.3	0.6	4.3	0.3
\$30,000-\$49,999	67.1	0.5	28.7	0.5	4.2	0.2	67.7	0.5	28.6	0.5	3.6	0.2

Table 8 (Continued)

Indoor Shopping Malls (cont.)	Smoking Should Be Allowed:											
	1992/93						1995/96					
	Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere		Not at All		In Some Areas		Anywhere	
	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
\$50,000-\$74,999	69.9	0.6	26.7	0.6	3.4	0.2	71.0	0.6	25.7	0.6	3.2	0.2
\$75,000 +	73.6	0.8	23.6	0.7	2.8	0.3	75.1	0.7	22.7	0.6	2.2	0.2
Unknown	66.2	1.1	28.7	1.0	5.1	0.5	67.7	0.9	27.4	0.8	4.8	0.4
Indoor Shopping Malls												
Overall	54.7	0.2	40.5	0.2	4.9	0.1	62.4	0.3	34.0	0.2	3.6	0.1
Smoking Status												
Never	64.7	0.3	32.4	0.3	3.0	0.1	71.7	0.3	26.3	0.3	2.0	0.1
Current	31.9	0.5	58.9	0.5	9.1	0.3	40.4	0.5	52.3	0.5	7.3	0.3
Former	56.1	0.5	39.2	0.5	4.6	0.2	63.1	0.5	33.3	0.5	3.6	0.2
Gender												
Male	51.7	0.4	41.7	0.4	6.5	0.2	58.9	0.4	36.1	0.4	4.9	0.2
Female	57.3	0.3	39.3	0.3	3.3	0.1	65.5	0.3	32.1	0.3	2.4	0.1

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval; "." = insufficient data.

Source: 1992/93 and 1995/96 Current Population Surveys.

*Universe: Individuals included in this table are self-responder adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must give their opinion about smoking in public places (i.e., smoking should be allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all). This is required for each public place separately; if an individual does not give his opinion about one public place, he will be included in other public places for which he did give his opinion.

†No data for 1995/96: all racial/ethnic groups were classified for this survey series.

TABLES 9A AND 9B State-Specific Attitudes About Smoking in Indoor Public Places (Restaurants, Hospitals, Indoor Work Areas, Bars and Cocktail Lounges, Indoor Sporting Events, and Indoor Shopping Malls) by Smoking Status

This table presents state-specific attitudes about restrictions on smoking in various indoor locations.

Restaurants—In the 1992/93 CPS, five states reported percentages of at least 50 percent of their population supporting smoke-free restaurants; this number increased to 19 states in the 1995/96 CPS. California and Utah had the highest percentages of people who think restaurants should be smoke-free in both the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS. The state with the lowest percentage was Kentucky, at 29 percent in the 1992/93 CPS and 30 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. Figures 7 through 9 present maps which show percentages of the population by state who think restaurants should be smoke-free for each survey year, and the change in that percentage between the 1992/93 and 1995/96 surveys. Utah had the largest change, with an increase from 53 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 68 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. In general, states in the tobacco growing areas of the Southeast and Nevada have lower levels of support for smoke-free restaurants, and states in the West have higher level of support.

Among current smokers, support for smoke-free restaurants declined in 10 states and increased in all the remaining states. California, where a statewide ban on smoking in restaurants was in place at the time of the 1995/96 CPS, had dramatically higher support for smoke-free restaurants among current smokers at 42 percent (up from 25 percent in the 1992/93 CPS), with Utah being the next highest for current smokers at 27 percent. This suggests that bans gain in acceptance as smokers experience their actual implementation.

Hospitals—Public opinion supporting smoke-free hospitals is high. In the 1992/93 CPS, 4 states reported percentages of at least 80 percent for smoke-free hospitals; this number increased to 21 states in the 1995/96 CPS. California had the highest percentage of people who think hospitals should be smoke-free in both the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS, at 85 percent and 89 percent, respectively. The states with the lowest percentages for the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS were West Virginia and Kentucky, at 56 percent and 60 percent, respectively. The maps in Figures 10 and 11 show the percentages of people who think hospitals should be smoke-free, for each state. The map in Figure 12 shows the absolute change in the percentage of people who think hospitals should be smoke-free, from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS.

The opinions of current smokers about smoke-free hospitals changed more than former and never-smokers. The percentage of West Virginian current smokers favoring smoke-free hospitals increased 43 percent between the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS, but the fraction of current smokers in South Carolina favoring smoke-free hospitals decreased by 10 percent. California had the highest percentages of current smokers, former smokers, and never-smokers supporting smoke-free hospitals for

both survey years. West Virginia and Kentucky had the lowest percentages for the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS, respectively.

Indoor Work Areas—Public opinion in most states favors smoke-free indoor work areas. In the 1992/93 CPS, 15 states reported percentages of at least 60 percent of the population who support smoke-free indoor work areas; this number increased to 31 states in the 1995/96 CPS. California had the highest percentage of people who think indoor work areas should be smoke-free in the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS, at 71 percent and 78 percent, respectively. The state with the lowest percentage of the population supporting smoke-free indoor work areas was Kentucky, at 41 percent in the 1992/93 CPS and 43 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. The maps in Figures 13 and 14 show the percentages of people for each state who think indoor work areas should be smoke-free. Washington, D.C. had the largest change of opinion favoring smoke-free workplaces, with an increase of 22 percent, from 56 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 68 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. The map in Figure 15 shows the absolute change in the percentage of people who think indoor work areas should be smoke-free, from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS.

Current smokers showed more change between the 1992/93 CPS and 1995/96 CPS in their support for smoke-free work areas than did never- or former smokers. For current smokers, the percent favoring smoke-free work areas in Washington, D.C. increased by 52 percent and Connecticut decreased by 9 percent. In the 1995/96 CPS, Kentucky and West Virginia have the lowest percentage of current smokers, former smokers, and never-smokers favoring smoke-free indoor work areas; California has the highest percentages.

Bars and Cocktail Lounges—The percentage of people who think bars and cocktail lounges should be smoke-free is lower than for other locations. In the 1992/93 CPS, only 2 states reported percentages of 30 percent or greater supporting smoke-free bars and cocktail lounges; this number increased to 11 states for the 1995/96 CPS. Mississippi had the highest percentage of people who think bars and cocktail lounges should be smoke-free in both the 1992/93 and 1995/96 CPS, at 31 percent and 35 percent, respectively. The states with the lowest percentages supporting smoke-free bars and cocktail lounges for the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS were Utah and Nevada, at 15 percent and 16 percent, respectively. Figures 16 and 17 present maps which show the percentages of people who think bars and cocktail lounges should be smoke-free, for each state. Figure 18 is a map showing the absolute change in the percentage of people who think bars and cocktail lounges should be smoke-free, from the 1992/93 CPS to the 1995/96 CPS. Maine had the largest change, with an increase of 38 percent, from 23 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 32 percent in the 1995/96 CPS. In nine states, the percentage of people who think bars and cocktail lounges should be smoke-free declined between surveys. Utah usually has a high percentage of people who think the various indoor public places should be smoke-free. For bars and cocktail lounges, however, Utah is one of the lowest states. Similarly, Mississippi is not near the top for any of the other

smoke-free indoor public places, but leads the states for smoke-free bars and cocktail lounges.

Between the 1992/93 CPS and 1995/96 CPS, the fraction of current smokers in Iowa favoring smoke-free bars and cocktail lounges dropped 38 percent, and the percentage of Vermont's current smokers favoring smoke-free bars and cocktail lounges increased 139 percent. Maine, Nevada, and Rhode Island also had increases in support greater than 100 percent among current smokers. Never-smokers showed less change; the percentage of never-smokers in Arizona favoring smoke-free bars and cocktail lounges increased by 37 percent and decreased 15 percent in Hawaii. However, support for smoke-free bars remains higher among never-smokers than among current smokers.

Indoor Sporting Events—Most people think indoor sporting events should be smoke-free. The percentage of people favoring smoke-free indoor sporting events was 75 percent or higher for 10 states in the 1992/93 CPS and was 75 percent or higher for 14 states in the 1995/96 CPS. Montana and Utah had the highest percentages of people who think indoor sporting events should be smoke-free in the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS, at 78 percent and 82 percent, respectively. The states with the lowest percentages favoring smoke-free indoor sporting events for the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS were Kentucky and North Carolina, at 53 percent and 54 percent, respectively. The maps in Figures 19 and 20 show the percentages of people who think indoor sporting events should be smoke-free for each state. The map in Figure 21 shows the absolute change between the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS in the percentage of people who think indoor sporting events should be smoke-free. Washington, D.C. had the largest change of opinion supporting smoke-free indoor sporting events, with an increase of 14 percent, from 59 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 67 percent in the 1995/96 CPS.

Indoor Shopping Malls—There was an increase in support for smoke-free indoor shopping malls between the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS. In the 1992/93 CPS, only one state reported 70 percent or more of the population supporting smoke-free indoor shopping malls; this number increased to eight states in the 1995/96 CPS. Utah had the highest percentage of people who think indoor shopping malls should be smoke-free in both the 1992/93 and 1995/96 CPS, at 70 percent and 82 percent, respectively. The state with the lowest percentage for the 1992/93 and 1995/96 CPS was Kentucky, at 37 percent and 42 percent, respectively. The maps in Figures 22 and 23 show the percentages for each state of people who think indoor shopping malls should be smoke-free. The map in Figure 24 shows the absolute change between the 1992/93 CPS and the 1995/96 CPS in the percentage of people who think indoor shopping malls should be smoke-free. Delaware had the largest change, with an increase of 28 percent, from 45 percent in the 1992/93 CPS to 58 percent in the 1995/96 CPS.

South Carolina is the only state that consistently declined in percentage of the population who think various indoor public places should be smoke-free. This state was at the bottom of the list for change for all six public places asked about in the survey.

South Carolina: Change in attitudes about smoking in indoor public places

Area	Absolute Change	Relative Change
Bars and Cocktail Lounges	-3%	-11%
Indoor Shopping Malls	-2%	-4%
Indoor Work Areas	-1%	-1%
Indoor Sporting Events	-6%	-9%
Restaurants	-6%	-13%
Hospitals	-4%	-5%

Figure 7: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Restaurants: 1992/93





Figure 8: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Restaurants: 1995/96



**Figure 9: Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Restaurants:
1992/93 to 1995/96**




Figure 10: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Hospitals: 1992/93





Figure 11: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Hospitals: 1995/96



Data Source: 1995/96 Current Population Survey
Note: States categorized by quintiles

Figure 12: Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Hospitals: 1992/93 to 1995/96




Figure 13: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Work Areas: 1992/93




Figure 14: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Work Areas: 1995/96




Figure 15: Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Work Areas: 1992/93 to 1995/96




Figure 16: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Bars and Cocktail Lounges: 1992/93




Figure 17: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Bars and Cocktail Lounges: 1995/96




Figure 18: Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Bars and Cocktail Lounges: 1992/93 to 1995/96




Figure 19: Attitudes Regarding Smoking During Indoor Sporting Events: 1992/93




Figure 20: Attitudes Regarding Smoking During Indoor Sporting Events: 1995/96




Figure 21: Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking During Indoor Sporting Events: 1992/93 to 1995/96




Figure 22: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Shopping Malls: 1992/93





Figure 23: Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Shopping Malls: 1995/96



Data Source: 1995/96 Current Population Survey
Note: States categorized by quintiles

Figure 24: Change in Attitudes Regarding Smoking in Indoor Shopping Malls: 1992/93 to 1995/96




Table 9a
 State-Specific Attitudes about Smoking in Indoor Public Places (Restaurants, Hospitals, Indoor Work Areas, Bars and Cocktail Lounges, Indoor Sporting Events, and Indoor Shopping Malls) by Smoking Status*—1992/93

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants			Hospitals			Indoor Work Areas			Bars and Cocktail Lounges			Indoor Sporting Events			Indoor Shopping Malls		
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI		
Alabama	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.8	2.3	71.7	2.0	59.9	2.2	29.9	2.1	67.0	2.1	55.3	2.3						
		Allowed in some areas	48.8	2.3	26.7	2.0	37.4	2.2	38.0	2.2	27.9	2.0	39.5	2.2						
		Allowed in all areas	3.4	0.8	1.5	0.6	2.8	0.7	32.1	2.1	5.0	1.0	5.2	1.0						
	Never	Not allowed at all	59.5	3.1	80.8	2.5	72.2	2.8	39.1	3.1	76.1	2.7	65.7	3.0						
		Allowed in some areas	38.9	3.1	18.7	2.4	26.7	2.8	37.9	3.1	21.7	2.6	31.9	2.9						
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.8	0.5	0.4	1.1	0.7	23.0	2.6	2.2	0.9	2.4	1.0						
	Current	Not allowed at all	20.1	3.6	50.1	4.4	33.8	4.2	9.1	2.6	47.3	4.4	32.9	4.2						
		Allowed in some areas	72.8	4.0	45.7	4.4	60.1	4.4	39.7	4.4	41.9	4.4	55.9	4.4						
		Allowed in all areas	7.1	2.3	4.1	1.8	6.1	2.1	51.2	4.4	10.8	2.8	11.2	2.8						
Former	Not allowed at all	52.8	4.9	75.8	4.2	61.2	4.8	32.5	4.6	69.0	4.5	57.1	4.8							
	Allowed in some areas	43.7	4.8	23.2	4.1	36.1	4.7	36.3	4.7	26.2	4.3	38.2	4.7							
	Allowed in all areas	3.5	1.8	1.0	1.0	2.7	1.6	31.2	4.6	4.9	2.1	4.7	2.1							
Alaska	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.2	2.1	75.9	1.8	59.8	2.1	22.4	1.8	72.1	1.9	57.8	2.1						
		Allowed in some areas	49.7	2.1	22.8	1.8	37.8	2.1	48.6	2.1	24.9	1.8	38.5	2.1						
		Allowed in all areas	3.0	0.7	1.3	0.5	2.4	0.7	29.0	1.9	2.9	0.7	3.7	0.8						
	Never	Not allowed at all	61.8	3.1	86.2	2.2	73.7	2.8	34.0	3.0	79.3	2.6	68.1	2.9						
		Allowed in some areas	37.1	3.0	13.7	2.2	26.1	2.8	49.6	3.2	19.9	2.5	30.0	2.9						
		Allowed in all areas	1.0	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	16.4	2.3	0.8	0.6	1.9	0.9						
	Current	Not allowed at all	21.3	3.3	56.1	3.9	34.4	3.8	4.7	1.7	58.9	3.9	38.8	3.9						
		Allowed in some areas	72.7	3.5	40.3	3.9	59.8	3.9	43.8	3.9	35.0	3.8	54.5	4.0						
		Allowed in all areas	6.0	1.9	3.6	1.5	5.9	1.9	51.5	4.0	6.1	1.9	6.7	2.0						
Former	Not allowed at all	50.3	4.2	79.7	3.4	63.4	4.0	21.7	3.4	74.3	3.7	60.9	4.1							
	Allowed in some areas	46.4	4.2	19.4	3.3	34.2	4.0	52.1	4.2	22.6	3.5	35.7	4.0							
	Allowed in all areas	3.3	1.5	0.9	0.8	2.4	1.3	26.2	3.7	3.1	1.5	3.4	1.5							

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Arizona	Overall	Not allowed at all	48.9	2.1	78.4	1.7	65.2	2.0	19.5	1.7	68.0	1.9	58.0	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	48.7	2.1	21.1	1.7	33.1	2.0	46.0	2.1	28.1	1.9	38.1	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	2.4	0.6	0.5	0.3	1.7	0.5	34.5	2.0	3.9	0.8	4.0	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	62.6	2.8	86.2	2.0	77.5	2.4	26.8	2.6	74.6	2.5	68.7	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	36.9	2.8	13.7	2.0	21.9	2.4	48.6	2.9	23.4	2.4	28.8	2.6
		Allowed in all areas	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.5	24.6	2.5	2.0	0.8	2.5	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	18.6	3.4	59.9	4.2	37.4	4.2	3.8	1.7	49.6	4.3	35.9	4.1
		Allowed in some areas	76.1	3.7	39.2	4.2	59.4	4.3	41.2	4.3	42.7	4.3	58.5	4.3
		Allowed in all areas	5.3	1.9	0.9	0.8	3.2	1.5	55.0	4.3	7.7	2.3	5.6	2.0
Former	Not allowed at all	47.9	4.2	79.1	3.4	64.8	4.0	18.7	3.3	71.1	3.8	56.0	4.2	
	Allowed in some areas	48.4	4.2	19.7	3.3	32.4	4.0	45.2	4.2	24.4	3.6	38.6	4.1	
	Allowed in all areas	3.6	1.6	1.2	0.9	2.7	1.4	36.1	4.1	4.5	1.7	5.5	1.9	
Arkansas	Overall	Not allowed at all	41.1	2.2	68.3	2.1	52.8	2.3	23.8	2.0	66.0	2.2	53.8	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	54.4	2.3	30.1	2.1	44.0	2.3	35.9	2.2	29.1	2.1	39.5	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	4.4	0.9	1.6	0.6	3.2	0.8	40.3	2.3	4.9	1.0	6.7	1.1
	Never	Not allowed at all	55.3	3.2	80.5	2.5	67.9	3.0	34.0	3.1	75.0	2.8	67.1	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	42.4	3.2	18.6	2.5	30.8	3.0	35.4	3.1	23.1	2.7	29.6	2.9
		Allowed in all areas	2.2	0.9	0.9	0.6	1.3	0.7	30.6	3.0	1.9	0.9	3.3	1.1
	Current	Not allowed at all	13.8	2.9	45.3	4.2	23.9	3.6	4.8	1.8	47.2	4.3	30.1	3.9
		Allowed in some areas	78.5	3.5	52.7	4.2	70.6	3.9	37.8	4.2	43.5	4.2	58.2	4.2
		Allowed in all areas	7.7	2.3	2.0	1.2	5.5	1.9	57.3	4.2	9.3	2.5	11.7	2.7
Former	Not allowed at all	44.2	4.9	70.4	4.5	56.2	4.9	25.2	4.3	70.1	4.5	54.2	4.9	
	Allowed in some areas	50.5	4.9	27.2	4.4	39.3	4.8	34.4	4.7	23.8	4.2	37.9	4.8	
	Allowed in all areas	5.4	2.2	2.5	1.5	4.6	2.1	40.5	4.9	6.1	2.4	7.9	2.7	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
California	Overall	Not allowed at all	55.9	0.8	84.7	0.6	71.1	0.7	27.2	0.7	71.4	0.7	63.4	0.8
		Allowed in some areas	41.5	0.8	14.6	0.6	27.2	0.7	42.5	0.8	23.9	0.7	31.6	0.7
		Allowed in all areas	2.6	0.3	0.7	0.1	1.8	0.2	30.3	0.7	4.6	0.3	5.0	0.4
	Never	Not allowed at all	66.5	1.0	90.2	0.6	79.6	0.8	34.5	1.0	76.9	0.9	70.9	1.0
		Allowed in some areas	32.3	1.0	9.6	0.6	19.6	0.8	43.7	1.0	20.3	0.8	25.9	0.9
		Allowed in all areas	1.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.8	0.2	21.8	0.9	2.9	0.3	3.2	0.4
	Current	Not allowed at all	25.4	1.6	70.0	1.7	47.1	1.8	7.0	0.9	54.2	1.8	42.7	1.8
		Allowed in some areas	67.7	1.7	28.1	1.6	48.6	1.8	37.4	1.8	35.7	1.7	46.9	1.8
		Allowed in all areas	6.9	0.9	1.9	0.5	4.4	0.7	55.6	1.8	10.1	1.1	10.4	1.1
Former	Not allowed at all	54.8	1.7	83.2	1.3	69.7	1.6	26.1	1.5	72.4	1.5	61.9	1.7	
	Allowed in some areas	42.6	1.7	16.1	1.3	28.4	1.5	43.8	1.7	23.0	1.4	32.9	1.6	
	Allowed in all areas	2.5	0.5	0.8	0.3	1.9	0.5	30.1	1.6	4.6	0.7	5.2	0.8	
Colorado	Overall	Not allowed at all	46.1	2.3	75.2	2.0	60.2	2.2	21.4	1.9	69.8	2.1	55.2	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	51.4	2.3	24.4	2.0	38.4	2.2	48.3	2.3	26.0	2.0	41.8	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	2.4	0.7	0.4	0.3	1.4	0.5	30.3	2.1	4.1	0.9	3.0	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	59.5	3.2	82.8	2.4	71.5	2.9	29.5	3.0	74.0	2.8	64.2	3.1
		Allowed in some areas	39.4	3.2	17.2	2.4	28.2	2.9	50.5	3.3	23.2	2.7	33.6	3.1
		Allowed in all areas	1.1	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	20.0	2.6	2.7	1.1	2.3	1.0
	Current	Not allowed at all	17.5	3.5	59.0	4.5	34.3	4.4	3.7	1.7	56.0	4.6	35.1	4.4
		Allowed in some areas	77.9	3.8	40.3	4.5	62.0	4.5	43.9	4.6	35.7	4.4	59.8	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	4.6	1.9	0.7	0.8	3.7	1.7	52.4	4.6	8.2	2.5	5.1	2.0
Former	Not allowed at all	47.6	4.4	76.2	3.8	63.0	4.3	22.7	3.7	74.8	3.9	57.2	4.4	
	Allowed in some areas	49.5	4.4	23.1	3.7	35.6	4.3	48.2	4.5	22.2	3.7	40.5	4.4	
	Allowed in all areas	2.9	1.5	0.8	0.8	1.4	1.0	29.1	4.1	3.0	1.5	2.3	1.3	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Connecticut	Overall	Not allowed at all	50.3	2.3	81.5	1.8	61.8	2.3	28.2	2.1	72.0	2.1	59.7	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	48.1	2.3	18.1	1.8	37.2	2.3	47.7	2.3	25.7	2.0	37.1	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.9	0.5	24.1	2.0	2.3	0.7	3.2	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	62.9	3.2	89.6	2.0	72.7	2.9	37.2	3.2	76.8	2.8	68.9	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	36.6	3.2	89.6	2.0	27.2	2.9	45.9	3.3	21.9	2.7	29.0	3.0
		Allowed in all areas	0.4	0.4	10.4	2.0	0.1	0.2	17.0	2.5	1.3	0.8	2.2	1.0
	Current	Not allowed at all	21.4	4.0	64.4	4.6	38.4	4.7	7.7	2.6	59.4	4.7	40.9	4.7
		Allowed in some areas	74.8	4.2	34.9	4.6	59.5	4.7	51.5	4.8	36.3	4.6	54.5	4.8
		Allowed in all areas	3.7	1.8	0.7	0.8	2.1	1.4	40.8	4.7	4.3	2.0	4.6	2.0
Delaware	Former	Not allowed at all	51.6	4.7	81.0	3.7	61.7	4.6	29.0	4.2	74.1	4.1	58.7	4.6
		Allowed in some areas	46.3	4.7	18.3	3.6	36.7	4.5	48.1	4.7	23.6	4.0	37.2	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	2.1	1.4	0.7	0.8	1.6	1.2	22.9	3.9	2.2	1.4	4.1	1.9
	Overall	Not allowed at all	39.1	2.2	71.2	2.1	52.8	2.3	22.5	1.9	58.7	2.2	45.3	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	57.6	2.2	27.3	2.0	44.3	2.3	48.0	2.3	36.5	2.2	49.6	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	3.3	0.8	1.5	0.5	2.9	0.8	29.4	2.1	4.8	1.0	5.1	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	50.7	3.2	79.6	2.6	63.6	3.1	32.0	3.0	67.5	3.0	57.5	3.2
		Allowed in some areas	47.4	3.2	19.1	2.5	34.6	3.1	47.1	3.2	28.8	2.9	38.6	3.1
		Allowed in all areas	1.9	0.9	1.3	0.7	1.8	0.9	20.9	2.6	3.8	1.2	3.9	1.2
Current	Not allowed at all	14.8	3.3	50.7	4.6	26.3	4.1	4.7	2.0	37.1	4.5	20.9	3.8	
	Allowed in some areas	79.5	3.7	46.9	4.6	68.4	4.3	48.5	4.6	56.0	4.6	70.3	4.2	
	Allowed in all areas	5.7	2.1	2.4	1.4	5.3	2.1	46.9	4.6	6.9	2.3	8.8	2.6	
Former	Not allowed at all	39.2	4.4	74.1	3.9	56.3	4.5	21.0	3.7	61.7	4.4	44.3	4.4	
	Allowed in some areas	57.1	4.4	24.9	3.9	41.2	4.4	49.4	4.5	33.3	4.2	51.7	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	3.7	1.7	1.1	0.9	2.6	1.4	29.5	4.1	5.0	1.9	4.0	1.8	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	District of Columbia	Overall/Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
				%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
District of Columbia	Overall	Overall	Not allowed at all	41.1	2.4	78.1	2.0	55.9	2.4	23.5	2.1	58.7	2.4	46.5	2.4
			Allowed in some areas	56.6	2.4	21.1	2.0	42.2	2.4	57.9	2.4	37.7	2.4	49.6	2.4
			Allowed in all areas	2.3	0.7	0.7	0.4	1.9	0.7	18.6	1.9	3.6	0.9	3.9	0.9
	Never	Never	Not allowed at all	48.5	3.2	83.3	2.4	63.1	3.1	27.7	2.9	63.4	3.1	53.0	3.2
			Allowed in some areas	50.3	3.2	16.3	2.4	36.0	3.1	58.6	3.2	34.7	3.1	44.3	3.2
			Allowed in all areas	1.2	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.9	0.6	13.7	2.2	1.8	0.9	2.6	1.0
	Current	Current	Not allowed at all	17.9	3.9	64.9	4.9	30.4	4.7	7.2	2.6	43.3	5.1	27.0	4.5
			Allowed in some areas	76.2	4.3	33.5	4.8	65.0	4.9	60.1	5.0	48.4	5.1	65.7	4.9
			Allowed in all areas	5.8	2.4	1.5	1.3	4.6	2.1	32.7	4.8	8.4	2.8	7.3	2.7
	Former	Former	Not allowed at all	46.2	5.4	78.5	4.4	64.1	5.2	30.1	5.0	62.9	5.2	50.0	5.4
			Allowed in some areas	52.2	5.4	20.8	4.4	34.2	5.2	53.2	5.4	33.9	5.1	46.5	5.4
			Allowed in all areas	1.6	1.4	0.7	0.9	1.7	1.4	16.6	4.0	3.2	1.9	3.5	2.0
Florida	Overall	Overall	Not allowed at all	46.8	1.0	76.2	0.9	61.2	1.0	27.1	0.9	65.1	1.0	54.1	1.0
			Allowed in some areas	49.7	1.0	22.8	0.8	36.3	1.0	42.2	1.0	29.3	0.9	39.9	1.0
			Allowed in all areas	3.5	0.4	1.0	0.2	2.5	0.3	30.7	0.9	5.6	0.5	6.0	0.5
	Never	Never	Not allowed at all	61.4	1.4	85.2	1.0	73.0	1.3	37.5	1.4	72.9	1.3	65.4	1.3
			Allowed in some areas	37.1	1.4	14.5	1.0	25.9	1.2	42.2	1.4	23.6	1.2	31.1	1.3
			Allowed in all areas	1.5	0.3	0.4	0.2	1.1	0.3	20.3	1.1	3.6	0.5	3.5	0.5
	Current	Current	Not allowed at all	16.8	1.5	57.3	2.0	35.2	1.9	6.0	1.0	46.6	2.0	29.0	1.8
			Allowed in some areas	76.2	1.7	40.5	2.0	59.6	2.0	40.2	2.0	43.2	2.0	59.4	2.0
			Allowed in all areas	7.0	1.0	2.2	0.6	5.2	0.9	53.8	2.0	10.2	1.2	11.6	1.3
	Former	Former	Not allowed at all	47.1	2.0	76.9	1.7	63.2	1.9	27.3	1.8	67.6	1.9	55.9	2.0
			Allowed in some areas	48.9	2.0	22.0	1.6	34.2	1.9	43.9	2.0	27.3	1.8	38.4	1.9
			Allowed in all areas	4.0	0.8	1.1	0.4	2.6	0.6	28.8	1.8	5.2	0.9	5.7	0.9

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Georgia	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.1	2.1	73.9	1.9	58.3	2.1	29.5	1.9	65.1	2.0	53.7	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	50.3	2.1	25.0	1.8	39.6	2.1	42.7	2.1	29.9	1.9	40.4	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	2.6	0.7	1.1	0.4	2.2	0.6	27.8	1.9	4.9	0.9	6.0	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	59.3	2.8	83.6	2.1	69.4	2.7	39.0	2.8	74.0	2.5	63.5	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	40.0	2.8	15.9	2.1	29.7	2.6	41.0	2.8	23.6	2.5	32.5	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.9	0.6	20.0	2.3	2.4	0.9	4.0	1.1
	Current	Not allowed at all	17.9	3.2	52.7	4.2	30.5	3.9	8.1	2.3	44.1	4.2	29.3	3.8
		Allowed in some areas	74.9	3.6	44.7	4.2	64.3	4.0	44.6	4.2	44.2	4.2	59.4	4.1
		Allowed in all areas	7.3	2.2	2.5	1.3	5.1	1.9	47.3	4.2	11.7	2.7	11.3	2.7
Former	Not allowed at all	50.9	4.6	74.7	4.0	63.1	4.5	30.8	4.3	67.9	4.3	57.7	4.6	
	Allowed in some areas	47.1	4.6	24.5	4.0	35.2	4.4	44.9	4.6	28.8	4.2	37.7	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	2.0	1.3	0.7	0.8	1.7	1.2	24.4	4.0	3.4	1.7	4.6	1.9	
Overall	Not allowed at all	47.1	2.2	81.8	1.7	67.0	2.1	24.4	1.9	69.0	2.0	56.9	2.2	
	Allowed in some areas	50.3	2.2	17.8	1.7	31.7	2.0	46.6	2.2	26.9	1.9	39.3	2.1	
	Allowed in all areas	2.6	0.7	0.4	0.3	1.3	0.5	29.0	2.0	4.1	0.9	3.9	0.8	
Never	Not allowed at all	56.8	2.9	86.3	2.0	74.8	2.6	33.0	2.8	72.6	2.6	62.9	2.9	
	Allowed in some areas	42.7	2.9	13.6	2.0	24.8	2.6	49.8	3.0	24.6	2.6	34.9	2.8	
	Allowed in all areas	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.4	17.2	2.2	2.8	1.0	2.2	0.9	
Current	Not allowed at all	23.7	3.9	69.4	4.3	44.3	4.6	6.8	2.3	55.9	4.6	40.9	4.5	
	Allowed in some areas	68.9	4.3	29.5	4.2	52.0	4.6	35.0	4.4	35.9	4.4	50.4	4.6	
	Allowed in all areas	7.4	2.4	1.1	1.0	3.8	1.8	58.2	4.6	8.2	2.5	8.7	2.6	
Former	Not allowed at all	47.2	4.6	83.2	3.5	71.0	4.2	21.0	3.8	73.6	4.1	58.2	4.6	
	Allowed in some areas	49.9	4.6	16.0	3.4	27.8	4.2	50.4	4.6	23.2	3.9	38.6	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	2.9	1.5	0.7	0.8	1.2	1.0	28.5	4.2	3.3	1.7	3.1	1.6	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Idaho	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.9	2.1	76.0	1.8	62.1	2.0	22.9	1.7	76.6	1.8	65.3	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	49.3	2.1	23.2	1.8	35.5	2.0	36.7	2.0	20.1	1.7	31.5	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	2.8	0.7	0.8	0.4	2.3	0.6	40.4	2.0	3.3	0.7	3.2	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	62.3	2.8	84.5	2.1	73.6	2.5	31.2	2.7	82.6	2.2	74.6	2.5
		Allowed in some areas	36.8	2.8	84.5	2.1	25.9	2.5	39.0	2.8	16.0	2.1	24.1	2.4
		Allowed in all areas	0.9	0.5	15.5	2.1	0.5	0.4	29.8	2.6	1.4	0.7	1.2	0.6
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.2	3.1	56.9	4.2	33.8	4.0	3.6	1.6	61.4	4.1	43.2	4.2
		Allowed in some areas	77.7	3.5	41.1	4.1	60.5	4.1	29.7	3.9	31.5	3.9	49.7	4.2
		Allowed in all areas	6.1	2.0	2.0	1.2	5.7	2.0	66.7	4.0	7.1	2.2	7.1	2.2
Former	Not allowed at all	48.4	4.3	76.6	3.7	65.6	4.1	24.2	3.7	78.7	3.6	67.2	4.1	
	Allowed in some areas	48.1	4.3	22.0	3.6	31.5	4.0	38.9	4.2	17.7	3.3	29.2	4.0	
	Allowed in all areas	3.5	1.6	1.4	1.0	3.0	1.5	36.9	4.2	3.6	1.6	3.6	1.6	
Illinois	Overall	Not allowed at all	43.5	1.1	73.5	1.0	55.2	1.1	22.6	1.0	65.3	1.1	52.9	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	52.7	1.1	25.2	1.0	42.3	1.1	43.4	1.1	29.7	1.0	42.6	1.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.8	0.4	1.3	0.3	2.5	0.4	34.0	1.1	5.0	0.5	4.4	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	56.0	1.6	84.3	1.2	68.2	1.5	30.9	1.5	72.5	1.4	63.2	1.5
		Allowed in some areas	42.3	1.6	15.0	1.1	30.9	1.5	45.0	1.6	24.6	1.4	34.0	1.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.7	0.4	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.3	24.1	1.4	2.9	0.5	2.9	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	15.0	1.6	51.0	2.3	27.2	2.0	4.5	0.9	46.2	2.3	30.4	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	77.2	1.9	46.5	2.3	67.0	2.1	39.0	2.2	43.5	2.3	61.1	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	7.9	1.2	2.5	0.7	5.8	1.1	56.5	2.3	10.4	1.4	8.5	1.3
Former	Not allowed at all	46.6	2.4	73.9	2.1	56.4	2.4	23.8	2.0	69.8	2.2	54.4	2.4	
	Allowed in some areas	49.4	2.4	24.9	2.1	41.2	2.3	44.4	2.4	26.0	2.1	42.2	2.3	
	Allowed in all areas	4.0	0.9	1.2	0.5	2.4	0.7	31.7	2.2	4.1	0.9	3.4	0.9	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Indiana	Overall	Not allowed at all	38.0	2.1	67.5	2.1	50.3	2.2	20.6	1.8	68.1	2.0	48.4	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	58.0	2.2	31.1	2.0	46.5	2.2	44.0	2.2	27.9	2.0	46.3	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	4.0	0.9	1.3	0.5	3.2	0.8	35.4	2.1	4.0	0.9	5.3	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	52.7	3.1	80.7	2.4	65.5	2.9	29.9	2.8	77.4	2.6	61.0	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	45.9	3.1	18.8	2.4	33.2	2.9	44.5	3.1	20.9	2.5	36.5	3.0
		Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.7	0.5	0.4	1.3	0.7	25.7	2.7	1.8	0.8	2.4	1.0
Current		Not allowed at all	11.9	2.7	42.5	4.1	21.7	3.4	3.7	1.6	48.5	4.2	24.2	3.6
		Allowed in some areas	79.8	3.4	54.5	4.2	71.6	3.8	42.2	4.1	42.4	4.1	65.5	4.0
		Allowed in all areas	8.3	2.3	3.0	1.4	6.7	2.1	54.2	4.2	9.1	2.4	10.4	2.5
Former		Not allowed at all	37.1	4.6	68.9	4.4	51.3	4.7	20.9	3.9	71.7	4.3	49.9	4.7
		Allowed in some areas	58.4	4.7	30.0	4.3	45.6	4.7	45.1	4.7	25.7	4.1	44.7	4.7
		Allowed in all areas	4.4	1.9	1.1	1.0	3.1	1.6	34.0	4.5	2.6	1.5	5.5	2.1
Overall		Not allowed at all	42.5	2.1	72.9	1.9	56.2	2.1	21.9	1.8	74.2	1.9	52.2	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	54.4	2.1	26.3	1.9	41.4	2.1	43.5	2.1	22.9	1.8	44.2	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.1	0.7	0.8	0.4	2.4	0.7	34.6	2.0	2.9	0.7	3.5	0.8
Never		Not allowed at all	56.0	2.9	82.9	2.2	70.7	2.7	30.2	2.7	79.6	2.4	63.1	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	42.8	2.9	16.9	2.2	28.6	2.6	47.1	2.9	18.2	2.3	34.9	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	1.2	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.5	22.8	2.5	2.2	0.9	2.0	0.8
Current		Not allowed at all	12.8	2.9	51.3	4.4	24.8	3.8	3.7	1.7	58.4	4.3	25.8	3.8
		Allowed in some areas	80.6	3.4	46.8	4.3	69.1	4.0	36.0	4.2	36.8	4.2	67.4	4.1
		Allowed in all areas	6.6	2.2	1.9	1.2	6.1	2.1	60.2	4.3	4.8	1.9	6.8	2.2
Former		Not allowed at all	42.4	4.5	72.3	4.1	55.5	4.5	21.6	3.7	78.5	3.7	54.7	4.5
		Allowed in some areas	54.1	4.5	27.0	4.0	42.0	4.5	43.2	4.5	18.9	3.6	41.5	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	3.6	1.7	0.8	0.8	2.5	1.4	35.3	4.4	2.6	1.4	3.8	1.7

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants			Hospitals			Indoor Work Areas			Bars and Cocktail Lounges			Indoor Sporting Events			Indoor Shopping Malls		
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI		
Kansas	Overall	Not allowed at all	43.6	2.1	72.5	1.9	55.7	2.1	22.8	1.8	68.9	2.0	53.0	2.1						
		Allowed in some areas	53.7	2.1	26.9	1.9	41.9	2.1	41.5	2.1	27.0	1.9	43.3	2.1						
		Allowed in all areas	2.8	0.7	0.6	0.3	2.4	0.6	35.6	2.0	4.1	0.8	3.7	0.8						
	Never	Not allowed at all	58.2	2.9	84.1	2.2	70.3	2.7	32.1	2.7	77.6	2.5	65.2	2.8						
		Allowed in some areas	40.9	2.9	15.6	2.1	29.0	2.7	42.1	2.9	20.2	2.4	32.6	2.8						
		Allowed in all areas	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.5	25.8	2.6	2.2	0.9	2.2	0.9						
	Current	Not allowed at all	12.3	2.8	48.0	4.2	24.5	3.6	3.3	1.5	47.9	4.2	25.6	3.7						
		Allowed in some areas	81.7	3.3	50.9	4.2	69.8	3.9	40.9	4.1	43.3	4.2	67.6	3.9						
		Allowed in all areas	6.0	2.0	1.1	0.9	5.7	2.0	55.8	4.2	8.8	2.4	6.8	2.1						
Former	Not allowed at all	44.9	4.3	73.2	3.8	56.9	4.3	23.3	3.7	72.3	3.9	55.4	4.3							
	Allowed in some areas	51.9	4.3	26.1	3.8	40.5	4.3	41.0	4.3	24.4	3.7	40.8	4.3							
	Allowed in all areas	3.3	1.5	0.7	0.7	2.5	1.4	35.7	4.2	3.3	1.6	3.8	1.7							
Kentucky	Overall	Not allowed at all	28.8	2.0	59.4	2.2	40.7	2.2	16.8	1.7	53.3	2.2	36.5	2.1						
		Allowed in some areas	64.1	2.1	37.9	2.1	54.1	2.2	43.8	2.2	39.8	2.2	53.9	2.2						
		Allowed in all areas	7.0	1.1	2.7	0.7	5.2	1.0	39.4	2.2	6.8	1.1	9.5	1.3						
	Never	Not allowed at all	40.5	3.2	72.0	2.9	54.7	3.3	23.7	2.8	61.9	3.2	45.3	3.3						
		Allowed in some areas	56.3	3.2	27.1	2.9	43.8	3.3	44.9	3.3	34.1	3.1	48.1	3.3						
		Allowed in all areas	3.2	1.1	1.0	0.6	1.5	0.8	31.5	3.1	4.0	1.3	6.6	1.6						
	Current	Not allowed at all	7.8	2.1	36.9	3.7	17.0	2.9	4.3	1.6	38.3	3.7	21.5	3.1						
		Allowed in some areas	79.2	3.1	57.7	3.8	72.0	3.4	41.8	3.8	50.3	3.8	63.8	3.7						
		Allowed in all areas	13.0	2.6	5.4	1.7	11.0	2.4	53.9	3.8	11.4	2.4	14.7	2.7						
Former	Not allowed at all	36.4	4.5	67.3	4.4	47.4	4.7	21.9	3.9	58.4	4.6	41.2	4.6							
	Allowed in some areas	57.6	4.6	30.3	4.3	48.8	4.7	44.5	4.7	35.8	4.5	51.0	4.7							
	Allowed in all areas	6.0	2.2	2.4	1.4	3.8	1.8	33.6	4.4	5.8	2.2	7.7	2.5							

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Louisiana	Overall	Not allowed at all	46.0	2.3	73.3	2.0	57.1	2.3	25.7	2.0	64.8	2.2	48.0	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	50.1	2.3	25.5	2.0	39.7	2.3	33.5	2.2	28.4	2.1	44.3	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	3.9	0.9	1.3	0.5	3.2	0.8	40.8	2.3	6.8	1.2	7.7	1.2
	Never	Not allowed at all	55.4	3.2	82.0	2.5	68.1	3.0	32.4	3.0	71.6	2.9	55.1	3.2
		Allowed in some areas	43.0	3.2	17.5	2.4	30.9	3.0	34.6	3.1	24.2	2.7	40.3	3.1
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.6	33.0	3.0	4.2	1.3	4.5	1.3
	Current	Not allowed at all	21.8	3.7	55.3	4.5	31.8	4.2	7.5	2.4	48.6	4.5	29.8	4.1
		Allowed in some areas	72.0	4.1	42.2	4.5	60.7	4.4	32.7	4.3	38.5	4.4	56.8	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	6.2	2.2	2.5	1.4	7.5	2.4	59.7	4.5	12.9	3.0	13.3	3.1
	Former	Not allowed at all	52.5	4.9	73.8	4.3	60.9	4.8	31.3	4.6	67.8	4.6	52.7	4.9
		Allowed in some areas	41.1	4.8	24.5	4.2	35.7	4.7	31.8	4.6	26.4	4.3	38.9	4.8
		Allowed in all areas	6.4	2.4	1.8	1.3	3.4	1.8	36.9	4.7	5.7	2.3	8.4	2.7
Overall	Not allowed at all	43.3	2.1	73.0	1.9	55.8	2.1	23.4	1.8	74.8	1.9	61.0	2.1	
	Allowed in some areas	53.9	2.2	26.3	1.9	42.3	2.1	50.3	2.2	22.8	1.8	36.8	2.1	
	Allowed in all areas	2.9	0.7	0.7	0.4	2.0	0.6	26.2	1.9	2.5	0.7	2.2	0.6	
Never	Not allowed at all	58.5	3.3	84.5	2.4	71.0	3.0	34.2	3.1	82.1	2.5	70.6	3.0	
	Allowed in some areas	40.5	3.2	15.4	2.4	28.1	3.0	50.1	3.3	16.8	2.5	28.3	3.0	
	Allowed in all areas	1.0	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.9	0.6	15.7	2.4	1.1	0.7	1.1	0.7	
Current	Not allowed at all	17.7	3.0	53.3	3.9	30.2	3.6	4.2	1.6	59.8	3.9	43.3	3.9	
	Allowed in some areas	76.2	3.4	45.4	3.9	65.8	3.7	52.2	4.0	35.6	3.8	53.2	3.9	
	Allowed in all areas	6.1	1.9	1.3	0.9	4.0	1.5	43.5	3.9	4.6	1.7	3.5	1.5	
Former	Not allowed at all	47.4	4.1	76.6	3.5	60.1	4.0	27.6	3.7	79.6	3.3	65.3	3.9	
	Allowed in some areas	50.3	4.1	22.5	3.4	38.4	4.0	48.6	4.1	18.2	3.2	32.2	3.9	
	Allowed in all areas	2.3	1.2	1.0	0.8	1.5	1.0	23.7	3.5	2.2	1.2	2.5	1.3	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Maryland	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.6	2.2	79.0	1.8	60.0	2.1	26.8	1.9	64.8	2.1	52.5	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	49.4	2.2	20.2	1.8	37.7	2.1	46.2	2.2	30.1	2.0	41.5	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.0	0.7	0.8	0.4	2.2	0.6	27.0	1.9	5.2	1.0	5.9	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	59.0	3.0	86.3	2.1	71.7	2.8	35.7	2.9	71.9	2.7	62.2	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	39.9	3.0	13.3	2.1	27.4	2.7	46.7	3.1	24.8	2.6	34.0	2.9
		Allowed in all areas	1.1	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.9	0.6	17.6	2.3	3.3	1.1	3.9	1.2
	Current	Not allowed at all	18.0	3.5	63.4	4.3	31.8	4.2	4.6	1.9	45.5	4.5	28.7	4.1
		Allowed in some areas	73.7	4.0	34.4	4.3	62.6	4.4	46.4	4.5	44.4	4.5	59.8	4.4
		Allowed in all areas	8.3	2.5	2.2	1.3	5.5	2.1	49.0	4.5	10.2	2.7	11.4	2.9
Former	Not allowed at all	51.9	4.3	78.6	3.5	62.3	4.2	29.3	3.9	68.1	4.0	55.0	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	46.1	4.3	20.9	3.5	35.8	4.1	45.3	4.3	27.5	3.9	39.9	4.2	
	Allowed in all areas	2.0	1.2	0.4	0.6	1.9	1.2	25.4	3.8	4.4	1.8	5.1	1.9	
Massachusetts	Overall	Not allowed at all	44.4	1.1	76.4	0.9	56.8	1.1	23.9	0.9	68.2	1.0	53.8	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	52.7	1.1	22.7	0.9	41.3	1.1	52.8	1.1	28.0	1.0	42.2	1.1
		Allowed in all areas	2.9	0.4	0.9	0.2	2.0	0.3	23.2	0.9	3.8	0.4	4.0	0.4
	Never	Not allowed at all	56.3	1.6	83.6	1.2	67.5	1.5	32.8	1.5	73.8	1.4	63.2	1.5
		Allowed in some areas	42.5	1.6	16.0	1.2	31.6	1.5	51.3	1.6	23.8	1.4	34.4	1.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.2	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.3	15.9	1.2	2.3	0.5	2.4	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.7	1.8	58.6	2.3	31.3	2.2	5.1	1.0	53.3	2.3	31.1	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	76.4	2.0	39.0	2.3	63.9	2.3	51.0	2.4	38.4	2.3	60.4	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	6.9	1.2	2.4	0.7	4.8	1.0	44.0	2.3	8.3	1.3	8.4	1.3
Former	Not allowed at all	45.8	2.0	78.0	1.7	58.6	2.0	23.7	1.7	70.2	1.9	55.5	2.0	
	Allowed in some areas	51.6	2.0	21.2	1.7	39.8	2.0	56.7	2.0	27.0	1.8	41.2	2.0	
	Allowed in all areas	2.6	0.6	0.7	0.3	1.6	0.5	19.6	1.6	2.8	0.7	3.3	0.7	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Michigan	Overall	Not allowed at all	41.8	1.1	71.0	1.0	50.5	1.1	21.1	0.9	63.5	1.1	52.3	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	55.6	1.1	28.2	1.0	47.2	1.1	48.3	1.1	33.3	1.1	44.3	1.1
		Allowed in all areas	2.6	0.4	0.7	0.2	2.3	0.3	30.6	1.0	3.2	0.4	3.4	0.4
	Never	Not allowed at all	55.1	1.6	81.7	1.3	64.3	1.6	30.3	1.5	72.5	1.5	63.5	1.6
		Allowed in some areas	43.8	1.6	18.0	1.3	34.7	1.6	49.9	1.6	25.6	1.4	34.2	1.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.1	0.3	0.3	0.2	1.0	0.3	19.8	1.3	1.8	0.4	2.2	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	14.7	1.5	50.2	2.1	23.4	1.8	3.6	0.8	44.3	2.1	30.8	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	80.4	1.7	48.2	2.1	72.1	1.9	45.7	2.1	50.1	2.1	63.8	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	4.9	0.9	1.6	0.5	4.5	0.9	50.7	2.1	5.6	1.0	5.4	1.0
	Former	Not allowed at all	46.7	2.3	73.8	2.0	54.3	2.3	23.0	1.9	67.5	2.1	54.8	2.2
	Allowed in some areas	50.4	2.3	25.6	2.0	43.5	2.2	48.4	2.3	29.5	2.1	41.7	2.2	
	Allowed in all areas	2.8	0.8	0.6	0.4	2.2	0.7	28.6	2.0	3.0	0.8	3.5	0.8	
Minnesota	Overall	Not allowed at all	39.9	2.2	72.4	2.0	57.1	2.2	17.9	1.7	70.9	2.0	52.7	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	58.1	2.2	27.0	2.0	41.9	2.2	52.4	2.2	27.7	2.0	45.8	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	2.0	0.6	0.6	0.3	1.0	0.4	29.7	2.0	1.4	0.5	1.5	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	51.9	3.1	82.2	2.4	70.8	2.8	23.8	2.7	77.6	2.6	63.5	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	47.4	3.1	17.6	2.4	28.8	2.8	53.6	3.1	21.6	2.6	35.6	3.0
		Allowed in all areas	0.6	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	22.5	2.6	0.8	0.6	0.9	0.6
	Current	Not allowed at all	9.9	2.6	48.8	4.4	26.7	3.9	2.1	1.3	52.3	4.4	27.3	3.9
		Allowed in some areas	85.5	3.1	50.4	4.4	71.2	4.0	48.4	4.4	44.9	4.3	70.3	4.0
		Allowed in all areas	4.5	1.8	0.7	0.8	2.1	1.3	49.5	4.4	2.8	1.4	2.4	1.3
	Former	Not allowed at all	46.5	4.4	76.9	3.7	60.8	4.3	22.3	3.7	76.4	3.8	57.2	4.4
	Allowed in some areas	51.3	4.4	22.1	3.7	38.0	4.3	54.1	4.4	22.3	3.7	41.1	4.4	
	Allowed in all areas	2.2	1.3	1.0	0.9	1.2	1.0	23.7	3.8	1.3	1.0	1.8	1.2	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Mississippi	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.0	2.3	73.8	2.0	60.1	2.2	30.5	2.1	69.8	2.1	57.6	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	49.8	2.3	25.2	2.0	37.6	2.2	31.8	2.1	25.9	2.0	37.6	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	3.2	0.8	1.0	0.4	2.2	0.7	37.6	2.2	4.2	0.9	4.8	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	57.5	3.0	82.5	2.3	72.2	2.7	38.8	3.0	78.0	2.5	66.5	2.9
		Allowed in some areas	41.7	3.0	17.2	2.3	27.0	2.7	31.9	2.8	20.2	2.4	31.6	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	0.8	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.8	0.5	29.3	2.8	1.8	0.8	1.9	0.8
	Current	Not allowed at all	20.7	3.6	55.1	4.4	31.3	4.1	10.4	2.7	49.7	4.4	34.8	4.2
		Allowed in some areas	70.5	4.0	42.7	4.4	63.2	4.3	32.3	4.2	40.5	4.4	53.9	4.4
		Allowed in all areas	8.9	2.5	2.2	1.3	5.5	2.0	57.3	4.4	9.8	2.6	11.2	2.8
Former	Not allowed at all	52.8	5.3	74.0	4.7	64.8	5.1	34.3	5.1	74.0	4.7	63.1	5.2	
	Allowed in some areas	44.6	5.3	24.7	4.6	33.2	5.1	30.9	5.0	22.4	4.5	32.4	5.0	
	Allowed in all areas	2.5	1.7	1.4	1.3	2.0	1.5	34.8	5.1	3.6	2.0	4.4	2.2	
Missouri	Overall	Not allowed at all	38.5	2.2	66.6	2.1	49.2	2.2	21.2	1.8	62.4	2.2	48.3	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	57.6	2.2	32.1	2.1	47.7	2.2	36.3	2.2	31.3	2.1	45.4	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	4.0	0.9	1.3	0.5	3.1	0.8	42.5	2.2	6.3	1.1	6.2	1.1
Never	Not allowed at all	52.4	3.1	78.2	2.6	64.2	3.0	30.8	2.9	69.9	2.9	59.4	3.1	
	Allowed in some areas	45.8	3.1	21.4	2.6	34.8	3.0	38.7	3.1	26.8	2.8	36.7	3.0	
	Allowed in all areas	1.8	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.6	30.5	2.9	3.3	1.1	3.8	1.2	
Current	Not allowed at all	12.0	2.8	42.6	4.3	21.4	3.6	3.2	1.5	45.7	4.3	27.9	3.9	
	Allowed in some areas	80.0	3.5	54.3	4.3	72.1	3.9	31.9	4.1	41.5	4.3	61.5	4.2	
	Allowed in all areas	7.9	2.4	3.1	1.5	6.5	2.2	64.8	4.2	12.8	2.9	10.7	2.7	
Former	Not allowed at all	38.4	4.5	68.6	4.3	48.4	4.7	20.7	3.8	65.0	4.4	47.5	4.7	
	Allowed in some areas	57.6	4.6	30.0	4.3	47.7	4.7	36.1	4.5	29.5	4.2	46.1	4.6	
	Allowed in all areas	4.0	1.8	1.4	1.1	3.9	1.8	43.2	4.6	5.5	2.1	6.4	2.3	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Montana	Overall	Not allowed at all	42.6	2.2	75.5	1.9	57.7	2.2	20.0	1.8	78.2	1.8	55.5	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	54.5	2.2	23.6	1.9	39.7	2.2	40.3	2.2	19.1	1.7	40.9	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	2.9	0.7	0.9	0.4	2.6	0.7	39.6	2.2	2.7	0.7	3.7	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	55.2	3.1	86.0	2.2	70.0	2.9	28.0	2.8	84.7	2.2	66.8	2.9
		Allowed in some areas	43.8	3.1	13.8	2.1	29.1	2.8	43.9	3.1	13.7	2.1	30.7	2.9
		Allowed in all areas	0.9	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.9	0.6	28.1	2.8	1.6	0.8	2.4	1.0
	Current	Not allowed at all	15.7	3.3	53.3	4.5	29.2	4.1	2.9	1.5	62.9	4.4	33.6	4.2
		Allowed in some areas	77.2	3.8	44.8	4.5	64.9	4.3	32.7	4.2	31.7	4.2	61.0	4.4
		Allowed in all areas	7.1	2.3	1.9	1.2	5.9	2.1	64.5	4.3	5.4	2.0	5.4	2.0
Former	Not allowed at all	42.9	4.3	75.7	3.8	60.4	4.3	20.5	3.6	79.8	3.5	53.7	4.4	
	Allowed in some areas	54.1	4.4	23.0	3.7	36.9	4.2	40.7	4.3	17.8	3.4	41.8	4.3	
	Allowed in all areas	3.0	1.5	1.4	1.0	2.7	1.4	38.8	4.3	2.4	1.3	4.4	1.8	
Nebraska	Overall	Not allowed at all	41.3	2.0	71.7	1.9	56.0	2.1	20.2	1.7	71.9	1.9	52.9	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	55.2	2.1	27.0	1.8	41.6	2.0	44.0	2.1	24.7	1.8	43.3	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	3.5	0.8	1.3	0.5	2.4	0.6	35.9	2.0	3.3	0.7	3.8	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	54.1	2.8	82.6	2.1	68.3	2.6	26.4	2.4	78.3	2.3	61.4	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	44.2	2.8	16.8	2.1	30.5	2.6	45.4	2.8	19.4	2.2	36.2	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.7	0.7	0.5	0.4	1.3	0.6	28.2	2.5	2.3	0.8	2.4	0.8
	Current	Not allowed at all	10.3	2.6	43.9	4.3	25.6	3.8	3.6	1.6	52.0	4.3	29.4	4.0
		Allowed in some areas	83.2	3.2	53.4	4.3	69.8	4.0	42.4	4.3	41.9	4.3	63.9	4.2
		Allowed in all areas	6.5	2.1	2.7	1.4	4.6	1.8	54.0	4.3	6.1	2.1	6.7	2.2
Former	Not allowed at all	40.8	4.3	72.6	3.9	56.5	4.4	21.5	3.6	76.5	3.7	55.7	4.4	
	Allowed in some areas	54.1	4.4	25.4	3.8	40.6	4.3	42.1	4.4	20.5	3.6	39.8	4.3	
	Allowed in all areas	5.2	2.0	1.9	1.2	2.9	1.5	36.4	4.2	3.0	1.5	4.4	1.8	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Nevada	Overall	Not allowed at all	39.1	2.0	76.1	1.8	49.9	2.1	15.4	1.5	55.4	2.1	44.0	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	56.5	2.1	22.7	1.7	47.2	2.1	41.6	2.0	37.3	2.0	49.2	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	4.5	0.9	1.2	0.5	3.0	0.7	43.0	2.0	7.3	1.1	6.8	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	52.1	3.0	86.9	2.0	62.5	2.9	20.8	2.4	64.0	2.9	54.1	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	46.3	3.0	12.8	2.0	36.8	2.9	45.1	3.0	32.0	2.8	42.0	3.0
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.7	0.5	34.1	2.8	4.0	1.2	3.9	1.2
	Current	Not allowed at all	11.1	2.4	57.6	3.8	23.4	3.3	1.7	1.0	34.9	3.7	21.2	3.1
		Allowed in some areas	79.6	3.1	39.9	3.8	69.1	3.6	33.8	3.6	51.1	3.8	66.1	3.6
		Allowed in all areas	9.3	2.2	2.5	1.2	7.5	2.0	64.5	3.7	14.0	2.7	12.8	2.6
	Former	Not allowed at all	47.4	4.3	77.1	3.6	57.1	4.3	21.6	3.5	63.4	4.2	51.8	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	48.1	4.3	21.5	3.5	41.0	4.3	44.3	4.3	30.6	4.0	43.0	4.3
		Allowed in all areas	4.5	1.8	1.4	1.0	2.0	1.2	34.1	4.1	6.0	2.1	5.2	1.9
New Hampshire	Overall	Not allowed at all	42.4	2.3	74.5	2.1	52.9	2.4	23.6	2.0	71.5	2.1	54.4	2.4
		Allowed in some areas	54.9	2.4	24.6	2.0	45.2	2.4	49.8	2.4	25.4	2.1	42.3	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	2.7	0.8	0.9	0.4	1.9	0.6	26.6	2.1	3.1	0.8	3.3	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	58.1	3.5	84.2	2.6	67.2	3.3	34.6	3.4	77.6	3.0	64.8	3.4
		Allowed in some areas	41.0	3.5	15.4	2.6	32.1	3.3	49.0	3.6	20.6	2.9	33.6	3.4
		Allowed in all areas	0.9	0.7	0.4	0.5	0.7	0.6	16.3	2.6	1.9	1.0	1.6	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.7	3.6	57.3	4.7	28.4	4.3	5.2	2.1	60.9	4.7	36.6	4.6
		Allowed in some areas	77.5	4.0	41.1	4.7	67.6	4.5	48.6	4.8	33.4	4.5	58.3	4.7
		Allowed in all areas	5.8	2.2	1.6	1.2	4.0	1.9	46.2	4.8	5.7	2.2	5.1	2.1
	Former	Not allowed at all	39.9	4.2	74.2	3.7	51.6	4.3	22.3	3.6	71.2	3.9	53.4	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	57.2	4.3	24.9	3.7	46.5	4.3	51.9	4.3	26.0	3.8	42.1	4.2
		Allowed in all areas	3.0	1.5	0.9	0.8	1.9	1.2	25.8	3.8	2.8	1.4	4.4	1.8

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
New Jersey	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.0	1.1	81.4	0.8	61.3	1.1	27.0	1.0	67.2	1.0	57.3	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	49.9	1.1	17.9	0.8	36.6	1.0	46.0	1.1	27.5	1.0	37.2	1.0
		Allowed in all areas	3.1	0.4	0.7	0.2	2.1	0.3	27.0	1.0	5.4	0.5	5.5	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	58.2	1.5	87.8	1.0	71.6	1.3	36.0	1.4	73.5	1.3	66.8	1.4
		Allowed in some areas	40.6	1.4	11.9	1.0	27.6	1.3	47.1	1.5	23.5	1.3	30.2	1.4
		Allowed in all areas	1.3	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.3	16.9	1.1	3.0	0.5	3.0	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	17.5	1.8	65.2	2.2	34.3	2.2	5.8	1.1	49.9	2.3	33.2	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	75.3	2.0	33.0	2.2	60.0	2.3	41.6	2.3	38.2	2.3	55.4	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	7.2	1.2	1.8	0.6	5.7	1.1	52.6	2.3	11.8	1.5	11.5	1.5
Former	Not allowed at all	48.4	2.1	81.7	1.7	62.2	2.1	26.0	1.9	68.4	2.0	57.9	2.1	
	Allowed in some areas	48.0	2.1	17.8	1.6	35.7	2.1	47.5	2.2	26.7	1.9	36.4	2.1	
	Allowed in all areas	3.6	0.8	0.5	0.3	2.1	0.6	26.6	1.9	4.8	0.9	5.7	1.0	
New Mexico	Overall	Not allowed at all	48.9	2.1	79.0	1.7	62.2	2.1	23.5	1.8	76.1	1.8	59.0	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	48.2	2.1	19.8	1.7	35.7	2.0	42.2	2.1	20.8	1.7	37.5	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	2.9	0.7	1.2	0.5	2.1	0.6	34.3	2.0	3.2	0.8	3.5	0.8
Never	Not allowed at all	61.5	2.9	87.5	2.0	72.9	2.7	32.2	2.8	81.7	2.3	68.2	2.8	
	Allowed in some areas	37.2	2.9	11.9	1.9	26.2	2.6	43.1	3.0	16.5	2.2	29.7	2.7	
	Allowed in all areas	1.3	0.7	0.7	0.5	1.0	0.6	24.7	2.6	1.8	0.8	2.2	0.9	
Current	Not allowed at all	22.5	3.6	62.4	4.2	38.8	4.2	5.8	2.0	62.8	4.2	40.7	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	71.6	3.9	35.2	4.1	56.2	4.3	41.0	4.3	31.6	4.0	54.4	4.3	
	Allowed in all areas	5.8	2.0	2.4	1.3	5.1	1.9	53.2	4.3	5.6	2.0	4.9	1.9	
Former	Not allowed at all	48.8	4.2	78.1	3.5	63.2	4.1	23.4	3.6	77.6	3.5	58.3	4.2	
	Allowed in some areas	47.8	4.2	20.8	3.4	35.3	4.0	41.5	4.2	18.9	3.3	37.0	4.1	
	Allowed in all areas	3.4	1.5	1.1	0.9	1.5	1.0	35.1	4.1	3.5	1.6	4.7	1.8	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
New York	Overall	Not allowed at all	46.8	0.8	77.2	0.7	58.0	0.8	26.8	0.7	65.6	0.8	61.7	0.8
		Allowed in some areas	50.0	0.8	21.9	0.7	39.8	0.8	49.2	0.8	30.3	0.8	34.4	0.8
		Allowed in all areas	3.2	0.3	0.8	0.1	2.2	0.2	24.0	0.7	4.1	0.3	3.8	0.3
	Never	Not allowed at all	58.7	1.1	85.3	0.8	69.2	1.0	36.2	1.1	72.5	1.0	69.4	1.0
		Allowed in some areas	39.9	1.1	14.4	0.8	29.7	1.0	47.4	1.1	24.8	1.0	27.8	1.0
		Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.3	0.4	0.1	1.1	0.2	16.4	0.8	2.7	0.4	2.8	0.4
	Current	Not allowed at all	19.4	1.4	59.6	1.7	31.7	1.6	6.4	0.9	47.4	1.8	41.5	1.7
		Allowed in some areas	72.9	1.6	38.2	1.7	63.0	1.7	49.6	1.8	44.2	1.7	51.4	1.8
		Allowed in all areas	7.7	0.9	2.1	0.5	5.3	0.8	44.0	1.7	8.3	1.0	7.1	0.9
Former	Not allowed at all	45.6	1.7	75.5	1.5	57.2	1.7	24.4	1.5	67.1	1.6	63.3	1.6	
	Allowed in some areas	51.6	1.7	23.9	1.5	41.0	1.7	53.1	1.7	29.5	1.6	33.6	1.6	
	Allowed in all areas	2.8	0.6	0.7	0.3	1.8	0.4	22.5	1.4	3.4	0.6	3.1	0.6	
North Carolina	Overall	Not allowed at all	34.8	1.0	66.3	1.0	47.1	1.1	21.8	0.9	59.9	1.0	45.4	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	60.8	1.0	32.4	1.0	50.0	1.1	45.9	1.1	35.1	1.0	48.2	1.1
		Allowed in all areas	4.5	0.4	1.3	0.2	2.9	0.4	32.3	1.0	5.0	0.5	6.4	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	45.8	1.5	75.8	1.3	58.8	1.5	29.9	1.4	67.5	1.4	55.9	1.5
		Allowed in some areas	51.7	1.5	23.7	1.3	39.6	1.5	46.9	1.5	29.5	1.4	40.3	1.5
		Allowed in all areas	2.5	0.5	0.5	0.2	1.6	0.4	23.2	1.3	3.0	0.5	3.8	0.6
	Current	Not allowed at all	12.2	1.3	47.2	2.0	23.1	1.7	5.3	0.9	42.9	2.0	25.0	1.7
		Allowed in some areas	79.9	1.6	50.2	2.0	71.5	1.8	45.7	2.0	48.1	2.0	63.9	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	8.0	1.1	2.6	0.6	5.3	0.9	49.0	2.0	9.0	1.2	11.1	1.3
Former	Not allowed at all	38.1	2.2	68.8	2.1	50.4	2.2	24.0	1.9	63.6	2.1	47.0	2.2	
	Allowed in some areas	57.4	2.2	29.8	2.0	46.6	2.2	44.0	2.2	31.6	2.1	46.5	2.2	
	Allowed in all areas	4.5	0.9	1.3	0.5	2.9	0.8	31.9	2.1	4.7	0.9	6.5	1.1	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
North Dakota	Overall	Not allowed at all	40.0	2.1	73.9	1.9	55.8	2.2	19.9	1.7	75.9	1.9	52.9	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	57.0	2.1	25.3	1.9	42.3	2.1	47.0	2.2	22.0	1.8	43.9	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.0	0.7	0.7	0.4	1.9	0.6	33.0	2.0	2.0	0.6	3.1	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	52.7	3.0	83.7	2.2	66.7	2.8	26.9	2.6	81.4	2.3	63.3	2.9
		Allowed in some areas	46.2	3.0	15.9	2.2	32.8	2.8	51.0	3.0	17.5	2.2	35.1	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	1.0	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.4	22.1	2.5	1.1	0.6	1.5	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	9.8	2.7	49.6	4.5	29.6	4.1	2.6	1.5	60.7	4.4	28.3	4.1
		Allowed in some areas	83.3	3.4	48.5	4.5	65.3	4.3	39.9	4.5	34.7	4.3	64.7	4.3
		Allowed in all areas	6.9	2.3	1.9	1.3	5.1	2.0	57.5	4.5	4.6	1.9	7.0	2.3
Former	Not allowed at all	40.2	4.3	75.1	3.8	56.2	4.4	20.7	3.6	78.2	3.7	53.0	4.4	
	Allowed in some areas	56.1	4.4	24.3	3.8	41.8	4.4	45.0	4.4	20.2	3.6	43.9	4.4	
	Allowed in all areas	3.7	1.7	0.5	0.6	2.0	1.2	34.3	4.2	1.6	1.1	3.1	1.5	
Ohio	Overall	Not allowed at all	38.4	1.1	66.7	1.0	49.3	1.1	21.1	0.9	62.2	1.1	47.4	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	58.3	1.1	32.2	1.0	48.0	1.1	43.6	1.1	33.2	1.0	47.6	1.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.3	0.4	1.1	0.2	2.7	0.4	35.3	1.0	4.6	0.5	5.0	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	51.5	1.5	77.8	1.3	62.9	1.5	30.1	1.4	70.4	1.4	58.5	1.5
		Allowed in some areas	47.2	1.5	21.7	1.3	36.0	1.5	44.3	1.5	27.0	1.4	38.3	1.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.2	0.3	0.5	0.2	1.0	0.3	25.7	1.3	2.6	0.5	3.2	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	11.3	1.3	43.9	2.1	21.2	1.7	3.7	0.8	42.8	2.1	23.6	1.8
		Allowed in some areas	81.8	1.6	53.9	2.1	73.2	1.9	40.7	2.1	48.3	2.1	67.8	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	6.9	1.1	2.2	0.6	5.6	1.0	55.6	2.1	8.9	1.2	8.6	1.2
Former	Not allowed at all	40.5	2.2	68.3	2.1	51.5	2.3	21.3	1.9	66.3	2.1	50.0	2.3	
	Allowed in some areas	55.7	2.2	30.5	2.1	45.6	2.3	45.3	2.3	29.8	2.1	44.9	2.2	
	Allowed in all areas	3.8	0.9	1.2	0.5	2.9	0.8	33.4	2.1	3.9	0.9	5.0	1.0	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Oklahoma	Overall	Not allowed at all	44.4	2.2	70.8	2.0	54.9	2.2	26.3	1.9	66.9	2.0	51.9	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	51.6	2.2	27.7	1.9	42.1	2.1	35.5	2.1	28.4	2.0	41.8	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	4.0	0.8	1.5	0.5	3.0	0.7	38.2	2.1	4.7	0.9	6.3	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	58.7	3.0	84.6	2.2	70.1	2.8	36.0	2.9	77.6	2.5	64.9	2.9
		Allowed in some areas	40.0	3.0	14.9	2.2	28.8	2.8	34.8	2.9	20.2	2.4	31.7	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	1.3	0.7	0.5	0.4	1.1	0.6	29.2	2.8	2.3	0.9	3.3	1.1
	Current	Not allowed at all	13.9	2.9	43.3	4.2	23.7	3.6	5.6	1.9	43.4	4.1	23.1	3.5
		Allowed in some areas	77.3	3.5	53.2	4.2	68.8	3.9	36.7	4.0	46.3	4.2	64.8	4.0
		Allowed in all areas	8.8	2.4	3.5	1.5	7.5	2.2	57.7	4.1	10.3	2.5	12.0	2.7
Former	Not allowed at all	49.0	4.5	72.4	4.1	57.7	4.5	29.4	4.2	71.0	4.1	57.1	4.5	
	Allowed in some areas	46.9	4.5	26.1	4.0	40.3	4.5	35.7	4.4	25.6	4.0	37.0	4.4	
	Allowed in all areas	4.2	1.8	1.5	1.1	2.0	1.3	34.9	4.4	3.4	1.6	5.9	2.1	
Oregon	Overall	Not allowed at all	52.1	2.3	75.1	2.0	64.6	2.2	24.4	1.9	76.8	1.9	62.1	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	45.8	2.3	24.3	1.9	34.4	2.2	43.7	2.2	21.0	1.8	35.8	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	2.1	0.7	0.6	0.3	1.0	0.5	31.9	2.1	2.2	0.7	2.1	0.6
	Never	Not allowed at all	66.1	3.1	85.2	2.3	77.0	2.7	34.1	3.1	84.1	2.4	73.5	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	33.1	3.0	14.6	2.3	22.6	2.7	45.0	3.2	14.4	2.3	25.2	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	0.8	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.4	20.9	2.6	1.4	0.8	1.3	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	19.0	3.7	52.9	4.7	36.0	4.5	4.9	2.0	60.7	4.6	36.5	4.5
		Allowed in some areas	75.5	4.0	45.7	4.7	61.7	4.5	37.6	4.5	34.6	4.5	59.3	4.6
		Allowed in all areas	5.5	2.1	1.4	1.1	2.3	1.4	57.5	4.6	4.7	2.0	4.3	1.9
Former	Not allowed at all	55.1	4.3	75.8	3.7	66.8	4.1	23.7	3.7	77.4	3.6	63.7	4.2	
	Allowed in some areas	43.2	4.3	23.4	3.7	32.3	4.1	46.7	4.3	21.0	3.5	34.6	4.1	
	Allowed in all areas	1.7	1.1	0.7	0.7	0.9	0.8	29.6	4.0	1.6	1.1	1.8	1.1	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Pennsylvania	Overall	Not allowed at all	42.0	1.1	74.7	0.9	53.5	1.1	22.7	0.9	66.0	1.0	49.5	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	55.0	1.1	24.4	0.9	44.4	1.1	46.9	1.1	29.8	1.0	44.9	1.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.0	0.4	1.0	0.2	2.2	0.3	30.4	1.0	4.2	0.4	5.6	0.5
Never		Not allowed at all	53.7	1.5	83.7	1.1	64.8	1.4	30.8	1.4	72.3	1.3	59.3	1.5
		Allowed in some areas	45.3	1.5	16.0	1.1	34.5	1.4	48.1	1.5	25.3	1.3	37.7	1.4
		Allowed in all areas	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.7	0.3	21.0	1.2	2.4	0.5	2.9	0.5
Current		Not allowed at all	15.0	1.6	54.5	2.2	27.3	2.0	4.4	0.9	50.4	2.2	27.2	1.9
		Allowed in some areas	78.6	1.8	43.3	2.2	68.0	2.0	45.3	2.2	42.0	2.2	62.2	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	6.4	1.1	2.2	0.6	4.7	0.9	50.2	2.2	7.5	1.2	10.7	1.3
Former		Not allowed at all	43.9	2.1	75.5	1.9	55.4	2.2	23.7	1.8	68.0	2.0	51.0	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	52.3	2.2	23.3	1.8	41.8	2.1	45.9	2.2	27.3	1.9	42.8	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.8	0.8	1.2	0.5	2.8	0.7	30.5	2.0	4.7	0.9	6.2	1.0
Rhode Island	Overall	Not allowed at all	45.5	2.3	78.5	1.9	58.3	2.3	25.8	2.0	69.0	2.1	54.4	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	51.7	2.3	20.6	1.9	39.6	2.3	46.8	2.3	27.9	2.1	42.5	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	2.8	0.8	0.9	0.4	2.1	0.7	27.4	2.1	3.1	0.8	3.0	0.8
Never		Not allowed at all	58.9	3.3	85.9	2.3	70.0	3.1	36.4	3.2	74.7	2.9	63.6	3.2
		Allowed in some areas	40.0	3.3	14.0	2.3	29.6	3.1	46.8	3.4	24.4	2.9	34.9	3.2
		Allowed in all areas	1.1	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	16.8	2.5	0.9	0.6	1.4	0.8
Current		Not allowed at all	14.8	3.4	59.9	4.7	31.2	4.4	4.2	1.9	52.0	4.8	34.4	4.5
		Allowed in some areas	79.5	3.8	37.3	4.6	63.0	4.6	46.4	4.8	41.4	4.7	59.9	4.7
		Allowed in all areas	5.7	2.2	2.8	1.6	5.8	2.2	49.4	4.8	6.7	2.4	5.7	2.2
Former		Not allowed at all	48.3	4.3	81.3	3.3	60.7	4.2	25.9	3.8	73.4	3.8	55.4	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	48.5	4.3	18.0	3.3	37.1	4.1	47.2	4.3	22.8	3.6	41.0	4.2
		Allowed in all areas	3.2	1.5	0.7	0.7	2.2	1.2	26.9	3.8	3.8	1.6	3.6	1.6

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
South Carolina	Overall	Not allowed at all	42.9	2.0	73.5	1.8	54.3	2.0	27.4	1.8	65.5	1.9	54.0	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	53.8	2.0	25.3	1.7	43.0	2.0	37.0	1.9	29.7	1.8	40.8	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	3.3	0.7	1.2	0.4	2.7	0.6	35.6	1.9	4.8	0.8	5.2	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	55.2	2.7	81.6	2.1	67.1	2.6	38.2	2.7	72.8	2.4	65.2	2.6
		Allowed in some areas	43.5	2.7	17.9	2.1	31.8	2.6	36.0	2.6	24.5	2.4	31.7	2.6
		Allowed in all areas	1.3	0.6	0.5	0.4	1.1	0.6	25.8	2.4	2.7	0.9	3.1	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	17.4	2.9	58.2	3.8	28.3	3.5	7.0	2.0	48.4	3.9	33.0	3.6
		Allowed in some areas	75.3	3.3	39.1	3.8	65.9	3.7	36.7	3.7	42.3	3.8	57.5	3.8
		Allowed in all areas	7.2	2.0	2.7	1.2	5.8	1.8	56.3	3.8	9.3	2.2	9.4	2.3
Former	Not allowed at all	44.6	4.3	72.6	3.9	54.9	4.3	26.3	3.8	69.0	4.0	52.4	4.4	
	Allowed in some areas	52.0	4.4	26.3	3.8	42.3	4.3	40.0	4.3	26.9	3.9	42.3	4.3	
	Allowed in all areas	3.4	1.6	1.1	0.9	2.7	1.4	33.7	4.1	4.2	1.7	5.3	2.0	
South Dakota	Overall	Not allowed at all	38.6	2.0	77.4	1.7	54.8	2.1	19.2	1.6	77.1	1.7	52.7	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	58.2	2.0	21.9	1.7	43.1	2.0	42.7	2.0	20.3	1.7	42.5	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	3.3	0.7	0.7	0.3	2.1	0.6	38.1	2.0	2.5	0.6	4.7	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	52.6	2.8	87.9	1.9	67.9	2.7	27.2	2.5	83.3	2.1	63.9	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	46.1	2.8	11.9	1.8	31.3	2.6	44.7	2.8	15.3	2.0	33.0	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.3	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.8	0.5	28.1	2.6	1.4	0.7	3.1	1.0
	Current	Not allowed at all	11.3	2.6	54.4	4.1	27.5	3.6	2.0	1.1	60.9	4.0	27.7	3.6
		Allowed in some areas	81.9	3.1	44.5	4.0	68.0	3.8	37.0	3.9	33.5	3.8	63.4	3.9
		Allowed in all areas	6.8	2.1	1.2	0.9	4.4	1.7	61.0	4.0	5.6	1.9	8.8	2.3
Former	Not allowed at all	37.0	4.2	79.2	3.5	55.2	4.3	20.2	3.5	81.2	3.4	55.2	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	59.3	4.3	19.6	3.5	42.4	4.3	44.4	4.4	17.0	3.3	41.0	4.3	
	Allowed in all areas	3.7	1.7	1.1	0.9	2.4	1.3	35.4	4.2	1.8	1.2	3.8	1.7	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Tennessee	Overall	Not allowed at all	37.2	2.0	68.7	1.9	52.8	2.1	22.4	1.7	60.5	2.0	50.8	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	59.1	2.0	29.9	1.9	44.2	2.1	43.4	2.1	35.2	2.0	42.4	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	3.7	0.8	1.4	0.5	3.0	0.7	34.2	2.0	4.3	0.8	6.8	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	49.1	2.9	78.8	2.4	66.9	2.8	30.1	2.7	69.3	2.7	62.2	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	49.4	2.9	20.6	2.4	32.3	2.8	44.5	2.9	28.9	2.7	34.0	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	1.5	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.9	0.5	25.4	2.6	1.9	0.8	3.9	1.1
	Current	Not allowed at all	13.5	2.6	50.4	3.8	26.3	3.4	5.8	1.8	41.9	3.8	30.4	3.5
		Allowed in some areas	79.2	3.1	46.6	3.8	67.0	3.6	43.6	3.8	49.2	3.8	57.3	3.8
		Allowed in all areas	7.3	2.0	3.0	1.3	6.7	1.9	50.6	3.8	9.0	2.2	12.3	2.5
	Former	Not allowed at all	42.5	4.5	70.8	4.1	56.7	4.5	27.6	4.1	66.2	4.3	52.5	4.6
		Allowed in some areas	53.6	4.5	28.2	4.1	40.3	4.5	40.2	4.5	30.4	4.2	41.6	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	3.9	1.8	1.0	0.9	3.0	1.6	32.1	4.3	3.5	1.7	5.9	2.2
Texas	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.6	1.1	75.1	1.0	60.9	1.1	24.7	1.0	67.0	1.1	55.1	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	49.6	1.1	24.1	1.0	37.0	1.1	40.2	1.1	28.5	1.0	40.5	1.1
		Allowed in all areas	2.8	0.4	0.9	0.2	2.1	0.3	35.1	1.1	4.5	0.5	4.4	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	58.8	1.5	83.5	1.1	72.3	1.4	32.6	1.4	74.6	1.3	64.9	1.5
		Allowed in some areas	39.8	1.5	16.0	1.1	26.7	1.4	41.1	1.5	22.3	1.3	32.2	1.4
		Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.4	0.5	0.2	1.0	0.3	26.3	1.4	3.1	0.5	2.9	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	18.9	1.8	54.5	2.3	33.1	2.2	6.2	1.1	46.8	2.3	31.5	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	75.1	2.0	43.5	2.3	62.3	2.3	36.5	2.2	44.5	2.3	60.3	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	6.1	1.1	2.0	0.6	4.6	1.0	57.3	2.3	8.7	1.3	8.1	1.3
	Former	Not allowed at all	50.8	2.5	76.4	2.1	62.8	2.4	25.1	2.2	70.2	2.3	56.2	2.5
		Allowed in some areas	46.4	2.5	22.9	2.1	35.0	2.4	42.0	2.5	26.4	2.2	39.8	2.5
		Allowed in all areas	2.8	0.8	0.7	0.4	2.2	0.7	33.0	2.4	3.3	0.9	4.0	1.0

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Utah	Overall	Not allowed at all	52.8	2.1	77.3	1.8	67.5	2.0	14.9	1.5	75.1	1.9	69.9	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	45.5	2.1	22.2	1.8	31.3	2.0	38.4	2.1	22.3	1.8	27.4	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	1.7	0.6	0.5	0.3	1.2	0.5	46.7	2.1	2.6	0.7	2.7	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	64.8	2.5	85.2	1.9	76.9	2.2	18.4	2.1	82.0	2.0	78.1	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	34.6	2.5	14.6	1.9	22.7	2.2	41.8	2.6	16.6	2.0	20.3	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	0.6	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3	39.7	2.6	1.4	0.6	1.6	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	13.7	3.6	52.4	5.2	36.4	5.0	2.4	1.6	50.6	5.2	44.3	5.2
		Allowed in some areas	80.8	4.1	45.5	5.2	59.1	5.1	25.5	4.5	42.0	5.1	49.1	5.2
		Allowed in all areas	5.5	2.4	2.1	1.5	4.4	2.1	72.2	4.7	7.5	2.7	6.6	2.6
Former	Not allowed at all	46.2	5.1	72.2	4.6	62.3	4.9	14.3	3.6	73.1	4.5	64.5	4.9	
	Allowed in some areas	51.8	5.1	72.2	4.6	36.3	4.9	38.3	5.0	24.7	4.4	32.6	4.8	
	Allowed in all areas	2.0	1.4	27.8	4.6	1.4	1.2	47.4	5.1	2.3	1.5	2.9	1.7	
Vermont	Overall	Not allowed at all	42.9	2.3	73.9	2.0	57.1	2.3	24.2	2.0	76.9	2.0	58.6	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	53.8	2.3	25.5	2.0	41.2	2.3	51.5	2.3	20.6	1.9	38.6	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	3.3	0.8	0.6	0.3	1.8	0.6	24.3	2.0	2.5	0.7	2.8	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	55.3	3.5	80.8	2.8	67.9	3.3	33.8	3.4	79.3	2.9	66.5	3.4
		Allowed in some areas	43.8	3.5	18.9	2.8	31.5	3.3	50.2	3.6	19.0	2.8	31.9	3.3
		Allowed in all areas	0.8	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.6	0.6	16.0	2.6	1.7	0.9	1.6	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	18.0	3.4	58.4	4.4	35.9	4.3	4.9	1.9	68.1	4.1	42.9	4.4
		Allowed in some areas	74.3	3.9	40.9	4.4	60.4	4.4	51.0	4.5	26.9	3.9	52.3	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	7.7	2.4	0.6	0.7	3.8	1.7	44.1	4.4	4.9	1.9	4.7	1.9
Former	Not allowed at all	47.9	4.2	78.2	3.5	60.8	4.1	28.1	3.8	81.4	3.3	61.6	4.1	
	Allowed in some areas	49.3	4.2	20.9	3.4	37.5	4.1	53.8	4.2	17.0	3.2	35.9	4.1	
	Allowed in all areas	2.8	1.4	0.9	0.8	1.7	1.1	18.0	3.3	1.6	1.1	2.6	1.3	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Virginia	Overall	Not allowed at all	39.3	1.9	70.6	1.8	53.5	1.9	20.7	1.6	64.2	1.9	46.6	1.9
		Allowed in some areas	57.7	1.9	28.5	1.8	44.1	1.9	50.9	2.0	31.6	1.8	48.0	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	3.1	0.7	0.9	0.4	2.3	0.6	28.4	1.8	4.1	0.8	5.3	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	51.6	2.8	80.4	2.2	66.9	2.6	27.4	2.5	71.4	2.5	57.6	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	46.8	2.7	19.0	2.2	32.0	2.6	52.4	2.8	26.4	2.4	38.6	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.7	0.7	0.6	0.4	1.2	0.6	20.2	2.2	2.2	0.8	3.7	1.0
	Current	Not allowed at all	13.4	2.6	49.9	3.8	27.1	3.4	5.0	1.7	47.5	3.8	22.7	3.2
		Allowed in some areas	81.3	3.0	48.4	3.8	68.7	3.5	49.2	3.8	44.2	3.8	68.5	3.5
		Allowed in all areas	5.4	1.7	1.6	1.0	4.2	1.5	45.8	3.8	8.4	2.1	8.8	2.2
	Former	Not allowed at all	42.2	3.9	72.9	3.5	54.7	3.9	24.1	3.4	67.7	3.7	50.0	3.9
		Allowed in some areas	54.4	3.9	26.3	3.5	42.6	3.9	49.8	4.0	28.8	3.6	45.1	3.9
		Allowed in all areas	3.4	1.4	0.7	0.7	2.7	1.3	26.1	3.5	3.5	1.5	4.9	1.7
Washington	Overall	Not allowed at all	51.1	2.1	78.9	1.7	68.0	2.0	24.1	1.8	77.4	1.8	67.1	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	46.5	2.1	20.4	1.7	30.8	2.0	50.3	2.1	20.3	1.7	31.0	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	2.4	0.6	0.6	0.3	1.2	0.5	25.6	1.9	2.3	0.6	1.8	0.6
	Never	Not allowed at all	65.8	3.0	88.4	2.0	80.7	2.5	34.4	3.0	84.5	2.3	75.9	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	33.3	2.9	11.5	2.0	19.0	2.4	52.2	3.1	14.6	2.2	23.1	2.6
		Allowed in all areas	0.9	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	13.4	2.1	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.6
	Current	Not allowed at all	20.4	3.5	62.9	4.1	44.6	4.3	4.0	1.7	64.1	4.1	49.4	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	74.4	3.7	35.4	4.1	52.8	4.3	44.8	4.3	31.6	4.0	47.5	4.3
		Allowed in all areas	5.1	1.9	1.7	1.1	2.6	1.4	51.2	4.3	4.3	1.7	3.1	1.5
	Former	Not allowed at all	53.4	3.9	77.3	3.3	67.4	3.7	24.7	3.4	77.3	3.3	68.1	3.7
		Allowed in some areas	44.2	3.9	22.0	3.3	31.3	3.7	52.1	4.0	19.9	3.2	29.8	3.6
		Allowed in all areas	2.4	1.2	0.7	0.6	1.3	0.9	23.3	3.3	2.8	1.3	2.1	1.1

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
West Virginia	Overall	Not allowed at all	33.9	2.1	56.4	2.2	44.2	2.2	22.6	1.9	58.6	2.2	41.8	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	60.7	2.2	40.9	2.2	51.8	2.2	39.5	2.2	36.0	2.1	51.2	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	5.4	1.0	2.7	0.7	4.0	0.9	38.0	2.2	5.4	1.0	7.0	1.1
	Never	Not allowed at all	46.6	3.2	70.1	2.9	59.7	3.2	33.7	3.1	67.6	3.0	53.9	3.2
		Allowed in some areas	51.5	3.2	29.3	2.9	39.2	3.1	38.3	3.1	30.5	3.0	42.9	3.2
		Allowed in all areas	1.9	0.9	0.6	0.5	1.1	0.7	28.0	2.9	1.9	0.9	3.2	1.1
	Current	Not allowed at all	10.8	2.5	32.1	3.7	17.0	3.0	3.7	1.5	40.4	3.9	19.2	3.1
		Allowed in some areas	78.0	3.3	61.5	3.9	73.4	3.5	42.8	3.9	47.9	4.0	66.9	3.7
		Allowed in all areas	11.2	2.5	6.4	2.0	9.7	2.4	53.5	4.0	11.6	2.5	13.9	2.8
Former	Not allowed at all	39.4	4.8	61.4	4.8	49.7	4.9	25.4	4.3	65.5	4.7	48.0	4.9	
	Allowed in some areas	55.8	4.9	36.6	4.7	48.0	4.9	37.1	4.7	30.5	4.5	46.8	4.9	
	Allowed in all areas	4.8	2.1	2.0	1.4	2.3	1.5	37.6	4.8	4.0	1.9	5.1	2.2	
Wisconsin	Overall	Not allowed at all	40.1	2.0	72.5	1.9	55.1	2.1	20.0	1.7	66.9	2.0	52.7	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	55.6	2.1	26.2	1.8	41.0	2.0	44.9	2.1	27.7	1.9	42.2	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	4.3	0.8	1.3	0.5	3.9	0.8	35.2	2.0	5.4	0.9	5.1	0.9
Never	Not allowed at all	52.6	3.0	84.2	2.2	67.7	2.8	27.9	2.7	74.7	2.6	63.2	2.9	
	Allowed in some areas	45.5	3.0	15.4	2.2	30.8	2.8	49.6	3.0	22.5	2.5	34.1	2.8	
	Allowed in all areas	1.9	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.6	0.7	22.4	2.5	2.8	1.0	2.7	1.0	
Current	Not allowed at all	12.0	2.6	49.7	4.1	27.1	3.6	2.7	1.3	47.0	4.1	30.7	3.8	
	Allowed in some areas	79.1	3.3	46.7	4.1	63.7	3.9	37.5	3.9	41.9	4.0	58.8	4.0	
	Allowed in all areas	8.9	2.3	3.6	1.5	9.2	2.3	59.7	4.0	11.1	2.6	10.6	2.5	
Former	Not allowed at all	45.0	4.1	73.7	3.6	60.0	4.0	22.5	3.5	72.4	3.7	55.2	4.1	
	Allowed in some areas	50.8	4.1	25.7	3.6	37.0	4.0	43.4	4.1	23.1	3.5	40.7	4.1	
	Allowed in all areas	4.2	1.7	0.7	0.7	3.0	1.4	34.1	3.9	4.5	1.7	4.1	1.6	

Table 9a (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Wyoming	Overall	Not allowed at all	39.4	2.4	70.6	2.3	52.9	2.5	18.1	1.9	74.2	2.2	52.4	2.5
		Allowed in some areas	57.7	2.5	28.5	2.3	45.0	2.5	42.9	2.5	23.0	2.1	44.4	2.5
		Allowed in all areas	2.9	0.8	0.9	0.5	2.2	0.7	39.0	2.4	2.8	0.8	3.2	0.9
Never		Not allowed at all	51.0	3.6	80.9	2.8	65.5	3.4	24.7	3.1	80.2	2.8	62.7	3.4
		Allowed in some areas	47.7	3.6	18.2	2.8	33.4	3.4	47.0	3.6	17.8	2.7	35.6	3.4
		Allowed in all areas	1.3	0.8	0.9	0.7	1.1	0.7	28.3	3.2	1.9	1.0	1.7	0.9
Current		Not allowed at all	13.5	3.4	48.2	4.9	26.0	4.3	3.6	1.8	60.3	4.8	33.7	4.7
		Allowed in some areas	81.5	3.8	50.5	4.9	70.5	4.5	37.7	4.8	35.8	4.7	61.8	4.8
		Allowed in all areas	5.0	2.1	1.3	1.1	3.5	1.8	58.6	4.9	4.0	1.9	4.5	2.1
Former		Not allowed at all	43.2	4.9	73.5	4.4	55.6	5.0	20.0	4.0	76.7	4.2	51.3	5.0
		Allowed in some areas	53.0	5.0	26.2	4.4	41.5	4.9	40.2	4.9	20.2	4.0	43.8	5.0
		Allowed in all areas	3.7	1.9	0.3	0.6	2.9	1.7	39.8	4.9	3.1	1.7	4.9	2.2

Note: CI = 95% confidence interval.

Source: 1992/93 Current Population Survey.

*Universe: Individuals included in this table are self-respondent adults only (age 18 and older) whose smoking status can be determined. They must give their opinion about smoking in public places (i.e., smoking should be allowed in all areas, allowed in some areas, or not allowed at all). This is required for each public place separately; if an individual does not give his opinion about one public place, he will be included in other public places for which he did give his opinion.

Table 9b
 State-Specific Attitudes about Smoking in Indoor Public Places (Restaurants, Hospitals, Indoor Work Areas, Bars and Cocktail Lounges, Indoor Sporting Events, and Indoor Shopping Malls) by Smoking Status*—1995/96

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants			Hospitals			Indoor Work Areas			Bars and Cocktail Lounges			Indoor Sporting Events			Indoor Shopping Malls		
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI		
Alabama	Overall	Not allowed at all	46.5	2.1	72.9	1.9	59.3	2.1	30.1	2.0	67.2	2.0	57.9	2.1						
		Allowed in some areas	50.0	2.2	25.6	1.9	38.2	2.1	38.2	2.1	29.1	2.0	38.5	2.1						
		Allowed in all areas	3.4	0.8	1.5	0.5	2.5	0.7	31.7	2.0	3.7	0.8	3.5	0.8						
	Never	Not allowed at all	57.4	2.8	80.6	2.3	70.1	2.6	38.9	2.8	74.4	2.5	68.2	2.7						
		Allowed in some areas	40.8	2.8	19.0	2.2	28.9	2.6	38.1	2.8	23.9	2.4	30.1	2.6						
		Allowed in all areas	1.8	0.8	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.6	23.0	2.4	1.7	0.7	1.7	0.7						
	Current	Not allowed at all	21.2	3.6	53.9	4.4	35.1	4.2	9.8	2.6	51.2	4.4	35.0	4.2						
		Allowed in some areas	71.1	4.0	42.1	4.4	58.7	4.4	37.3	4.3	39.3	4.3	57.2	4.4						
		Allowed in all areas	7.7	2.4	4.0	1.7	6.2	2.1	52.9	4.4	9.5	2.6	7.8	2.4						
Former	Not allowed at all	46.0	4.8	73.7	4.2	57.7	4.8	29.8	4.5	65.9	4.6	56.2	4.8							
	Allowed in some areas	51.2	4.8	24.8	4.1	40.0	4.7	39.7	4.8	31.5	4.5	40.3	4.7							
	Allowed in all areas	2.9	1.6	1.5	1.2	2.3	1.4	30.5	4.5	2.6	1.5	3.6	1.8							
Alaska	Overall	Not allowed at all	50.3	2.2	77.8	1.8	63.5	2.1	25.4	1.9	72.0	2.0	67.6	2.1						
		Allowed in some areas	46.7	2.2	21.5	1.8	35.1	2.1	48.7	2.2	25.6	1.9	29.9	2.0						
		Allowed in all areas	3.0	0.8	0.7	0.4	1.4	0.5	25.9	2.0	2.4	0.7	2.5	0.7						
	Never	Not allowed at all	63.3	3.0	85.0	2.2	73.6	2.8	33.8	3.0	77.2	2.6	75.0	2.7						
		Allowed in some areas	35.2	3.0	14.3	2.2	25.9	2.7	49.2	3.2	21.2	2.6	23.7	2.7						
		Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	17.0	2.4	1.6	0.8	1.3	0.7						
	Current	Not allowed at all	22.5	3.6	64.2	4.2	43.4	4.3	6.9	2.2	60.6	4.3	53.7	4.4						
		Allowed in some areas	71.8	3.9	35.6	4.2	53.4	4.4	47.2	4.4	35.4	4.2	40.9	4.3						
		Allowed in all areas	5.7	2.0	0.2	0.4	3.2	1.5	45.9	4.4	4.1	1.7	5.4	2.0						
Former	Not allowed at all	52.6	4.5	77.1	3.7	63.7	4.3	27.9	4.0	73.3	3.9	67.0	4.2							
	Allowed in some areas	44.0	4.4	21.5	3.7	35.1	4.3	49.2	4.5	24.3	3.8	31.1	4.1							
	Allowed in all areas	3.4	1.6	1.4	1.0	1.2	1.0	22.9	3.8	2.3	1.3	1.9	1.2							

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Arizona	Overall	Not allowed at all	53.2	2.1	82.0	1.6	68.3	1.9	26.8	1.9	72.2	1.9	67.7	1.9
		Allowed in some areas	43.4	2.1	16.8	1.6	29.7	1.9	40.3	2.1	23.3	1.8	28.9	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	3.4	0.8	1.2	0.5	2.0	0.6	33.0	2.0	4.5	0.9	3.4	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	67.1	2.7	89.3	1.8	79.0	2.3	36.7	2.8	79.7	2.3	77.1	2.4
		Allowed in some areas	31.2	2.6	9.8	1.7	19.7	2.3	40.3	2.8	17.5	2.2	20.5	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	1.7	0.7	1.0	0.6	1.4	0.7	23.0	2.4	2.8	0.9	2.4	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	21.7	3.5	66.4	4.0	42.8	4.3	6.5	2.1	52.8	4.3	45.9	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	71.3	3.9	31.9	4.0	53.3	4.3	37.9	4.2	38.7	4.2	47.9	4.3
		Allowed in all areas	7.0	2.2	1.7	1.1	3.8	1.7	55.6	4.3	8.5	2.4	6.2	2.1
Former	Not allowed at all	53.2	4.3	81.2	3.4	69.5	4.0	24.8	3.7	74.8	3.8	68.0	4.0	
	Allowed in some areas	43.1	4.3	17.5	3.3	28.9	3.9	42.6	4.3	21.1	3.5	29.0	3.9	
	Allowed in all areas	3.7	1.6	1.3	1.0	1.6	1.1	32.7	4.1	4.1	1.7	3.0	1.5	
Arkansas	Overall	Not allowed at all	43.8	2.1	72.1	1.9	55.0	2.1	26.9	1.9	66.5	2.0	59.1	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	52.4	2.1	26.3	1.9	42.0	2.1	37.5	2.1	29.1	2.0	36.8	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.8	0.8	1.6	0.5	3.0	0.7	35.6	2.1	4.5	0.9	4.1	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	55.6	2.9	80.6	2.3	67.7	2.8	35.8	2.9	72.3	2.7	68.8	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	42.7	2.9	18.7	2.3	31.2	2.7	38.2	2.9	24.9	2.6	29.4	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.7	0.8	0.7	0.5	1.1	0.6	26.1	2.6	2.8	1.0	1.8	0.8
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.3	3.0	53.8	4.1	27.8	3.7	8.3	2.3	51.2	4.1	37.2	4.0
		Allowed in some areas	75.5	3.5	43.0	4.1	65.0	3.9	37.4	4.0	41.4	4.1	55.2	4.1
		Allowed in all areas	8.2	2.3	3.2	1.4	7.2	2.1	54.3	4.2	7.4	2.2	7.6	2.2
Former	Not allowed at all	50.0	4.8	74.2	4.2	58.8	4.7	29.1	4.5	72.0	4.3	63.2	4.7	
	Allowed in some areas	46.3	4.8	23.7	4.1	38.9	4.7	35.7	4.7	23.3	4.1	31.3	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	3.8	1.8	2.1	1.4	2.3	1.4	35.2	4.7	4.8	2.0	5.5	2.2	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
California	Overall	Not allowed at all	67.1	0.8	89.0	0.5	78.3	0.7	33.7	0.8	78.1	0.7	76.3	0.7
		Allowed in some areas	30.7	0.8	10.4	0.5	20.3	0.7	39.0	0.8	19.1	0.7	21.2	0.7
		Allowed in all areas	2.1	0.2	0.6	0.1	1.4	0.2	27.3	0.8	2.9	0.3	2.5	0.3
	Never	Not allowed at all	75.6	1.0	92.3	0.6	84.8	0.8	42.1	1.1	82.6	0.8	81.4	0.9
		Allowed in some areas	23.3	0.9	7.3	0.6	14.7	0.8	39.7	1.1	15.7	0.8	17.0	0.8
		Allowed in all areas	1.2	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.6	0.2	18.2	0.9	1.7	0.3	1.6	0.3
	Current	Not allowed at all	41.8	2.0	80.0	1.6	59.6	2.0	11.1	1.3	61.9	2.0	61.3	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	53.0	2.0	18.5	1.6	36.4	1.9	35.0	1.9	31.5	1.9	33.5	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	5.1	0.9	1.5	0.5	4.1	0.8	53.8	2.0	6.6	1.0	5.3	0.9
	Former	Not allowed at all	65.2	1.7	87.4	1.2	76.3	1.6	29.9	1.7	79.2	1.5	74.8	1.6
		Allowed in some areas	32.5	1.7	12.0	1.2	22.5	1.5	40.4	1.8	17.9	1.4	22.6	1.5
		Allowed in all areas	2.3	0.5	0.6	0.3	1.3	0.4	29.8	1.7	2.9	0.6	2.7	0.6
Colorado	Overall	Not allowed at all	45.9	2.2	79.6	1.8	65.5	2.1	20.3	1.8	69.1	2.0	62.6	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	51.2	2.2	19.5	1.7	32.7	2.0	50.2	2.2	27.4	1.9	34.5	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.0	0.7	0.9	0.4	1.9	0.6	29.5	2.0	3.5	0.8	2.9	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	59.5	2.9	86.4	2.0	77.3	2.5	27.5	2.7	76.4	2.5	71.2	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	38.9	2.9	13.1	2.0	21.5	2.5	53.0	3.0	21.7	2.5	26.5	2.6
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.7	0.5	0.4	1.3	0.7	19.4	2.4	1.9	0.8	2.3	0.9
Current	Not allowed at all	16.4	3.3	66.0	4.3	41.1	4.4	5.5	2.1	52.1	4.5	43.5	4.5	
	Allowed in some areas	77.1	3.8	31.8	4.2	54.9	4.5	41.5	4.4	40.1	4.4	51.4	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	6.5	2.2	2.1	1.3	4.0	1.8	53.0	4.5	7.9	2.4	5.1	2.0	
Former	Not allowed at all	44.3	4.4	77.8	3.7	63.0	4.3	18.7	3.5	69.7	4.1	62.2	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	53.0	4.5	21.7	3.7	35.8	4.3	52.8	4.5	27.5	4.0	35.9	4.3	
	Allowed in all areas	2.7	1.4	0.5	0.7	1.2	1.0	28.5	4.1	2.8	1.5	1.9	1.2	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Connecticut	Overall	Not allowed at all	51.1	2.3	81.6	1.8	63.6	2.3	32.4	2.2	70.4	2.1	66.1	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	46.1	2.3	17.6	1.8	34.2	2.2	46.8	2.3	25.9	2.1	30.8	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	2.8	0.8	0.8	0.4	2.3	0.7	20.8	1.9	3.6	0.9	3.1	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	62.8	3.1	87.0	2.2	73.5	2.9	43.1	3.2	77.5	2.7	75.3	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	35.6	3.1	12.4	2.1	25.4	2.8	43.4	3.2	20.6	2.6	23.3	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.8	0.6	0.5	1.1	0.7	13.4	2.2	1.9	0.9	1.4	0.8
	Current	Not allowed at all	21.1	4.2	66.1	4.9	34.9	4.9	8.9	3.0	52.4	5.2	44.8	5.1
		Allowed in some areas	73.2	4.6	32.5	4.8	59.7	5.1	50.9	5.2	39.9	5.1	47.8	5.2
		Allowed in all areas	5.7	2.4	1.4	1.2	5.4	2.3	40.2	5.1	7.7	2.8	7.5	2.7
Former	Not allowed at all	51.2	4.5	83.0	3.4	66.1	4.3	29.6	4.1	70.4	4.1	64.6	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	45.7	4.5	16.5	3.3	31.8	4.2	50.0	4.5	25.7	3.9	32.3	4.2	
	Allowed in all areas	3.1	1.6	0.5	0.7	2.1	1.3	20.3	3.6	3.9	1.7	3.1	1.6	
Delaware	Overall	Not allowed at all	41.8	2.2	75.9	1.9	58.0	2.3	25.4	2.0	63.3	2.2	58.1	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	52.9	2.3	23.1	1.9	39.4	2.2	43.6	2.3	32.3	2.1	37.2	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	5.3	1.0	1.0	0.5	2.5	0.7	31.0	2.1	4.5	0.9	4.8	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	54.9	3.2	83.4	2.4	70.7	2.9	36.5	3.2	70.4	3.0	67.0	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	42.9	3.2	16.1	2.4	27.8	2.9	43.0	3.2	27.1	2.9	30.4	3.0
		Allowed in all areas	2.2	1.0	0.6	0.5	1.5	0.8	20.5	2.6	2.5	1.0	2.5	1.0
	Current	Not allowed at all	17.0	3.3	61.0	4.4	35.2	4.3	5.2	2.0	46.2	4.4	37.6	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	74.1	3.9	37.8	4.3	60.2	4.4	43.3	4.4	46.1	4.4	53.2	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	9.0	2.5	1.3	1.0	4.6	1.9	51.5	4.5	7.7	2.4	9.2	2.6
Former	Not allowed at all	41.9	4.5	76.6	3.9	56.7	4.6	24.7	4.0	67.2	4.3	61.8	4.5	
	Allowed in some areas	50.4	4.6	21.8	3.8	40.9	4.5	45.1	4.6	27.8	4.1	33.7	4.4	
	Allowed in all areas	7.7	2.5	1.6	1.2	2.4	1.4	30.2	4.3	5.0	2.0	4.5	1.9	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	District of Columbia	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
				%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
District of Columbia	Overall	Overall	Not allowed at all	50.1	2.4	83.5	1.8	68.0	2.2	26.7	2.1	67.0	2.3	59.1	2.3
			Allowed in some areas	47.0	2.4	15.6	1.7	30.2	2.2	51.6	2.4	30.3	2.2	38.1	2.3
			Allowed in all areas	2.9	0.8	0.9	0.5	1.8	0.6	21.7	2.0	2.7	0.8	2.8	0.8
	Never	Never	Not allowed at all	58.9	3.1	87.4	2.1	76.6	2.7	33.1	3.0	72.3	2.8	66.1	3.0
			Allowed in some areas	39.7	3.1	11.9	2.0	22.4	2.6	51.4	3.2	26.1	2.8	32.2	2.9
			Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.9	0.6	15.5	2.3	1.5	0.8	1.7	0.8
	Current	Current	Not allowed at all	26.0	4.4	72.7	4.4	46.2	5.0	8.6	2.8	52.6	5.0	41.4	4.9
			Allowed in some areas	66.6	4.7	25.5	4.4	49.3	5.0	51.5	5.0	41.7	5.0	53.3	5.0
			Allowed in all areas	7.4	2.6	1.9	1.3	4.6	2.1	39.9	4.9	5.7	2.3	5.3	2.2
	Former	Former	Not allowed at all	52.3	5.4	84.1	3.9	68.0	5.0	28.9	4.9	67.8	5.0	59.1	5.3
			Allowed in some areas	45.7	5.3	15.3	3.9	30.8	5.0	52.2	5.4	29.6	4.9	37.8	5.2
			Allowed in all areas	2.0	1.5	0.6	0.8	1.2	1.2	18.9	4.2	2.6	1.7	3.1	1.9
Florida	Overall	Overall	Not allowed at all	50.2	1.1	80.7	0.8	67.3	1.0	31.9	1.0	68.3	1.0	63.8	1.0
			Allowed in some areas	46.3	1.1	18.2	0.8	30.4	1.0	38.6	1.0	27.5	0.9	32.3	1.0
			Allowed in all areas	3.5	0.4	1.1	0.2	2.3	0.3	29.5	1.0	4.2	0.4	3.9	0.4
	Never	Never	Not allowed at all	63.1	1.4	88.5	0.9	78.5	1.2	42.4	1.5	76.2	1.2	73.7	1.3
			Allowed in some areas	35.1	1.4	11.1	0.9	20.5	1.2	37.7	1.4	21.4	1.2	24.1	1.2
			Allowed in all areas	1.8	0.4	0.5	0.2	1.1	0.3	19.9	1.2	2.4	0.4	2.2	0.4
	Current	Current	Not allowed at all	19.0	1.7	62.1	2.1	40.3	2.2	9.0	1.3	45.5	2.2	39.4	2.2
			Allowed in some areas	73.8	1.9	35.2	2.1	54.6	2.2	39.0	2.2	45.6	2.2	53.3	2.2
			Allowed in all areas	7.2	1.1	2.6	0.7	5.2	1.0	52.0	2.2	8.8	1.3	7.3	1.1
Former	Former	Not allowed at all	51.9	2.1	81.6	1.6	68.7	2.0	31.1	2.0	72.5	1.9	65.5	2.0	
		Allowed in some areas	44.4	2.1	17.4	1.6	29.1	1.9	40.1	2.1	23.6	1.8	30.3	1.9	
		Allowed in all areas	3.7	0.8	1.0	0.4	2.2	0.6	28.8	1.9	3.9	0.8	4.2	0.8	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Georgia	Overall	Not allowed at all	48.9	2.0	77.3	1.6	61.4	1.9	29.5	1.8	66.0	1.9	59.3	1.9
		Allowed in some areas	47.0	2.0	21.0	1.6	35.7	1.9	44.1	2.0	29.5	1.8	36.2	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	4.1	0.8	1.7	0.5	2.9	0.7	26.4	1.7	4.5	0.8	4.5	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	60.6	2.5	85.6	1.8	72.3	2.3	38.3	2.5	75.5	2.2	69.0	2.4
		Allowed in some areas	37.9	2.5	13.7	1.8	26.8	2.3	45.0	2.6	22.7	2.2	29.4	2.4
		Allowed in all areas	1.5	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.9	0.5	16.7	2.0	1.7	0.7	1.6	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.9	3.1	57.7	4.1	31.1	3.8	6.2	2.0	42.4	4.1	34.8	3.9
		Allowed in some areas	72.0	3.7	37.5	4.0	60.0	4.0	44.9	4.1	46.3	4.1	54.2	4.1
		Allowed in all areas	11.1	2.6	4.7	1.7	8.9	2.3	48.9	4.1	11.3	2.6	11.0	2.6
Former	Not allowed at all	51.4	4.4	75.7	3.7	64.3	4.2	31.2	4.1	65.4	4.2	59.2	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	44.9	4.3	22.8	3.7	33.6	4.1	40.8	4.4	29.8	4.0	35.6	4.2	
	Allowed in all areas	3.6	1.6	1.5	1.1	2.1	1.3	27.9	4.0	4.8	1.9	5.2	1.9	
Hawaii	Overall	Not allowed at all	52.4	2.3	85.2	1.7	75.7	2.0	23.9	2.0	73.8	2.1	70.2	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	45.5	2.3	14.3	1.6	22.9	2.0	49.8	2.3	23.1	2.0	26.6	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	2.2	0.7	0.6	0.4	1.4	0.5	26.4	2.1	3.2	0.8	3.2	0.8
Never	Not allowed at all	61.6	3.0	88.4	2.0	82.5	2.3	28.2	2.8	78.3	2.6	75.2	2.7	
	Allowed in some areas	37.2	3.0	11.0	1.9	16.4	2.3	53.1	3.1	19.1	2.4	21.8	2.6	
	Allowed in all areas	1.2	0.7	0.6	0.5	1.0	0.6	18.7	2.4	2.5	1.0	3.0	1.1	
Current	Not allowed at all	26.4	4.5	76.5	4.3	58.8	5.0	8.3	2.8	59.5	5.0	59.4	5.0	
	Allowed in some areas	69.3	4.7	22.9	4.3	38.7	5.0	41.9	5.0	35.3	4.9	37.0	4.9	
	Allowed in all areas	4.4	2.1	0.6	0.8	2.4	1.6	49.7	5.1	5.2	2.3	3.6	1.9	
Former	Not allowed at all	53.3	4.9	85.0	3.5	74.0	4.3	27.6	4.4	75.5	4.2	67.6	4.6	
	Allowed in some areas	44.0	4.9	14.5	3.5	24.6	4.3	48.8	4.9	21.8	4.1	29.1	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	2.7	1.6	0.5	0.7	1.3	1.1	23.6	4.2	2.8	1.6	3.3	1.8	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Idaho	Overall	Not allowed at all	55.0	2.1	79.6	1.7	68.3	2.0	24.1	1.8	78.7	1.7	74.1	1.8
		Allowed in some areas	42.1	2.1	19.2	1.7	29.7	1.9	36.6	2.0	18.1	1.6	23.0	1.8
		Allowed in all areas	2.9	0.7	1.1	0.4	2.0	0.6	39.3	2.1	3.2	0.7	2.8	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	69.6	2.6	87.7	1.8	79.8	2.3	32.7	2.7	86.0	2.0	83.1	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	29.3	2.6	12.1	1.8	20.1	2.3	38.9	2.8	13.0	1.9	15.9	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	1.1	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	28.4	2.6	1.0	0.6	0.9	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	20.4	3.7	60.2	4.4	41.8	4.5	5.2	2.0	63.8	4.4	55.2	4.5
		Allowed in some areas	72.6	4.0	36.6	4.3	52.4	4.5	29.7	4.1	29.0	4.1	37.9	4.4
		Allowed in all areas	7.0	2.3	3.2	1.6	5.8	2.1	65.0	4.3	7.2	2.3	6.9	2.3
Former	Not allowed at all	51.7	4.4	78.3	3.6	65.3	4.2	21.5	3.6	74.9	3.8	70.1	4.0	
	Allowed in some areas	44.7	4.4	20.4	3.5	31.6	4.1	37.5	4.3	20.3	3.5	26.2	3.9	
	Allowed in all areas	3.6	1.6	1.4	1.0	3.0	1.5	41.0	4.3	4.8	1.9	3.6	1.6	
Illinois	Overall	Not allowed at all	45.3	1.2	77.6	1.0	59.5	1.2	24.8	1.1	65.4	1.2	58.1	1.2
		Allowed in some areas	50.7	1.2	21.0	1.0	38.2	1.2	43.5	1.2	30.4	1.1	38.0	1.2
		Allowed in all areas	4.0	0.5	1.4	0.3	2.3	0.4	31.8	1.1	4.2	0.5	3.8	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	58.2	1.6	85.4	1.2	71.4	1.5	34.1	1.6	72.5	1.5	67.6	1.6
		Allowed in some areas	40.1	1.6	13.7	1.1	27.4	1.5	44.6	1.7	25.2	1.4	30.4	1.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.4	0.9	0.3	1.3	0.4	21.3	1.4	2.3	0.5	2.0	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	15.4	1.8	57.2	2.4	30.8	2.3	5.5	1.1	45.2	2.4	35.8	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	75.4	2.1	40.1	2.4	64.6	2.3	38.2	2.4	45.9	2.4	56.9	2.4
		Allowed in all areas	9.2	1.4	2.7	0.8	4.6	1.0	56.3	2.4	8.8	1.4	7.3	1.3
Former	Not allowed at all	47.2	2.6	81.3	2.0	62.6	2.5	23.7	2.2	70.6	2.3	60.0	2.5	
	Allowed in some areas	49.0	2.6	17.5	1.9	35.1	2.4	46.6	2.6	25.5	2.2	35.6	2.5	
	Allowed in all areas	3.7	1.0	1.2	0.6	2.3	0.8	29.7	2.4	3.9	1.0	4.4	1.0	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Indiana	Overall	Not allowed at all	38.8	2.1	71.7	1.9	52.0	2.1	21.4	1.8	68.2	2.0	56.3	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	56.4	2.1	26.0	1.9	44.2	2.1	37.4	2.1	27.1	1.9	38.8	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	4.8	0.9	2.4	0.6	3.9	0.8	41.3	2.1	4.8	0.9	4.9	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	53.4	3.0	83.3	2.2	66.7	2.8	29.6	2.8	77.5	2.5	68.4	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	45.5	3.0	16.0	2.2	32.4	2.8	41.6	3.0	20.5	2.4	29.4	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	1.2	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.9	0.6	28.8	2.8	2.0	0.9	2.1	0.9
Current		Not allowed at all	10.4	2.4	48.8	4.0	23.3	3.4	5.1	1.8	48.5	4.0	31.7	3.7
		Allowed in some areas	79.0	3.2	46.0	4.0	68.3	3.7	32.5	3.7	41.9	3.9	58.7	3.9
		Allowed in all areas	10.6	2.4	5.2	1.8	8.5	2.2	62.4	3.9	9.6	2.3	9.6	2.3
Former		Not allowed at all	43.3	4.7	75.6	4.1	56.4	4.7	25.0	4.2	73.2	4.2	61.4	4.6
		Allowed in some areas	51.2	4.7	22.0	3.9	39.0	4.6	34.1	4.6	22.2	3.9	33.4	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	5.5	2.2	2.4	1.5	4.5	2.0	40.9	4.7	4.6	2.0	5.2	2.1
Overall		Not allowed at all	47.2	2.2	78.8	1.8	61.9	2.1	21.8	1.8	75.8	1.9	63.8	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	49.7	2.2	20.6	1.8	36.3	2.1	43.1	2.2	21.7	1.8	33.9	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.2	0.8	0.7	0.4	1.7	0.6	35.1	2.1	2.5	0.7	2.3	0.7
Never		Not allowed at all	60.1	2.9	87.4	1.9	74.2	2.6	29.2	2.7	81.0	2.3	72.2	2.6
		Allowed in some areas	38.5	2.8	12.3	1.9	25.4	2.5	46.6	2.9	17.8	2.2	26.4	2.6
		Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	24.2	2.5	1.2	0.6	1.4	0.7
Current		Not allowed at all	13.7	3.1	57.3	4.5	28.1	4.1	2.3	1.4	58.0	4.5	39.2	4.5
		Allowed in some areas	78.4	3.8	40.8	4.5	66.9	4.3	36.1	4.4	35.8	4.4	56.2	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	7.9	2.5	1.9	1.2	5.0	2.0	61.6	4.5	6.2	2.2	4.6	1.9
Former		Not allowed at all	49.2	4.7	79.1	3.8	65.7	4.4	23.3	4.0	81.1	3.7	67.8	4.4
		Allowed in some areas	48.2	4.7	20.5	3.8	32.6	4.4	41.8	4.6	17.1	3.5	30.1	4.3
		Allowed in all areas	2.6	1.5	0.4	0.6	1.7	1.2	34.9	4.5	1.8	1.2	2.2	1.4

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Kansas	Overall	Not allowed at all	44.9	2.2	76.0	1.9	59.7	2.2	21.4	1.9	70.1	2.0	60.5	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	51.6	2.2	22.7	1.9	37.5	2.2	43.2	2.2	25.3	1.9	35.5	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.5	0.8	1.3	0.5	2.8	0.7	35.4	2.2	4.6	0.9	4.0	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	57.7	3.0	85.7	2.1	71.6	2.8	28.6	2.8	76.6	2.6	70.4	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	40.5	3.0	13.9	2.1	27.4	2.7	47.8	3.1	21.0	2.5	27.8	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.8	0.8	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.6	23.6	2.6	2.4	0.9	1.8	0.8
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.0	3.2	55.8	4.4	33.2	4.2	5.1	2.0	52.3	4.4	38.3	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	77.2	3.7	41.2	4.3	59.9	4.3	34.5	4.2	39.5	4.3	53.7	4.4
		Allowed in all areas	6.8	2.2	3.0	1.5	6.9	2.2	60.4	4.3	8.2	2.4	8.0	2.4
Former	Not allowed at all	47.5	4.9	75.8	4.2	62.0	4.8	23.1	4.2	75.2	4.2	62.5	4.7	
	Allowed in some areas	48.4	4.9	22.8	4.1	35.6	4.7	42.5	4.9	19.1	3.9	33.0	4.6	
	Allowed in all areas	4.1	1.9	1.4	1.1	2.4	1.5	34.4	4.7	5.7	2.3	4.5	2.0	
Kentucky	Overall	Not allowed at all	30.3	2.0	60.1	2.1	42.6	2.1	19.5	1.7	54.8	2.1	41.9	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	63.6	2.0	38.0	2.1	53.7	2.1	47.2	2.2	39.8	2.1	52.9	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	6.1	1.0	1.9	0.6	3.7	0.8	33.3	2.1	5.4	1.0	5.2	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	41.1	3.0	71.2	2.8	56.0	3.1	28.5	2.9	63.2	3.0	51.3	3.1
		Allowed in some areas	55.9	3.1	27.7	2.8	41.9	3.1	48.8	3.2	33.0	2.9	44.4	3.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.1	1.1	1.1	0.6	2.1	0.9	22.6	2.7	3.9	1.2	4.3	1.3
	Current	Not allowed at all	11.6	2.5	42.9	3.8	21.8	3.2	6.1	1.9	41.4	3.8	27.0	3.4
		Allowed in some areas	77.9	3.2	54.1	3.8	72.2	3.4	47.2	3.9	50.3	3.8	65.6	3.6
		Allowed in all areas	10.5	2.3	3.0	1.3	6.1	1.8	46.7	3.9	8.3	2.1	7.4	2.0
Former	Not allowed at all	33.1	4.3	60.6	4.4	42.7	4.5	19.5	3.7	55.6	4.5	42.9	4.5	
	Allowed in some areas	60.2	4.5	37.3	4.4	53.2	4.5	43.7	4.7	39.7	4.5	53.2	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	6.6	2.3	2.1	1.3	4.1	1.8	36.8	4.5	4.7	1.9	4.0	1.8	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Louisiana	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.1	2.1	75.7	1.8	61.1	2.1	30.1	2.0	63.5	2.1	57.0	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	47.8	2.1	21.8	1.8	35.0	2.0	32.9	2.0	30.0	2.0	37.0	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	5.2	0.9	2.5	0.7	3.9	0.8	37.0	2.1	6.5	1.1	5.9	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	59.0	2.8	83.3	2.1	73.3	2.5	39.0	2.8	71.7	2.6	67.1	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	38.9	2.8	15.1	2.0	24.9	2.5	34.2	2.7	25.2	2.5	30.1	2.6
		Allowed in all areas	2.1	0.8	1.6	0.7	1.8	0.8	26.8	2.6	3.1	1.0	2.8	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	18.1	3.3	56.9	4.2	31.6	3.9	7.1	2.2	41.4	4.2	32.6	4.0
		Allowed in some areas	70.5	3.9	37.7	4.1	59.4	4.2	31.4	4.0	43.5	4.2	54.4	4.2
		Allowed in all areas	11.4	2.7	5.4	1.9	9.1	2.4	61.5	4.2	15.2	3.1	13.0	2.9
Former	Not allowed at all	50.6	4.8	78.2	3.9	64.7	4.6	34.8	4.6	68.4	4.5	59.9	4.7	
	Allowed in some areas	43.5	4.7	20.2	3.8	32.0	4.5	31.0	4.5	26.4	4.2	34.3	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	5.9	2.3	1.6	1.2	3.2	1.7	34.2	4.6	5.2	2.1	5.8	2.2	
Maine	Overall	Not allowed at all	53.0	2.2	81.6	1.7	64.8	2.1	32.3	2.1	78.8	1.8	72.8	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	44.0	2.2	17.7	1.7	33.1	2.1	43.9	2.2	19.1	1.8	25.2	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	3.0	0.8	0.8	0.4	2.1	0.6	23.8	1.9	2.2	0.7	2.0	0.6
Never	Not allowed at all	68.4	3.1	90.2	2.0	79.5	2.7	46.4	3.4	84.9	2.4	82.2	2.6	
	Allowed in some areas	30.7	3.1	9.4	1.9	19.9	2.7	41.0	3.3	14.0	2.3	17.3	2.5	
	Allowed in all areas	0.9	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.5	12.6	2.2	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.5	
Current	Not allowed at all	23.7	3.7	66.4	4.1	38.5	4.2	9.9	2.6	66.4	4.1	56.5	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	69.2	4.0	31.7	4.0	56.4	4.3	45.0	4.4	29.6	4.0	38.6	4.2	
	Allowed in all areas	7.1	2.2	1.9	1.2	5.1	1.9	45.1	4.4	4.0	1.7	4.9	1.9	
Former	Not allowed at all	55.9	4.2	81.8	3.2	66.0	4.0	31.2	3.9	80.7	3.3	72.8	3.7	
	Allowed in some areas	41.7	4.1	17.7	3.2	32.5	3.9	47.3	4.2	17.3	3.2	25.3	3.6	
	Allowed in all areas	2.4	1.3	0.4	0.5	1.5	1.0	21.5	3.5	2.0	1.2	1.9	1.1	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Maryland	Overall	Not allowed at all	50.7	2.2	82.5	1.7	67.3	2.1	27.3	2.0	69.4	2.1	64.8	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	46.8	2.2	16.7	1.7	31.0	2.1	47.8	2.2	27.0	2.0	32.4	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	2.5	0.7	0.8	0.4	1.7	0.6	24.8	1.9	3.6	0.8	2.8	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	63.8	2.9	89.2	1.9	78.1	2.5	37.1	2.9	77.5	2.5	74.6	2.6
		Allowed in some areas	34.8	2.9	10.3	1.8	21.2	2.5	47.0	3.0	20.5	2.4	24.0	2.6
		Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.5	15.9	2.2	2.1	0.9	1.4	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	18.9	3.8	64.4	4.6	38.6	4.7	4.0	1.9	50.0	4.8	39.8	4.7
		Allowed in some areas	75.8	4.1	34.3	4.5	57.3	4.8	45.4	4.8	42.8	4.8	54.5	4.8
		Allowed in all areas	5.3	2.2	1.2	1.1	4.2	1.9	50.5	4.8	7.2	2.5	5.8	2.2
Former	Not allowed at all	49.9	4.5	83.6	3.3	68.4	4.2	26.4	4.0	68.7	4.2	65.1	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	47.5	4.5	15.5	3.2	29.9	4.1	51.7	4.5	27.5	4.0	31.4	4.2	
	Allowed in all areas	2.6	1.4	1.0	0.9	1.7	1.1	21.9	3.7	3.8	1.7	3.5	1.6	
Massachusetts	Overall	Not allowed at all	49.6	1.4	81.1	1.1	63.4	1.3	30.5	1.3	70.9	1.3	65.5	1.3
		Allowed in some areas	47.5	1.4	18.1	1.1	35.0	1.3	50.4	1.4	26.4	1.2	31.8	1.3
		Allowed in all areas	2.9	0.5	0.8	0.2	1.6	0.4	19.1	1.1	2.7	0.4	2.7	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	61.2	1.9	87.1	1.3	74.8	1.7	41.2	1.9	77.1	1.7	74.1	1.7
		Allowed in some areas	37.0	1.9	12.2	1.3	24.3	1.7	47.7	2.0	21.2	1.6	24.2	1.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.8	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.4	11.1	1.2	1.7	0.5	1.7	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	20.6	2.5	64.3	2.9	35.6	2.9	7.1	1.6	52.7	3.1	42.5	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	72.3	2.7	33.8	2.9	60.0	3.0	52.6	3.0	40.9	3.0	51.0	3.0
		Allowed in all areas	7.1	1.6	1.9	0.8	4.4	1.2	40.3	3.0	6.4	1.5	6.5	1.5
Former	Not allowed at all	50.5	2.6	82.9	1.9	63.6	2.5	29.2	2.4	73.4	2.3	67.4	2.4	
	Allowed in some areas	47.8	2.6	16.8	1.9	35.5	2.5	53.4	2.6	25.0	2.2	31.0	2.4	
	Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.7	0.3	0.3	0.9	0.5	17.5	2.0	1.6	0.6	1.6	0.7	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Michigan	Overall	Not allowed at all	44.7	1.3	74.8	1.1	54.6	1.3	22.6	1.1	64.2	1.2	57.6	1.2
		Allowed in some areas	52.9	1.3	24.4	1.1	43.5	1.2	50.0	1.3	32.9	1.2	40.0	1.2
		Allowed in all areas	2.4	0.4	0.7	0.2	1.9	0.3	27.3	1.1	2.9	0.4	2.4	0.4
	Never	Not allowed at all	58.6	1.7	84.7	1.3	68.3	1.7	31.2	1.7	72.3	1.6	68.1	1.7
		Allowed in some areas	40.4	1.7	15.1	1.3	30.9	1.6	51.6	1.8	26.3	1.6	30.4	1.6
		Allowed in all areas	1.1	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.8	0.3	17.1	1.4	1.4	0.4	1.4	0.4
	Current	Not allowed at all	14.2	1.7	53.7	2.4	26.2	2.2	5.7	1.1	43.4	2.4	34.1	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	80.8	1.9	44.5	2.4	69.3	2.3	45.8	2.5	50.4	2.5	61.4	2.4
		Allowed in all areas	5.0	1.1	1.8	0.6	4.6	1.0	48.5	2.5	6.1	1.2	4.5	1.0
Former	Not allowed at all	48.7	2.6	77.3	2.2	56.6	2.6	23.4	2.2	69.8	2.4	61.2	2.5	
	Allowed in some areas	48.8	2.6	22.1	2.1	42.0	2.6	51.4	2.6	27.8	2.3	36.7	2.5	
	Allowed in all areas	2.4	0.8	0.6	0.4	1.4	0.6	25.2	2.3	2.5	0.8	2.1	0.7	
Minnesota	Overall	Not allowed at all	48.0	2.2	79.7	1.8	65.9	2.1	20.4	1.8	77.1	1.8	67.4	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	49.6	2.2	19.7	1.7	32.7	2.1	47.2	2.2	21.1	1.8	31.3	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	2.4	0.7	0.6	0.3	1.4	0.5	32.4	2.1	1.9	0.6	1.3	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	61.4	2.9	88.8	1.9	77.6	2.5	28.1	2.7	84.0	2.2	76.2	2.6
		Allowed in some areas	37.3	2.9	10.6	1.9	21.6	2.5	50.3	3.0	14.9	2.1	22.8	2.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.2	0.7	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.5	21.6	2.5	1.1	0.6	1.0	0.6
Current	Not allowed at all	16.5	3.4	60.0	4.5	36.6	4.4	2.1	1.3	61.1	4.5	47.0	4.6	
	Allowed in some areas	78.9	3.7	39.1	4.5	60.6	4.5	37.6	4.4	35.1	4.4	50.9	4.6	
	Allowed in all areas	4.6	1.9	0.9	0.8	2.8	1.5	60.3	4.5	3.8	1.7	2.1	1.3	
Former	Not allowed at all	48.6	4.4	78.5	3.6	68.3	4.1	21.2	3.6	77.2	3.7	67.6	4.1	
	Allowed in some areas	48.5	4.4	21.0	3.6	30.4	4.1	49.7	4.5	21.2	3.6	31.2	4.1	
	Allowed in all areas	2.8	1.5	0.5	0.6	1.4	1.0	29.1	4.1	1.6	1.1	1.2	1.0	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Mississippi	Overall	Not allowed at all	48.6	2.2	71.3	2.0	61.3	2.1	35.3	2.1	64.3	2.1	58.2	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	46.9	2.2	26.2	1.9	35.5	2.1	36.5	2.1	30.1	2.0	36.6	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	4.6	0.9	2.6	0.7	3.2	0.8	28.2	2.0	5.6	1.0	5.2	1.0
	Never	Not allowed at all	60.6	2.8	80.2	2.3	73.0	2.5	46.1	2.9	73.5	2.5	67.8	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	37.6	2.8	18.9	2.2	25.9	2.5	34.4	2.7	23.6	2.4	29.8	2.6
		Allowed in all areas	1.8	0.8	0.9	0.5	1.1	0.6	19.5	2.3	2.9	1.0	2.4	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	18.7	3.5	51.0	4.5	32.0	4.2	8.8	2.6	44.0	4.5	34.3	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	70.8	4.1	42.4	4.4	59.7	4.4	44.7	4.5	45.6	4.5	54.6	4.5
		Allowed in all areas	10.5	2.7	6.6	2.2	8.2	2.5	46.5	4.5	10.3	2.7	11.1	2.8
Former	Not allowed at all	48.7	5.0	69.0	4.7	61.6	4.9	35.0	4.9	61.3	4.9	58.4	5.0	
	Allowed in some areas	45.4	5.0	28.3	4.5	34.8	4.8	32.7	4.8	30.9	4.7	35.0	4.8	
	Allowed in all areas	5.9	2.4	2.8	1.6	3.6	1.9	32.2	4.8	7.9	2.7	6.6	2.5	
Missouri	Overall	Not allowed at all	40.1	2.1	70.4	2.0	53.7	2.2	21.7	1.8	61.0	2.1	49.8	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	55.2	2.2	28.6	2.0	43.8	2.2	42.2	2.2	34.4	2.1	46.6	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	4.7	0.9	1.0	0.4	2.5	0.7	36.1	2.1	4.6	0.9	3.6	0.8
Never	Not allowed at all	55.1	3.1	79.5	2.5	66.8	2.9	29.9	2.9	69.9	2.8	61.2	3.0	
	Allowed in some areas	42.7	3.1	19.9	2.5	32.0	2.9	45.6	3.1	27.9	2.8	37.2	3.0	
	Allowed in all areas	2.2	0.9	0.6	0.5	1.2	0.7	24.5	2.7	2.2	0.9	1.6	0.8	
Current	Not allowed at all	12.0	2.8	51.5	4.3	27.4	3.8	4.3	1.7	41.6	4.2	26.9	3.8	
	Allowed in some areas	78.7	3.5	46.7	4.3	67.2	4.0	37.2	4.1	48.2	4.3	66.1	4.0	
	Allowed in all areas	9.3	2.5	1.8	1.1	5.4	1.9	58.5	4.2	10.2	2.6	7.0	2.2	
Former	Not allowed at all	39.4	4.4	72.0	4.1	55.1	4.5	24.1	3.9	63.4	4.4	50.9	4.5	
	Allowed in some areas	55.6	4.5	27.1	4.0	42.9	4.5	40.8	4.5	32.9	4.3	44.9	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	4.9	2.0	1.0	0.9	2.0	1.3	35.1	4.4	3.7	1.7	4.2	1.8	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Montana	Overall	Not allowed at all	44.0	2.1	78.6	1.7	58.4	2.1	20.1	1.7	78.6	1.7	64.2	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	52.6	2.1	20.6	1.7	39.3	2.1	40.1	2.1	18.8	1.7	32.7	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	3.4	0.8	0.8	0.4	2.4	0.6	39.8	2.1	2.5	0.7	3.1	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	57.6	3.1	88.1	2.0	71.5	2.8	28.2	2.8	84.0	2.3	73.1	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	41.1	3.0	11.6	2.0	27.5	2.8	43.2	3.1	14.5	2.2	24.8	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.3	0.7	0.3	0.3	1.0	0.6	28.6	2.8	1.6	0.8	2.0	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.3	3.1	59.8	4.2	33.3	4.0	3.2	1.5	65.2	4.1	46.5	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	76.7	3.6	39.1	4.2	62.3	4.1	35.0	4.1	30.9	4.0	48.6	4.3
		Allowed in all areas	7.0	2.2	1.1	0.9	4.3	1.7	61.8	4.2	3.9	1.7	5.0	1.9
Former	Not allowed at all	45.6	4.0	79.4	3.3	58.2	4.0	21.9	3.4	81.6	3.1	64.9	3.9	
	Allowed in some areas	50.5	4.0	19.2	3.2	38.9	3.9	39.5	4.0	15.5	2.9	31.9	3.8	
	Allowed in all areas	3.8	1.5	1.4	0.9	2.9	1.3	38.6	4.0	2.9	1.4	3.3	1.4	
	Overall	Not allowed at all	47.1	2.1	79.7	1.7	62.6	2.1	24.5	1.9	74.5	1.9	62.5	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	49.8	2.1	19.5	1.7	35.6	2.0	43.6	2.1	22.7	1.8	34.8	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	3.1	0.7	0.8	0.4	1.8	0.6	31.9	2.0	2.8	0.7	2.7	0.7
Never	Not allowed at all	59.6	2.8	88.8	1.8	74.1	2.5	32.4	2.7	82.8	2.1	72.2	2.5	
	Allowed in some areas	38.6	2.7	10.8	1.7	25.3	2.4	44.5	2.8	15.5	2.0	26.0	2.5	
	Allowed in all areas	1.9	0.8	0.4	0.3	0.6	0.4	23.1	2.4	1.6	0.7	1.8	0.8	
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.8	3.4	58.7	4.5	32.5	4.3	5.7	2.1	53.8	4.5	39.7	4.4
	Allowed in some areas	76.0	3.9	39.1	4.4	63.2	4.4	41.0	4.5	39.7	4.5	54.8	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	7.2	2.4	2.2	1.3	4.4	1.9	53.2	4.5	6.5	2.2	5.5	2.1	
Former	Not allowed at all	44.3	4.8	76.4	4.0	62.7	4.6	22.9	4.0	73.5	4.2	59.8	4.7	
	Allowed in some areas	53.5	4.8	23.1	4.0	34.8	4.6	43.6	4.8	24.5	4.1	38.3	4.6	
	Allowed in all areas	2.1	1.4	0.5	0.7	2.5	1.5	33.5	4.5	2.0	1.3	1.9	1.3	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Nevada	Overall	Not allowed at all	37.7	2.1	77.2	1.8	51.5	2.1	16.1	1.6	55.3	2.1	44.1	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	56.8	2.1	21.9	1.8	45.8	2.1	45.8	2.2	37.3	2.1	46.8	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	5.5	1.0	0.8	0.4	2.7	0.7	38.1	2.1	7.4	1.1	9.1	1.2
	Never	Not allowed at all	49.2	3.0	85.5	2.1	61.4	2.9	21.7	2.5	61.1	2.9	51.3	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	48.7	3.0	14.1	2.1	37.0	2.9	52.2	3.0	35.0	2.9	41.2	3.0
		Allowed in all areas	2.1	0.9	0.4	0.4	1.6	0.8	26.1	2.7	3.8	1.2	7.5	1.6
	Current	Not allowed at all	14.2	2.8	61.7	4.0	30.1	3.8	3.7	1.6	39.8	4.0	28.2	3.7
		Allowed in some areas	74.2	3.6	36.8	3.9	64.5	3.9	33.4	3.9	44.6	4.1	57.5	4.0
		Allowed in all areas	11.6	2.6	1.5	1.0	5.4	1.9	62.9	4.0	15.5	3.0	14.3	2.8
	Former	Not allowed at all	40.8	4.5	77.9	3.8	55.6	4.6	18.9	3.6	61.5	4.5	47.9	4.6
		Allowed in some areas	53.6	4.6	21.0	3.8	42.8	4.6	46.7	4.6	33.1	4.4	45.9	4.6
		Allowed in all areas	5.6	2.1	1.1	1.0	1.7	1.2	34.4	4.4	5.4	2.1	6.1	2.2
New Hampshire	Overall	Not allowed at all	49.9	2.4	78.8	1.9	62.4	2.3	27.6	2.1	73.9	2.1	66.2	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	48.0	2.4	20.7	1.9	36.3	2.3	47.9	2.4	24.0	2.0	31.7	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	2.2	0.7	0.5	0.3	1.3	0.5	24.5	2.1	2.1	0.7	2.0	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	66.4	3.4	87.1	2.4	75.8	3.0	38.5	3.5	80.9	2.8	75.9	3.0
		Allowed in some areas	32.7	3.3	12.4	2.3	23.4	3.0	47.3	3.6	17.9	2.7	22.8	3.0
		Allowed in all areas	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.8	0.6	14.2	2.5	1.1	0.8	1.3	0.8
	Current	Not allowed at all	15.6	3.5	61.1	4.7	38.3	4.7	6.7	2.4	57.1	4.8	46.8	4.8
		Allowed in some areas	80.3	3.8	38.3	4.6	59.7	4.7	49.1	4.8	38.7	4.7	50.0	4.8
		Allowed in all areas	4.1	1.9	0.6	0.8	2.0	1.4	44.2	4.8	4.2	1.9	3.2	1.7
	Former	Not allowed at all	53.4	4.3	81.0	3.4	62.3	4.2	28.8	3.9	77.1	3.6	67.7	4.0
		Allowed in some areas	44.2	4.2	18.6	3.3	36.3	4.1	47.7	4.3	21.0	3.5	30.1	3.9
		Allowed in all areas	2.4	1.3	0.4	0.5	1.4	1.0	23.5	3.7	1.9	1.2	2.2	1.3

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
New Jersey	Overall	Not allowed at all	48.2	1.3	81.0	1.0	63.2	1.2	28.2	1.1	63.9	1.2	60.7	1.2
		Allowed in some areas	48.2	1.3	17.9	1.0	34.6	1.2	47.8	1.3	31.4	1.2	35.1	1.2
		Allowed in all areas	3.6	0.5	1.1	0.3	2.2	0.4	23.9	1.1	4.7	0.5	4.2	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	59.9	1.7	87.6	1.1	74.3	1.5	37.1	1.6	70.9	1.5	69.5	1.6
		Allowed in some areas	38.8	1.6	11.7	1.1	24.8	1.5	47.9	1.7	26.5	1.5	28.2	1.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.4	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.3	15.0	1.2	2.6	0.5	2.3	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	20.8	2.2	65.4	2.6	34.9	2.6	7.6	1.5	42.5	2.7	36.5	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	70.3	2.5	33.0	2.6	59.5	2.7	43.7	2.8	46.4	2.8	53.8	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	8.9	1.6	1.6	0.7	5.6	1.3	48.7	2.8	11.1	1.7	9.7	1.6
Former	Not allowed at all	45.0	2.5	78.9	2.1	61.6	2.5	25.6	2.2	66.0	2.4	61.1	2.5	
	Allowed in some areas	50.8	2.5	19.4	2.0	36.0	2.4	51.1	2.6	29.8	2.3	34.9	2.4	
	Allowed in all areas	4.2	1.0	1.6	0.6	2.4	0.8	23.3	2.2	4.2	1.0	4.0	1.0	
New Mexico	Overall	Not allowed at all	49.0	2.1	81.5	1.6	65.4	2.0	23.8	1.8	75.0	1.8	65.4	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	47.6	2.1	17.5	1.6	32.5	2.0	41.8	2.1	21.9	1.7	31.2	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	3.4	0.8	1.1	0.4	2.1	0.6	34.4	2.0	3.1	0.7	3.3	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	60.7	2.8	87.7	1.9	75.4	2.5	32.9	2.8	79.9	2.3	73.2	2.6
		Allowed in some areas	37.8	2.8	11.9	1.9	24.0	2.5	43.8	2.9	18.5	2.3	25.1	2.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.7	0.4	0.4	0.6	0.5	23.3	2.5	1.6	0.7	1.7	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	22.6	3.5	70.9	3.8	46.6	4.2	6.8	2.1	64.6	4.0	49.5	4.2
		Allowed in some areas	71.1	3.8	27.2	3.7	49.6	4.2	36.5	4.1	30.0	3.8	45.2	4.2
		Allowed in all areas	6.3	2.0	2.0	1.2	3.8	1.6	56.7	4.2	5.5	1.9	5.3	1.9
Former	Not allowed at all	51.4	4.4	79.1	3.5	63.4	4.2	21.8	3.6	75.2	3.8	65.3	4.1	
	Allowed in some areas	44.0	4.3	19.3	3.4	33.2	4.1	43.4	4.4	20.9	3.5	29.8	4.0	
	Allowed in all areas	4.6	1.8	1.6	1.1	3.4	1.6	34.8	4.2	3.9	1.7	4.8	1.9	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
New York	Overall	Not allowed at all	49.9	0.9	80.1	0.7	62.2	0.9	32.2	0.8	67.4	0.9	66.6	0.9
		Allowed in some areas	46.4	0.9	19.1	0.7	35.9	0.9	48.1	0.9	29.1	0.8	30.5	0.8
		Allowed in all areas	3.6	0.3	0.8	0.2	1.9	0.2	19.7	0.7	3.5	0.3	2.8	0.3
	Never	Not allowed at all	62.2	1.2	86.7	0.8	73.3	1.1	42.5	1.2	74.4	1.1	74.4	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	35.9	1.2	12.9	0.8	25.9	1.1	45.0	1.2	23.6	1.0	23.9	1.0
		Allowed in all areas	1.9	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.9	0.2	12.5	0.8	2.0	0.3	1.7	0.3
	Current	Not allowed at all	21.4	1.6	64.9	1.8	35.5	1.9	11.0	1.2	49.9	1.9	48.6	1.9
		Allowed in some areas	70.9	1.8	33.4	1.8	60.5	1.9	52.4	1.9	43.2	1.9	46.3	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	7.7	1.0	1.7	0.5	4.0	0.8	36.7	1.9	6.9	1.0	5.1	0.9
Former	Not allowed at all	47.2	1.9	78.6	1.6	60.7	1.9	27.5	1.7	67.0	1.8	65.0	1.8	
	Allowed in some areas	48.8	1.9	20.4	1.5	37.1	1.8	51.8	1.9	29.1	1.7	31.5	1.8	
	Allowed in all areas	4.0	0.7	0.9	0.4	2.2	0.6	20.8	1.5	3.9	0.7	3.5	0.7	
North Carolina	Overall	Not allowed at all	33.5	1.3	68.5	1.3	48.1	1.4	21.5	1.2	54.4	1.4	47.0	1.4
		Allowed in some areas	61.3	1.4	29.7	1.3	48.3	1.4	47.3	1.5	39.9	1.4	46.8	1.4
		Allowed in all areas	5.2	0.6	1.8	0.4	3.6	0.5	31.3	1.3	5.7	0.7	6.2	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	42.9	1.9	76.1	1.7	59.0	1.9	28.7	1.8	60.7	1.9	55.7	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	54.4	2.0	22.7	1.6	38.9	1.9	47.9	2.0	35.6	1.9	40.8	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	2.7	0.6	1.2	0.4	2.1	0.6	23.4	1.7	3.7	0.7	3.5	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	12.0	1.8	51.1	2.8	23.9	2.4	5.6	1.3	38.2	2.7	26.9	2.5
		Allowed in some areas	78.4	2.3	45.3	2.8	69.0	2.6	47.2	2.8	51.2	2.8	60.9	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	9.6	1.6	3.6	1.0	7.1	1.4	47.1	2.8	10.6	1.7	12.2	1.8
Former	Not allowed at all	37.2	3.1	71.3	2.9	51.3	3.2	23.8	2.7	59.0	3.1	50.6	3.2	
	Allowed in some areas	56.8	3.1	27.4	2.8	45.7	3.1	45.7	3.2	36.3	3.0	44.1	3.1	
	Allowed in all areas	6.0	1.5	1.3	0.7	3.0	1.1	30.5	3.0	4.6	1.3	5.3	1.4	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
North Dakota	Overall	Not allowed at all	43.6	2.2	78.9	1.8	61.9	2.2	22.5	1.9	77.8	1.9	63.7	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	52.9	2.2	20.0	1.8	35.8	2.1	46.2	2.2	20.2	1.8	34.0	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.5	0.8	1.0	0.5	2.3	0.7	31.3	2.1	2.0	0.6	2.3	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	55.8	3.0	88.0	2.0	74.4	2.6	30.3	2.8	84.2	2.2	72.3	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	43.4	3.0	11.6	1.9	24.6	2.6	47.0	3.1	14.7	2.1	26.3	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	0.8	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.9	0.6	22.7	2.6	1.0	0.6	1.4	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	14.0	3.2	57.9	4.6	30.1	4.2	4.2	1.9	59.7	4.5	41.0	4.5
		Allowed in some areas	76.9	3.9	40.0	4.5	64.3	4.4	42.3	4.6	35.9	4.4	54.7	4.6
		Allowed in all areas	9.0	2.6	2.1	1.3	5.6	2.1	53.5	4.6	4.4	1.9	4.3	1.9
Former	Not allowed at all	44.6	4.6	78.9	3.8	64.5	4.5	23.0	4.0	81.1	3.7	66.6	4.4	
	Allowed in some areas	50.9	4.7	19.6	3.7	33.3	4.4	48.3	4.7	17.1	3.5	31.0	4.3	
	Allowed in all areas	4.4	1.9	1.5	1.1	2.1	1.4	28.7	4.3	1.8	1.2	2.5	1.4	
Ohio	Overall	Not allowed at all	39.0	1.2	70.3	1.1	51.7	1.2	20.7	1.0	61.5	1.2	51.9	1.2
		Allowed in some areas	56.6	1.2	28.1	1.1	44.9	1.2	42.0	1.2	33.2	1.2	43.2	1.2
		Allowed in all areas	4.4	0.5	1.6	0.3	3.4	0.4	37.3	1.2	5.3	0.6	5.0	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	53.5	1.7	80.8	1.4	66.4	1.6	29.4	1.6	71.5	1.6	64.7	1.7
		Allowed in some areas	44.6	1.7	18.4	1.3	32.1	1.6	44.5	1.7	25.7	1.5	32.7	1.6
		Allowed in all areas	1.8	0.5	0.8	0.3	1.5	0.4	26.1	1.5	2.8	0.6	2.6	0.6
	Current	Not allowed at all	11.9	1.5	49.6	2.4	23.3	2.0	5.1	1.0	40.6	2.3	28.7	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	78.7	1.9	47.3	2.4	69.4	2.2	34.6	2.3	48.1	2.4	61.3	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	9.4	1.4	3.1	0.8	7.3	1.2	60.4	2.3	11.3	1.5	10.0	1.4
Former	Not allowed at all	39.3	2.5	71.6	2.3	52.7	2.5	20.3	2.1	64.3	2.4	51.2	2.5	
	Allowed in some areas	56.6	2.5	26.7	2.2	44.1	2.5	45.3	2.6	31.8	2.4	44.7	2.5	
	Allowed in all areas	4.1	1.0	1.7	0.7	3.2	0.9	34.4	2.4	3.9	1.0	4.1	1.0	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Oklahoma	Overall	Not allowed at all	43.8	2.1	72.4	1.9	54.9	2.1	23.9	1.8	64.6	2.0	57.2	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	52.0	2.1	25.7	1.9	42.4	2.1	37.1	2.1	30.7	2.0	37.7	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	4.2	0.9	1.9	0.6	2.7	0.7	39.1	2.1	4.7	0.9	5.1	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	56.1	2.9	81.8	2.2	66.3	2.7	32.6	2.7	71.7	2.6	66.4	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	42.4	2.9	17.2	2.2	32.8	2.7	36.7	2.8	25.7	2.5	31.7	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.5	0.7	0.9	0.6	0.9	0.5	30.7	2.7	2.6	0.9	1.9	0.8
	Current	Not allowed at all	15.6	3.0	52.2	4.2	28.3	3.8	5.1	1.9	45.8	4.2	35.3	4.0
		Allowed in some areas	74.5	3.6	43.6	4.1	65.2	4.0	37.8	4.1	44.6	4.2	53.4	4.2
		Allowed in all areas	9.9	2.5	4.2	1.7	6.5	2.1	57.1	4.2	9.6	2.5	11.3	2.7
Former	Not allowed at all	47.0	4.7	73.0	4.2	58.2	4.7	24.5	4.1	69.2	4.4	60.2	4.6	
	Allowed in some areas	48.7	4.7	25.5	4.1	39.0	4.6	37.0	4.6	26.5	4.2	34.2	4.5	
	Allowed in all areas	4.3	1.9	1.5	1.2	2.8	1.6	38.5	4.7	4.3	1.9	5.6	2.2	
Oregon	Overall	Not allowed at all	57.5	2.2	81.9	1.7	70.4	2.0	24.7	1.9	78.4	1.8	70.9	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	40.6	2.2	17.5	1.7	28.3	2.0	43.5	2.2	19.6	1.8	27.0	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	1.9	0.6	0.6	0.4	1.3	0.5	31.8	2.1	2.0	0.6	2.1	0.6
Never	Not allowed at all	72.5	2.7	89.5	1.9	82.9	2.3	33.7	2.9	83.7	2.3	80.7	2.4	
	Allowed in some areas	26.2	2.7	9.9	1.8	16.4	2.3	46.2	3.1	15.0	2.2	18.0	2.4	
	Allowed in all areas	1.2	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.5	20.1	2.5	1.4	0.7	1.3	0.7	
Current	Not allowed at all	20.6	3.8	66.3	4.4	45.8	4.7	5.0	2.0	65.0	4.5	50.1	4.7	
	Allowed in some areas	75.7	4.0	32.9	4.4	51.4	4.7	39.2	4.6	32.1	4.4	46.8	4.6	
	Allowed in all areas	3.7	1.7	0.8	0.8	2.8	1.5	55.8	4.6	2.9	1.6	3.1	1.6	
Former	Not allowed at all	59.5	4.3	80.1	3.5	66.6	4.1	24.0	3.8	79.5	3.6	69.7	4.0	
	Allowed in some areas	38.7	4.3	19.3	3.5	32.0	4.1	41.8	4.3	17.9	3.4	27.5	3.9	
	Allowed in all areas	1.8	1.2	0.6	0.7	1.4	1.0	34.2	4.2	2.6	1.4	2.9	1.5	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Outdoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Pennsylvania	Overall	Not allowed at all	44.0	1.2	77.5	1.0	57.1	1.2	24.3	1.0	65.9	1.1	57.1	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	52.3	1.2	21.6	1.0	40.5	1.1	45.4	1.2	29.9	1.1	38.6	1.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.7	0.4	1.0	0.2	2.4	0.4	30.3	1.1	4.3	0.5	4.3	0.5
	Never	Not allowed at all	56.6	1.6	85.8	1.1	69.6	1.5	33.9	1.6	73.5	1.5	68.2	1.5
		Allowed in some areas	41.5	1.6	13.6	1.1	29.4	1.5	45.8	1.7	24.4	1.4	29.5	1.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.9	0.4	0.6	0.2	1.1	0.3	20.3	1.3	2.1	0.5	2.3	0.5
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.9	1.8	60.2	2.3	31.0	2.2	5.4	1.1	48.6	2.3	34.1	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	76.2	2.0	38.3	2.3	64.4	2.2	42.5	2.3	43.5	2.3	58.1	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	6.9	1.2	1.5	0.6	4.6	1.0	52.1	2.4	8.0	1.3	7.8	1.3
Former	Not allowed at all	45.5	2.3	77.8	1.9	57.9	2.3	24.1	2.0	67.6	2.2	57.8	2.3	
	Allowed in some areas	50.4	2.3	20.9	1.9	39.2	2.2	47.5	2.3	27.6	2.1	37.4	2.2	
	Allowed in all areas	4.2	0.9	1.3	0.5	2.9	0.8	28.4	2.1	4.8	1.0	4.8	1.0	
Rhode Island	Overall	Not allowed at all	50.2	2.3	79.2	1.9	60.7	2.3	29.4	2.1	69.0	2.2	61.6	2.3
		Allowed in some areas	46.3	2.3	18.9	1.8	36.7	2.3	46.7	2.4	26.8	2.1	34.9	2.2
		Allowed in all areas	3.5	0.9	2.0	0.6	2.6	0.8	23.9	2.0	4.2	0.9	3.5	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	63.4	3.2	84.9	2.4	71.7	3.0	41.4	3.3	76.3	2.9	70.7	3.1
		Allowed in some areas	33.8	3.2	13.2	2.3	26.2	3.0	45.0	3.4	20.7	2.7	26.5	3.0
		Allowed in all areas	2.8	1.1	1.9	0.9	2.1	1.0	13.6	2.3	3.0	1.1	2.8	1.1
	Current	Not allowed at all	24.6	4.0	66.9	4.4	37.1	4.5	9.2	2.7	52.8	4.7	43.6	4.7
		Allowed in some areas	70.6	4.3	31.8	4.3	59.5	4.6	46.9	4.7	40.6	4.6	51.0	4.7
		Allowed in all areas	4.8	2.0	1.3	1.0	3.5	1.7	44.0	4.7	6.7	2.4	5.5	2.1
Former	Not allowed at all	50.5	4.5	80.3	3.6	62.6	4.4	26.6	4.0	70.6	4.1	62.0	4.4	
	Allowed in some areas	46.0	4.5	17.0	3.4	34.5	4.3	49.6	4.6	25.2	4.0	34.9	4.3	
	Allowed in all areas	3.5	1.7	2.8	1.5	2.8	1.5	23.7	3.9	4.1	1.8	3.1	1.6	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
South Carolina	Overall	Not allowed at all	37.3	2.1	69.7	2.0	53.5	2.1	24.4	1.9	59.5	2.1	51.8	2.2
		Allowed in some areas	56.8	2.1	28.8	1.9	42.9	2.1	41.8	2.1	35.5	2.1	43.3	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	5.9	1.0	1.5	0.5	3.6	0.8	33.8	2.1	5.0	0.9	4.9	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	48.6	2.9	77.1	2.4	65.0	2.8	33.2	2.8	66.8	2.7	62.0	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	47.9	2.9	22.1	2.4	34.0	2.7	44.0	2.9	31.1	2.7	35.7	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	3.4	1.1	0.8	0.5	1.1	0.6	22.8	2.5	2.1	0.8	2.3	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	10.9	2.6	52.2	4.2	28.7	3.8	6.3	2.0	39.3	4.1	28.7	3.8
		Allowed in some areas	78.5	3.4	45.0	4.2	62.6	4.1	37.8	4.1	49.1	4.2	61.4	4.1
		Allowed in all areas	10.5	2.6	2.7	1.4	8.7	2.4	55.9	4.2	11.6	2.7	9.9	2.5
Former	Not allowed at all	41.0	4.9	72.4	4.4	54.4	5.0	24.3	4.3	66.3	4.7	54.5	5.0	
	Allowed in some areas	52.4	5.0	25.6	4.3	41.8	4.9	40.9	5.0	29.2	4.5	40.0	4.9	
	Allowed in all areas	6.5	2.5	1.9	1.4	3.8	1.9	34.8	4.8	4.5	2.1	5.5	2.3	
South Dakota	Overall	Not allowed at all	44.9	2.1	78.0	1.7	61.7	2.0	22.0	1.8	77.9	1.7	66.6	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	51.9	2.1	21.1	1.7	36.1	2.0	40.6	2.1	19.9	1.7	30.8	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	3.2	0.7	0.8	0.4	2.2	0.6	37.3	2.0	2.2	0.6	2.6	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	57.1	2.8	87.9	1.9	74.2	2.5	30.4	2.7	85.0	2.0	77.2	2.4
		Allowed in some areas	42.2	2.8	11.8	1.8	25.2	2.5	42.8	2.9	13.7	2.0	21.3	2.3
		Allowed in all areas	0.7	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.7	0.5	26.7	2.6	1.3	0.6	1.5	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	13.4	3.0	57.0	4.3	31.0	4.1	4.0	1.7	59.0	4.3	41.1	4.3
		Allowed in some areas	77.6	3.6	40.4	4.3	62.8	4.2	33.8	4.2	36.0	4.2	52.6	4.4
		Allowed in all areas	8.9	2.5	2.5	1.4	6.2	2.1	62.2	4.3	5.0	1.9	6.3	2.1
Former	Not allowed at all	47.7	4.3	75.9	3.7	63.0	4.1	20.9	3.5	80.0	3.4	67.0	4.0	
	Allowed in some areas	49.1	4.3	23.5	3.6	35.3	4.1	42.3	4.3	18.4	3.3	31.3	4.0	
	Allowed in all areas	3.1	1.5	0.6	0.7	1.7	1.1	36.8	4.2	1.6	1.1	1.8	1.1	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Tennessee	Overall	Not allowed at all	42.2	2.1	71.5	1.9	55.6	2.1	25.5	1.9	64.2	2.0	56.1	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	52.8	2.1	26.8	1.8	40.7	2.0	40.6	2.1	31.3	1.9	39.8	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	4.9	0.9	1.7	0.5	3.7	0.8	33.9	2.0	4.5	0.9	4.1	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	57.6	2.9	82.3	2.3	69.5	2.7	35.5	2.9	73.1	2.6	67.5	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	40.2	2.9	17.2	2.2	29.4	2.7	41.6	3.0	24.6	2.6	30.6	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	2.2	0.9	0.6	0.4	1.1	0.6	22.9	2.6	2.3	0.9	1.9	0.8
	Current	Not allowed at all	14.1	2.8	49.9	4.0	25.6	3.5	6.6	2.0	45.3	4.0	32.5	3.7
		Allowed in some areas	76.2	3.4	46.3	4.0	65.8	3.8	39.0	3.9	45.7	4.0	59.0	3.9
		Allowed in all areas	9.8	2.4	3.7	1.5	8.6	2.2	54.4	4.0	9.0	2.3	8.5	2.2
	Former	Not allowed at all	42.9	4.3	74.1	3.7	61.4	4.2	27.3	3.9	67.6	4.0	59.8	4.2
		Allowed in some areas	52.1	4.3	24.3	3.7	35.2	4.1	40.5	4.3	28.8	3.9	36.6	4.1
		Allowed in all areas	5.0	1.9	1.7	1.1	3.4	1.5	32.2	4.1	3.6	1.6	3.6	1.6
Texas	Overall	Not allowed at all	51.8	1.1	81.2	0.9	67.4	1.1	27.2	1.0	69.8	1.0	64.8	1.1
		Allowed in some areas	45.3	1.1	17.9	0.9	30.6	1.0	39.1	1.1	26.2	1.0	32.0	1.0
		Allowed in all areas	2.9	0.4	1.0	0.2	2.0	0.3	33.7	1.1	4.0	0.4	3.2	0.4
	Never	Not allowed at all	63.7	1.4	88.1	1.0	78.3	1.2	35.2	1.4	77.0	1.3	73.8	1.3
		Allowed in some areas	34.9	1.4	11.3	0.9	20.8	1.2	40.5	1.5	20.6	1.2	24.3	1.3
		Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.3	0.5	0.2	0.9	0.3	24.3	1.3	2.4	0.5	1.9	0.4
Current	Not allowed at all	22.3	1.9	65.3	2.2	41.4	2.3	7.9	1.2	49.9	2.3	42.6	2.3	
	Allowed in some areas	71.1	2.1	32.5	2.2	53.3	2.3	34.6	2.2	41.3	2.3	50.6	2.3	
	Allowed in all areas	6.6	1.1	2.2	0.7	5.3	1.0	57.5	2.3	8.8	1.3	6.8	1.2	
Former	Not allowed at all	52.9	2.6	80.1	2.0	67.1	2.4	27.5	2.3	72.7	2.3	65.6	2.4	
	Allowed in some areas	44.4	2.5	19.1	2.0	31.7	2.4	40.7	2.6	24.2	2.2	31.7	2.4	
	Allowed in all areas	2.7	0.8	0.8	0.5	1.1	0.5	31.8	2.4	3.1	0.9	2.8	0.8	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Utah	Overall	Not allowed at all	67.8	2.0	87.3	1.4	76.9	1.8	19.6	1.7	82.5	1.6	82.0	1.6
		Allowed in some areas	31.3	2.0	12.4	1.4	22.5	1.8	33.8	2.1	16.3	1.6	17.0	1.6
		Allowed in all areas	1.0	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.3	46.6	2.2	1.3	0.5	1.0	0.4
	Never	Not allowed at all	77.7	2.1	92.3	1.4	84.4	1.8	22.9	2.2	87.0	1.7	86.6	1.7
		Allowed in some areas	21.8	2.1	7.6	1.3	15.1	1.8	36.4	2.5	12.3	1.7	12.7	1.7
		Allowed in all areas	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.3	40.6	2.6	0.8	0.4	0.7	0.4
	Current	Not allowed at all	27.3	4.8	68.2	5.0	46.4	5.4	4.1	2.1	61.6	5.3	61.9	5.2
		Allowed in some areas	70.4	4.9	31.0	5.0	52.3	5.4	26.5	4.8	34.9	5.1	36.7	5.2
		Allowed in all areas	2.3	1.6	0.9	1.0	1.3	1.2	69.4	5.0	3.5	2.0	1.4	1.3
Former	Not allowed at all	63.5	5.3	84.0	4.0	74.0	4.8	21.2	4.6	83.4	4.1	81.4	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	34.6	5.3	15.6	4.0	25.4	4.8	29.5	5.1	15.3	4.0	16.2	4.1	
	Allowed in all areas	1.8	1.5	0.3	0.6	0.7	0.9	49.3	5.6	1.3	1.2	2.4	1.7	
Overall	Not allowed at all	52.0	2.3	81.8	1.8	65.7	2.2	30.7	2.2	81.4	1.8	75.1	2.0	
	Allowed in some areas	45.3	2.3	17.4	1.8	32.7	2.2	47.6	2.3	16.4	1.7	22.7	1.9	
	Allowed in all areas	2.8	0.8	0.8	0.4	1.6	0.6	21.7	1.9	2.2	0.7	2.2	0.7	
Never	Not allowed at all	65.0	3.3	88.4	2.2	77.1	2.9	40.4	3.4	85.2	2.4	82.0	2.6	
	Allowed in some areas	33.6	3.3	11.3	2.2	22.1	2.9	48.1	3.5	13.4	2.4	16.2	2.5	
	Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.8	0.3	0.4	0.8	0.6	11.6	2.2	1.4	0.8	1.7	0.9	
Current	Not allowed at all	26.3	4.1	69.8	4.2	44.6	4.6	11.7	3.0	70.7	4.2	63.7	4.4	
	Allowed in some areas	68.3	4.3	28.4	4.2	52.5	4.6	47.7	4.6	25.3	4.0	32.9	4.3	
	Allowed in all areas	5.3	2.1	1.7	1.2	2.9	1.5	40.6	4.6	3.9	1.8	3.4	1.7	
Former	Not allowed at all	54.0	4.3	82.0	3.3	66.5	4.1	32.3	4.1	84.7	3.1	74.3	3.8	
	Allowed in some areas	43.3	4.3	17.2	3.3	31.9	4.0	46.7	4.3	13.2	2.9	23.7	3.7	
	Allowed in all areas	2.7	1.4	0.8	0.8	1.6	1.1	21.0	3.5	2.1	1.3	1.9	1.2	

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
Virginia	Overall	Not allowed at all	42.7	2.0	75.1	1.8	58.3	2.0	23.2	1.7	66.0	1.9	58.0	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	52.9	2.0	23.7	1.7	38.9	2.0	49.8	2.0	29.0	1.8	36.9	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	4.3	0.8	1.2	0.4	2.8	0.7	27.0	1.8	4.9	0.9	5.0	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	54.5	2.8	82.4	2.1	71.0	2.6	30.7	2.6	73.3	2.5	68.6	2.6
		Allowed in some areas	43.9	2.8	17.2	2.1	27.9	2.5	51.9	2.8	23.3	2.4	28.8	2.6
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.7	0.4	0.4	1.1	0.6	17.4	2.2	3.4	1.0	2.7	0.9
	Current	Not allowed at all	16.6	3.0	56.5	4.1	29.8	3.7	6.5	2.0	46.5	4.1	33.4	3.8
		Allowed in some areas	73.3	3.6	40.6	4.0	63.5	3.9	45.2	4.1	43.7	4.1	56.5	4.0
		Allowed in all areas	10.1	2.5	3.0	1.4	6.7	2.0	48.3	4.1	9.8	2.4	10.0	2.5
	Former	Not allowed at all	44.3	4.1	78.6	3.4	60.2	4.1	24.4	3.6	70.5	3.8	60.7	4.1
		Allowed in some areas	51.4	4.2	20.6	3.4	37.4	4.0	49.9	4.2	26.1	3.7	34.4	4.0
		Allowed in all areas	4.2	1.7	0.8	0.7	2.3	1.3	25.7	3.7	3.4	1.5	4.9	1.8
Washington	Overall	Not allowed at all	53.9	2.2	83.1	1.7	70.3	2.1	23.8	1.9	76.9	1.9	73.1	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	43.5	2.2	15.9	1.6	27.9	2.0	45.0	2.3	20.6	1.8	24.5	1.9
		Allowed in all areas	2.6	0.7	1.1	0.5	1.8	0.6	31.3	2.1	2.5	0.7	2.4	0.7
	Never	Not allowed at all	67.7	3.0	88.5	2.0	81.3	2.5	33.5	3.0	81.7	2.4	79.0	2.6
		Allowed in some areas	30.7	2.9	10.6	1.9	17.6	2.4	47.2	3.2	16.6	2.4	19.2	2.5
		Allowed in all areas	1.6	0.8	0.9	0.6	1.1	0.6	19.3	2.5	1.7	0.8	1.8	0.8
	Current	Not allowed at all	24.0	3.9	72.7	4.1	49.6	4.6	4.3	1.9	64.8	4.4	63.1	4.5
		Allowed in some areas	70.1	4.2	25.8	4.0	46.5	4.6	39.0	4.5	30.4	4.3	32.8	4.3
		Allowed in all areas	5.9	2.2	1.5	1.1	3.9	1.8	56.7	4.6	4.8	2.0	4.2	1.8
	Former	Not allowed at all	54.5	4.5	81.8	3.5	67.8	4.2	23.2	3.8	78.9	3.7	70.5	4.1
		Allowed in some areas	43.9	4.5	17.2	3.4	30.8	4.1	46.3	4.5	19.3	3.5	27.3	4.0
		Allowed in all areas	1.5	1.1	1.0	0.9	1.4	1.0	30.5	4.2	1.8	1.2	2.1	1.3

Table 9b (Continued)

State	Overall/ Smoking Status	Smoking Should be:	Restaurants		Hospitals		Indoor Work Areas		Bars and Cocktail Lounges		Indoor Sporting Events		Indoor Shopping Malls	
			%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI	%	CI
West Virginia	Overall	Not allowed at all	35.8	1.9	64.9	1.9	47.6	2.0	22.0	1.7	65.2	1.9	49.5	2.0
		Allowed in some areas	59.0	2.0	33.4	1.9	48.3	2.0	36.7	2.0	30.5	1.9	45.2	2.0
		Allowed in all areas	5.2	0.9	1.7	0.5	4.0	0.8	41.3	2.0	4.3	0.8	5.2	0.9
	Never	Not allowed at all	50.3	2.9	77.0	2.5	61.4	2.9	31.6	2.8	74.9	2.5	61.5	2.8
		Allowed in some areas	46.3	2.9	21.8	2.4	36.0	2.8	34.6	2.9	22.1	2.4	34.8	2.8
		Allowed in all areas	3.4	1.1	1.2	0.6	2.6	0.9	33.8	2.8	3.0	1.0	3.7	1.1
	Current	Not allowed at all	11.8	2.5	45.9	3.8	22.4	3.2	5.6	1.8	47.6	3.8	27.4	3.4
		Allowed in some areas	79.8	3.1	51.5	3.8	70.2	3.5	38.2	3.8	45.6	3.8	63.5	3.7
		Allowed in all areas	8.4	2.1	2.6	1.2	7.4	2.0	56.2	3.8	6.8	1.9	9.2	2.2
Former	Not allowed at all	35.0	3.9	63.0	4.0	49.8	4.1	22.7	3.5	66.3	3.9	51.7	4.1	
	Allowed in some areas	59.8	4.0	35.2	3.9	47.4	4.1	38.9	4.1	29.5	3.8	44.6	4.1	
	Allowed in all areas	5.2	1.8	1.8	1.1	2.8	1.4	38.4	4.1	4.1	1.6	3.6	1.5	
Wisconsin	Overall	Not allowed at all	42.8	2.1	77.4	1.8	60.4	2.1	20.4	1.8	71.4	2.0	62.2	2.1
		Allowed in some areas	54.1	2.2	21.8	1.8	37.3	2.1	43.4	2.2	24.8	1.9	34.4	2.1
		Allowed in all areas	3.1	0.8	0.8	0.4	2.4	0.7	36.2	2.1	3.8	0.8	3.4	0.8
	Never	Not allowed at all	56.5	3.0	85.9	2.1	72.1	2.7	28.0	2.8	79.4	2.5	72.7	2.7
		Allowed in some areas	42.1	3.0	13.7	2.1	26.6	2.7	45.9	3.1	18.5	2.4	25.8	2.7
		Allowed in all areas	1.4	0.7	0.4	0.4	1.3	0.7	26.1	2.7	2.1	0.9	1.5	0.7
	Current	Not allowed at all	15.9	3.1	59.9	4.2	35.9	4.1	4.3	1.7	53.6	4.3	42.0	4.2
		Allowed in some areas	77.1	3.6	38.6	4.2	59.4	4.2	36.3	4.1	39.6	4.2	51.1	4.3
		Allowed in all areas	6.9	2.2	1.5	1.1	4.7	1.8	59.4	4.2	6.8	2.2	6.9	2.2
Former	Not allowed at all	42.8	4.4	78.2	3.6	61.9	4.3	21.8	3.7	73.7	3.9	62.1	4.3	
	Allowed in some areas	54.6	4.4	20.8	3.6	36.0	4.3	45.9	4.4	22.2	3.7	34.5	4.2	
	Allowed in all areas	2.6	1.4	1.0	0.9	2.1	1.3	32.2	4.1	4.2	1.8	3.4	1.6	

Section IV:

Model Tobacco Control Ordinances

The model ordinances in this section were developed based on Americans for Nonsmokers' Rights' (ANR) 20+ years of experience helping communities enact and implement local tobacco-control ordinances. The provisions and language have been adopted by literally hundreds of communities across the country and have proven themselves over the test of time and implementation. Carefully review the model ordinance(s) and determine what, if any, modifications to make based on the needs and practices of your community.

ANR strongly encourages you to contact them for assistance as you develop your draft ordinance; their staff can review drafts and provide extensive background materials. You can reach ANR at (510) 841-3032 or visit their web site at <http://www.no-smoke.org> for updated versions of these model ordinances, as well as other useful resources.

MODEL ORDINANCE ELIMINATING SMOKING IN WORKPLACES AND ENCLOSED PUBLIC PLACES (100% SMOKE-FREE)*

Revised May 14, 1999

Sec. 1000. Title

This article shall be known as the *Smoking Pollution Control Ordinance*.

Sec. 1001. Findings and Purpose

The City Council [or Board of Supervisors] does hereby find that:

Numerous studies have found that tobacco smoke is a major contributor to indoor air pollution, and that breathing secondhand smoke is a cause of disease, including lung cancer, in nonsmokers. At special risk are children, elderly people, individuals with cardiovascular disease, and individuals with impaired respiratory function, including asthmatics and those with obstructive airway disease; and

Health hazards induced by breathing secondhand smoke include lung cancer, heart disease, respiratory infection, and decreased respiratory function, including bronchoconstriction and bronchospasm.

Accordingly, the City Council [or Board of Supervisors] finds and declares that the purposes of this ordinance are (1) to protect the public health and welfare by prohibiting smoking in public places and places of employment; and (2) to guarantee the right of nonsmokers to breathe smoke-free air, and to recognize that the need to breathe smoke-free air shall have priority over the desire to smoke.

Sec. 1002. Definitions

The following words and phrases, whenever used in this article, shall be construed as defined in this section:

1. "Bar" means an area which is devoted to the serving of alcoholic beverages for consumption by guests on the premises and in which the serving of food is only incidental to the consumption of such beverages. A "bar" for the purposes of this ordinance shall not include any area where full meals are served, but may include the service of appetizers and snacks.

2. "Business" means any sole proprietorship, partnership, joint venture, corporation or other business entity formed for profit-making purposes, including retail establishments where goods or services are sold as well as professional corporations and other entities where legal, medical, dental, engineering, architectural, or other professional services are delivered.

* Developed by the American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation: 2530 San Pablo Avenue, Suite J, Berkeley, California 94702, Phone (510) 841-3032 Fax (510) 841-3071.

3. "Employee" means any person who is employed by any employer in the consideration for direct or indirect monetary wages or profit, and any person who volunteers his or her services for a non-profit entity.

4. "Employer" means any person, partnership, corporation, including a municipal corporation, or non-profit entity, who employs the services of one or more individual persons.

5. "Enclosed Area" means all space between a floor and ceiling which is enclosed on all sides by solid walls or windows (exclusive of door or passage ways) which extend from the floor to the ceiling, including all space therein screened by partitions which do not extend to the ceiling or are not solid, "office landscaping" or similar structures.

6. "Place of Employment" means any enclosed area under the control of a public or private employer which employees normally frequent during the course of employment, including, but not limited to, work areas, employee lounges and restrooms, conference and class rooms, employee cafeterias and hallways. A private residence is not a "place of employment" unless it is used as a child care, adult day care, or health care facility.

7. "Public Place" means any enclosed area to which the public is invited or in which the public is permitted, including but not limited to, banks, educational facilities, health facilities, Laundromats, public transportation facilities, reception areas, restaurants, retail food production and marketing establishments, retail service establishments, retail stores, theaters, and waiting rooms. A private residence is not a "public place."

8. "Restaurant" means any coffee shop, cafeteria, sandwich stand, private and public school cafeteria, and any other eating establishment which gives or offers for sale food to the public, guests, or employees, as well as kitchens in which food is prepared on the premises for serving elsewhere, including catering facilities, except that the term "restaurant" shall not include a cocktail lounge or tavern if said cocktail lounge or tavern is a "bar" as defined in Section 1002 (1).

9. "Retail Tobacco Store" means a retail store utilized primarily for the sale of tobacco products and accessories and in which the sale of other products is merely incidental.

10. "Service Line" means any indoor line at which one (1) or more persons are waiting for or receiving service of any kind, whether or not such service involves the exchange of money.

11. "Smoking" means inhaling, exhaling, burning or carrying any lighted cigar, cigarette, pipe, weed, plant, or other combustible substance in any manner or in any form.

12. "Sports Arena" means sports pavilions, gymnasiums, health spas, boxing arenas, swimming pools, roller and ice rinks, bowling alleys, and other similar places where members of the general public assemble either to engage in physical exercise, participate in athletic competition, or witness sports events.

Sec. 1003. Application of Article to City-Owned [County-Owned] Facilities

All enclosed facilities owned by the City [County] of _____ shall be subject to the provisions of this article.

Sec. 1004. Prohibition of Smoking in Public Places

A. Smoking shall be prohibited in all enclosed public places within the City [County] of _____, including, but not limited to, the following places:

1. Elevators.
2. Restrooms, lobbies, reception areas, hallways and any other common-use areas.
3. Buses, taxicabs, and other means of public transit under the authority of the City [County] of _____, and ticket, boarding, and waiting areas of public transit depots.
4. Service lines.
5. Retail stores.
6. All areas available to and customarily used by the general public in all businesses and non-profit entities patronized by the public, including but not limited to, attorneys' offices and other offices, banks, Laundromats, hotels and motels.
7. Restaurants and restaurant bar areas.
8. Bars.
9. Public areas of aquariums, galleries, libraries, and museums when open to the public.
10. Any facility which is primarily used for exhibiting any motion picture, stage, drama, lecture, musical recital or other similar performance, except performers when smoking is part of a stage production.
11. Sports arenas and convention halls, including bowling facilities.
12. Every room, chamber, place of meeting or public assembly, including school buildings under the control of any board, council, commission, committee, including joint committees, or agencies of the City [County] or any political subdivision of the State during such time as a public meeting is in progress, to the extent such place is subject to the jurisdiction of the City [County].
13. Waiting rooms, hallways, wards and semiprivate rooms of health facilities, including, but not limited to, hospitals, clinics, physical therapy facilities, doctors' offices, and dentists' offices.
14. Lobbies, hallways, and other common areas in apartment buildings, condominiums, trailer parks, retirement facilities, nursing homes, and other multiple-unit residential facilities.

15. Polling places.

16. Bingo games.

B. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any owner, operator, manager, or other person who controls any establishment or facility may declare that entire establishment or facility as a nonsmoking establishment.

Sec. 1005. Prohibition of Smoking in Places of Employment

A. It shall be the responsibility of employers to provide a smoke-free workplace for all employees, but employers are not required to incur any expense to make structural or other physical modifications.

B. Within 90 days of the effective date of this article, each employer having an enclosed place of employment located within the City [County] shall adopt, implement, make known and maintain a written smoking policy which shall contain the following requirements:

Smoking shall be prohibited in all enclosed facilities within a place of employment without exception. This includes common work areas, auditoriums, classrooms, conference and meeting rooms, private offices, elevators, hallways, medical facilities, cafeterias, employee lounges, stairs, restrooms, vehicles, and all other enclosed facilities.

C. The smoking policy shall be communicated to all employees within three (3) weeks of its adoption.

D. All employers shall supply a written copy of the smoking policy upon request to any existing or prospective employee.

Sec. 1006. Reasonable Distance

Smoking shall occur at a reasonable distance outside any enclosed area where smoking is prohibited to ensure that tobacco smoke does not enter the area through entrances, windows, ventilation systems or any other means.

Sec. 1007. Where Smoking Not Regulated

A. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article to the contrary, the following areas shall not be subject to the smoking restrictions of this article:

1. Private residences, except when used as a child care, adult day care, or health care facility.
2. Twenty-five percent (25%) of hotel and motel rooms rented to guests.
3. Retail tobacco stores.

B. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any owner, operator, manager, or other person who controls any establishment described in this section may declare that entire establishment as a nonsmoking establishment.

Sec. 1008. Posting of Signs

A. "No Smoking" signs or the international "No Smoking" symbol (consisting of a pictorial representation of a burning cigarette enclosed in a red circle with a red bar across it) shall be clearly, sufficiently and conspicuously posted in every building or other area where smoking is prohibited by this article, by the owner, operator, manager or other person having control of such building or other area.

B. Every public place where smoking is prohibited by this article shall have posted at every entrance a conspicuous sign clearly stating that smoking is prohibited.

C. All ashtrays and other smoking paraphernalia shall be removed from any area where smoking is prohibited by this article by the owner, operator, manager, or other person having control of such area.

Sec. 1009. Enforcement

A. Enforcement of this article shall be implemented by the Department of Health [or City Manager], or his or her designee.

B. Notice of the provisions set forth in this article shall be given to all applicants for a business license in the City [County] of _____.

C. Any citizen who desires to register a complaint under this chapter may initiate enforcement with the Department of Health [or City Manager].

D. The Health Department or the Fire Department shall require, while an establishment is undergoing otherwise mandated inspections, a "self-certification" from the owner, manager, operator, or other person having control of such establishment that all requirements of this article have been complied with.

E. Any owner, manager, operator, or employee of any establishment regulated by this article may inform persons violating this article of the appropriate provisions thereof.

F. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, a private citizen may bring legal action to enforce this article.

Sec. 1010. Nonretaliation

No person or employer shall discharge, refuse to hire, or in any manner retaliate against any employee, applicant for employment, or customer because such employee, applicant, or customer exercises any right to a smoke-free environment afforded by this article.

Sec. 1011. Violations and Penalties

A. It shall be unlawful for any person who owns, manages, operates or otherwise controls the use of any premises subject to regulation under this article to fail to comply with any of its provisions.

B. It shall be unlawful for any person to smoke in any area where smoking is prohibited by the provisions of this article.

C. Any person who violates any provision of this article shall be guilty of an infraction, punishable by:

1. A fine not exceeding one hundred dollars (\$100) for a first violation.
2. A fine not exceeding two hundred dollars (\$200) for a second violation of this article within one (1) year.
3. A fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500) for each additional violation of this article within one (1) year.

D. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, an employee or private citizen may bring legal action to enforce this article.

Sec. 1012. Public Education

The Department of Health [or City Manager] shall engage in a continuing program to explain and clarify the purposes and requirements of this ordinance to citizens affected by it, and to guide owners, operators and managers in their compliance with it. Such program may include publication of a brochure for affected businesses and individuals explaining the provisions of this ordinance.

Sec. 1013. Other Applicable Laws

This article shall not be interpreted or construed to permit smoking where it is otherwise restricted by other applicable laws.

Sec. 1014. Severability

If any provision, clause, sentence, or paragraph of this article or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this article which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this article are declared to be severable.

Sec. 1015. Effective Date

This article shall be effective thirty (30) days from and after the date of its adoption.

MODEL ORDINANCE ELIMINATING SMOKING IN CITY FACILITIES*

Revised October 15, 1998

Sec. 1000. Title

This article shall be known as the *Smoking Pollution Control Ordinance*.

Sec. 1001. Findings and Purpose

The City Council does hereby find that:

Numerous studies have found that tobacco smoke is a major contributor to indoor air pollution, and that breathing secondhand smoke is a cause of disease, including lung cancer, in nonsmokers. At special risk are children, elderly people, individuals with cardiovascular disease, and individuals with impaired respiratory function, including asthmatics and those with obstructive airway disease; and

Health hazards induced by breathing secondhand smoke include lung cancer, heart disease, respiratory infection, and decreased respiratory function, including bronchoconstriction and bronchospasm.

Accordingly, the City Council [or Board of Supervisors] finds and declares that the purposes of this ordinance are (1) to protect the public health and welfare by prohibiting smoking in city [or county] facilities; and (2) to guarantee the right of nonsmokers to breathe smoke-free air, and to recognize that the need to breathe smoke-free air shall have priority over the desire to smoke.

Sec. 1002. Definitions

The following words and phrases, whenever used in this article, shall be construed as defined in this section:

1. "Dining Area" means any enclosed area containing a counter or tables upon which food or snacks are served.
2. "Enclosed Area" means all space between a floor and ceiling which is enclosed on all sides by solid walls or windows (exclusive of door or passage ways) which extend from the floor to the ceiling, including all space therein screened by partitions which do not extend to the ceiling or are not solid, "office landscaping" or similar structures.
3. "Smoking" means inhaling, exhaling, burning or carrying any lighted cigar, cigarette, pipe, weed, plant, or other combustible substance in any manner or in any form.

* Developed by the American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation: 2530 San Pablo Avenue, Suite J, Berkeley, California 94702, Phone (510) 841-3032 Fax (510) 841-3071.

4. "Sports Arena" means sports pavilions, gymnasiums, health spas, boxing arenas, swimming pools, roller and ice rinks, bowling alleys, and other similar places where members of the general public assemble either to engage in physical exercise, participate in athletic competition, or witness sports events.

Sec. 1003. Prohibition of Smoking in Public Facilities

A. Smoking shall be prohibited:

1. Within any structure owned by the City [or County] of _____, except private residences leased from the City [or County];
2. Within any structure leased by the City [or County] of _____, providing that this prohibition shall apply only to those areas of the structure actually being leased by the City [or County];
3. Within buses, taxicabs, and other means of public transit under the authority of the City [or County] of _____;
4. Within sports arenas and convention halls owned or leased by the City [or County] of _____;
5. Every room, chamber, place of meeting or public assembly, including school buildings under the control of any board, council, commission, committee, including joint committees, or agencies of the City [or County] or any political subdivision of the State during such time as a public meeting is in progress, to the extent such place is subject to the jurisdiction of the City [or County]; and
6. Polling places.

B. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, any owner, operator, manager, or other person who controls any establishment or facility may declare that entire establishment or facility as a nonsmoking establishment.

Sec. 1004. Reasonable Distance

Smoking shall occur at a reasonable distance outside any enclosed area where smoking is prohibited to ensure that tobacco smoke does not enter the area through entrances, windows ventilation systems, or any other means.

Sec. 1005. Posting of Signs

A. "No Smoking" signs or the international "No Smoking" symbol (consisting of a pictorial representation of a burning cigarette enclosed in a red circle with a red bar across it) shall be clearly, sufficiently, and conspicuously posted in every building or other place where smoking is regulated by this article, by the owner, operator, manager, or other person having control of such building or other place.

B. Every dining area within a facility owned or leased by the City [or County] of _____ shall have posted at every entrance a conspicuous sign clearly stating that smoking is prohibited.

C. All ashtrays and other smoking paraphernalia shall be removed from any area where smoking is prohibited by this article by the owner, operator, manager, or other person having control of the area.

Sec. 1006. Enforcement

A. Enforcement of this article shall be implemented by the Department of Health [or the City Manager].

B. Any citizen who desires to register a complaint under this chapter may initiate enforcement with the Department of Health [or the City Manager].

C. Any owner, manager, operator, or employee of any establishment regulated by this article may inform persons violating this article of the appropriate provisions thereof.

D. Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, a private citizen may bring legal action to enforce this article.

Sec. 1007. Violations and Penalties

A. It shall be unlawful for any person who owns, manages, operates, or otherwise controls the use of any premises subject to regulation under this article to fail to comply with any of its provisions.

B. It shall be unlawful for any person to smoke in any area where smoking is prohibited by the provisions of this article.

C. Any person who violates any provision of this article shall be guilty of an infraction, punishable by:

1. A fine not exceeding one hundred dollars (\$100) for a first violation.
2. A fine not exceeding two hundred dollars (\$200) for a second violation of this article within one (1) year.
3. A fine not exceeding five hundred dollars (\$500) for each additional violation of this article within one (1) year.

Sec. 1008. Nonretaliation

No person or employer shall discharge, refuse to hire, or in any manner retaliate against any employee or applicant for employment because such employee or applicant exercises any right to a smoke-free environment afforded by this article.

Sec. 1009. Other Applicable Laws

This article shall not be interpreted or construed to permit smoking where it is otherwise restricted by other applicable laws.

Sec. 1010. Severability

If any provision, clause, sentence, or paragraph of this article or the application thereof to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions of this article which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this article are declared to be severable.

Sec. 1011. Effective Date

This article shall be effective thirty (30) days from and after the date of its adoption.

MODEL SALE OF TOBACCO TO MINORS ORDINANCE*

Revised April 29, 1996

Section 1000. Title

This ordinance shall be known as the *Sale of Tobacco to Minors Ordinance*.

Section 1001. Findings and Purpose

The City Council [or Board of Supervisors] finds that youth addiction to tobacco products is a public health problem with grave health consequences. More than half of all smokers begin smoking before the age of 14, and 90% begin by the age of 19. The average age of first use of tobacco products is now 11 to 15 years of age. In recognition of the Surgeon General's conclusion that nicotine is as addictive as cocaine or heroin, action is needed to curtail the easy access of minors to cigarettes and other tobacco products. Therefore, the purpose of this ordinance is to implement a strict and enforceable system to prevent the illegal sale of cigarettes and other tobacco products to minors.

Section 1002. Definitions

1. "License" means a license issued by the City [or County] of _____ for the retail sale of tobacco products.
2. "Licensee" means the holder of a valid license for the retail sale of tobacco products.
3. "Minor" means any person under 18 years of age.
4. "Public Place" means any area to which the public is invited or in which the public is permitted, including, but not limited to, any right-of-way, mall or shopping center, park, playground, and any other property owned by the city, and any school district, or any park district.
5. "Retail Tobacco Store" means a retail store utilized primarily for the sale of tobacco products and accessories and in which the sale of other products is merely incidental.
6. "Self-Service Displays" means open displays of tobacco products and point-of-sale tobacco promotional products that the public has access to without the intervention of a store employee.
7. "Tobacco Product" means any tobacco cigarette, cigar, pipe tobacco, smokeless tobacco, or any other form of tobacco or tobacco papers which may be utilized for smoking, chewing, inhalation, or other means of ingestion.

* Developed by the American Nonsmokers' Rights Foundation: 2530 San Pablo Avenue, Suite J, Berkeley, California 94702, Phone (510) 841-3032 Fax (510) 841-3071.

8. "Tobacco Vending Machine" means any machine or device designated for or used for the vending of cigarettes, cigars, tobacco, or tobacco products upon the insertion of coins, trade checks, or slugs.

9. "Vendor-assisted" means only a store employee has access to the tobacco product and assists the customer by supplying the product. The customer does not take possession of the product until after it is purchased.

Section 1003. Identification Required

No retailer shall sell or permit to be sold cigarettes or other tobacco products to an individual without requesting and examining photographic identification establishing the purchaser's age as eighteen (18) years or greater.

Section 1004. License Required

After [specify date], it shall be unlawful for a retailer to sell cigarettes or other tobacco products unless that retailer holds and maintains a valid license from the City [or County] for each location in which tobacco products are sold. All such licenses shall be renewed annually.

Section 1005. Fee

The fee for the license shall be established by the City Manager [or Department of Health], and shall be sufficient to fund the administration, implementation, and enforcement of this ordinance. The fee for renewing tobacco licenses shall be determined by the City Manager [or Department of Health], and shall be sufficient to fund the administration, implementation, and enforcement of this ordinance.

Section 1006. Non-transferability

A tobacco retail license is non-transferable, except a new license will be issued to a tobacco retailer who changes location.

Section 1007. Vending Machines

After [specify date], tobacco vending machines or any other devices for the sale or distribution of tobacco products are prohibited.

Section 1008. Out-of-Package Sales Prohibited

It is unlawful to sell cigarettes out of the manufacturer's package with required health warnings. It is unlawful to sell cigarettes in packages of fewer than twenty (20) cigarettes per package.

Section 1009. Tobacco Samples Prohibited

No person shall knowingly distribute or furnish without charge or at nominal charge, or cause to be furnished or distributed without charge or at nominal charge, cigarettes or other tobacco products, or coupons for cigarettes or other tobacco products, in any public place or at any event open to the public, except in retail tobacco stores.

Section 1010. Vendor-Assisted Sales

It shall be unlawful for any person, business, or tobacco retailer to sell, permit to be sold, or offer for sale any tobacco product by means of self-service displays or any other means other than vendor-assisted sales.

Section 1011. Revocation of License

A. Any license holder who violates any provision of this ordinance shall have their license suspended after notice and opportunity to be heard as follows:

1. In the case of a first violation, the licensee shall be fined two hundred dollars (\$200) and shall be notified in writing of penalties levied for further violations.

2. In the case of a second violation in a two (2) year period, the licensee shall be fined five hundred dollars (\$500) and the license shall be suspended for not less than thirty (30) consecutive business days nor more than three (3) months. Tobacco retailers must remove all tobacco merchandise from all areas accessible to the public while the license is suspended.

3. In the case of three or more violations within a two (2) year period, the licensee shall be fined one thousand dollars (\$1,000) and the license shall be revoked not less than six (6) months nor more than eighteen (18) months from the date of revocation. Tobacco retailers must remove all tobacco merchandise from all areas accessible to the public while the license is suspended.

B. The City Manager [or City Attorney, or Health Department] shall initiate enforcement against license holders who violate any provision of this ordinance, and shall conduct hearings upon the license-holder's request. Rulings made by the City Manager [or City Attorney, or Health Department] regarding violations of this ordinance, after adequate hearing, shall be final.

Section 1012. Enforcement

Violations of Sections 1004, 1007, and 1009 of this ordinance are subject to a fine of \$1,000 per day for each violation. The City Attorney, City Manager [or Department of Health], and the Police Department shall have the authority to enforce this ordinance.

Section 1013. Nonretaliation

No person or employer shall discharge, refuse to hire, or in any manner retaliate against any employee, applicant for employment, or customer because such employee, applicant, or customer reported violations of any provisions of this ordinance.

Section 1014. Severability

If any provision, clause, sentence, or paragraph of this ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the provisions of this article which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions are declared to be severable.

Section 1015. Effective Date

This chapter shall take effect on [specify date].

MODEL ORDINANCE REGULATING TOBACCO ADVERTISING (WITH VARIATIONS)

Revised July 1998

This model ordinance was produced by the Technical Assistance Legal Center (TALC)*, a project of the Public Health Institute, to provide guidance to California cities and counties wishing to regulate the advertising of tobacco products.¹ Because the ordinance was drafted based on California law, communities in other states should seek legal advice prior to adoption.

Everyone, including the tobacco industry, agrees that children should not use tobacco products. This model ordinance is based on the assumption that a local movement has decided that it wishes to adopt advertising (and perhaps other) controls as a child-protection measure. Its focus is on the regulation of outdoor advertising placed on billboards, signs, building facades, store windows, and other locations likely to be seen regularly by children.²

This version of the ordinance contains only the suggested ordinance text, with alternate provisions offered at various points. Italicized text requires you to make a choice or insert information. Another version of the ordinance is available with extensive annotation for each provision of the model ordinance. We strongly recommend that you review the annotated version of the ordinance prior to drafting your own local ordinance. To receive a copy of the annotated version, please contact TALC at (510) 540-8585.

*Technical Assistance Legal Center, Public Health Institute, 2001 Addison St., 2nd Floor, Berkeley, CA 94704-1103, Phone: (510) 540-8585, Fax: (510) 649-7894, Email: talc@publichealth.org

The Technical Assistance Legal Center is a project of the Public Health Institute.

This ordinance was produced with funds received from the Tobacco Tax Health Protection Act of 1988–Proposition 99–under grant #94-20982 with the California Department of Health Services, Tobacco Control Section.

¹ This ordinance originally appeared as part of a larger publication: *Regulating Tobacco Advertising: A Guide for Cities and Counties*. For copies of this publication, or questions about the ordinance please contact TALC at (510) 540-8585 or by email: talc@publichealth.org

² This ordinance does not address the regulation of alcohol advertising. A model ordinance regulating alcohol is available from the Marin Institute for the Prevention of Alcohol and Other Drug Problems in San Rafael, CA (415) 456-5692.

MODEL ORDINANCE

Ordinance Number _____

An Ordinance Restricting the Advertising and Promotion of Tobacco Products to Minors

The City Council of the City of _____/The Board of Supervisors of the County of _____ does ordain as follows:

Section _____ of the _____ Code is amended by adding _____ to read as follows:

RESTRICTING THE ADVERTISING AND PROMOTION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS TO MINORS

1. Purpose

The purpose of this ordinance is to promote the welfare of minors by discouraging the commercial exploitation of potential underage tobacco users and by discouraging actions that promote the unlawful sale of tobacco products to minors as well as the unlawful purchase or possession of tobacco products by minors.

2. Findings

[Insert findings here. A local ordinance based on “child protection “ goals should contain findings about the problem of youth smoking; the desirability of reducing youth smoking; the scope of tobacco advertising; the connection between advertising and youth smoking; and the likelihood that restricting the advertising of tobacco products will help contribute to the reduction of youth smoking. It will probably also help to have findings that relate to why the various exemptions are allowed—both those that tailor the restrictions to places where youths congregate and any other exemptions that are granted. Extensive suggested findings can be found in the annotated version of the model ordinance.]

3. Definitions

“Advertising” means printed matter that calls the public's attention to things for sale.

“Advertising display” means any sign, billboard, signboard, poster, placard, pennant, banner, graphic display, mural, or similar device that is used to advertise or promote a product.

“Area which minors frequent” means any public or private kindergarten, elementary, middle, junior high, or high school; licensed child-care facility or preschool, but not including family day-care; playground; youth center; recreational facility; arcade; park; or library.

“Person” means any individual, firm, partnership, cooperative association, private corporation, personal representative, receiver, trustee, assignee, or other legal entity.

“Promotion” means a display of any logo, brand name, character, graphic, artwork, colors, scenes, or designs that are a recognized image of a particular product brand that calls the public's attention to the product brand.

“Publicly visible location” means any outdoor location that is visible from any street, sidewalk, or other public thoroughfare, or any location inside a commercial establishment that is in or adjacent to a window or doorway and is visible from any street, sidewalk, or other public thoroughfare.

“Tobacco product” means any substance containing any tobacco leaf, including but not limited to cigarettes, cigars, pipe tobacco, snuff, chewing tobacco, and smokeless tobacco.

4. Restrictions on Tobacco Advertising

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this [chapter/section], no person shall place or maintain, or cause or allow to be placed or maintained, any advertising or promotion of tobacco products on any advertising display in a publicly visible location.

(b) No part of this ordinance shall be construed to permit any advertising display that is otherwise restricted or prohibited by law. Nor shall it be construed to permit an otherwise restricted or prohibited advertising display because it is combined with a permitted public service message.

(c) No part of this ordinance shall be construed to regulate messages that do not propose a commercial transaction.

5. Exceptions

This ordinance shall not apply to any advertising display:

(a) that is located in a nonresidential zone, provided it is more than _____ [insert number] feet in any direction (measured in a straight line from parcel boundary to parcel boundary) from any area which minors frequent; or

[OPTIONAL EXCEPTIONS: The following italicized exceptions are optional. Exceptions (d) and (e) require you to choose which approach to take.]

(b) that is located within 660 feet from the edge of the right-of-way of, and the copy on which is visible from, an interstate highway; or

(c) that exists at the time of the introduction of this ordinance, contains the name or slogan of a business that sells tobacco products, and is on the premises of the business; or

(d)(1) that contains a generic description of tobacco products; or

(d)(2) that is located on the premises of a commercial establishment if the advertising display provides notice that the establishment sells tobacco products, as long as the display does not promote any brand of tobacco product or otherwise constitute a “promotion” as defined by this [chapter/section]; or

(d)(3) that is no larger than six square feet and contains only black text, in any

language, not exceeding eight inches in height on a white background stating "Tobacco Products Sold Here" located within ten feet of an entrance to the premises where tobacco products are sold or offered for sale; or

(d)(4) that contains only black text, in any language, on a white background and states a tobacco product brand name, or a tobacco product brand name and its price, or indicates that tobacco products are sold on the premises, and is located within ten feet of an entrance to the premises where tobacco products are sold or offered for sale, provided that any such premises shall not have more than one such sign; or

(e)(1) that is located on a commercial vehicle used for transporting tobacco products, and/or

(e)(2) that is located on a taxicab, and/or

(e)(3) that is located on a municipal transit vehicle, or

(e)(4) that is located on any vehicle, except a vehicle that is used primarily to advertise or promote tobacco products; or

(f) that is located on tobacco product packaging; or

(g) that is located at (on, in) a (designated) sports facility; or

(h) that is worn as clothing by an individual.

6. Enforcement; Penalties; Civil Actions

(a) Causing, permitting, aiding, abetting, or concealing a violation of any provision of this ordinance shall constitute a violation. After notification, it shall be a separate offense for each day such violation shall continue.

[Choose one of four options provided in section (b), below]

(b) Violations of this ordinance shall be prosecuted

- (1) as infractions, pursuant to section _____ of this code; or
- (2) as misdemeanors, pursuant to section _____ of this code; or
- (3) as infractions, pursuant to section _____ of this code, for the first and second violations in a twelve (12) month period, and thereafter as misdemeanors, pursuant to section _____ of this code; or
- (4) as misdemeanors, pursuant to section _____ of this code [as long as there is a "wobbler" provision in the existing code].

(c) This ordinance shall be administered and enforced by the _____.

(d) Violations of this ordinance are hereby declared to be public nuisances.

(e) In addition to other remedies provided by this [chapter/section], any violation of this ordinance may be enforced by a civil action brought by the [City Attorney/County Counsel], including but not limited to administrative or judicial nuisance abatement proceedings, civil or criminal code enforcement proceedings, and suits for injunctive relief. The remedies provided by this [chapter/section] are cumulative and in addition to any other remedies available at law or in equity.

(f) An action for injunction may be brought in a court of competent jurisdiction by any aggrieved person, or any person or entity that will fairly and adequately represent the interests of the protected class.

7. Effective Date and Legal Nonconforming Uses

(a) The effective date of this ordinance shall be thirty (30) days from the date of its enactment.

(b) On the effective date of this ordinance, advertising displays that were in place at the time of the introduction of this ordinance may remain in place for no more than sixty (60) additional days, unless an extension of time is granted pursuant to this [chapter/section].

(c) Owners of advertising displays in place on _____ [the date the ordinance adopting this chapter/section was introduced] may, by _____ [the sixtieth day after the effective date of the ordinance adopting this chapter/section], apply for an extension of time for compliance and provide written documentation to the [Planning Director/Zoning Administrator] that demonstrates that the owner had a right or an obligation under a written lease or contract executed prior to _____ [the date the ordinance adopting this chapter/section was introduced] to maintain an advertising display in violation of this [chapter/section] for a period extending beyond _____ [the sixtieth day after the effective date of the ordinance adopting this chapter/section]. On timely receipt of sufficient documentation, the [Planning Director/Zoning Administrator] shall grant an extension of time to remove the advertising display for the period required or authorized by the lease or contract or for a period of one year, whichever is shorter. Renewal rights present in the lease or contract shall not affect the determination of the period required or authorized by the lease or contract.

(d) Owners of advertising displays in place on _____ [the date the ordinance adopting this chapter/section was introduced] may, by _____ [the sixtieth day after the effective date of the ordinance adopting this chapter/section], apply for an extension of time for compliance and provide written documentation to the [Planning Commission/Zoning Administrator] that demonstrates that timely compliance would cause unreasonable financial hardship and that granting the extension of time would not confer a special privilege on the owner. On timely receipt of sufficient documentation, the [Planning Commission/Zoning Administrator] shall conduct a hearing pursuant to section _____ of this code [the hearing provision of the zoning ordinance applicable to a variance or conditional use permit] and determine whether, and on what conditions, the extension of time ought to be granted.

(e) Whether or not an extension of time to remove a preexisting advertising display is granted pursuant to subdivision 7(c) or subdivision 7(d) of this [section/chapter], advertising displays that are prohibited by this ordinance shall not be legal nonconforming uses.

8. Severability

(a) If any provision of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is declared invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, this ordinance, to the extent it can be given effect, or the application of this ordinance to persons other than the person to whom it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby, and to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are severable.