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Brief Evaluation Report - Abstract

Background on the County:
Sacramento County is the eighth most populous county in California. This urban county is made up of seven incorporated cities (Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Rancho Cordova and City of Sacramento) and an unincorporated area, with a total of approximately 1,407,000 residents. The County’s largest city, the City of Sacramento has approximately 470,000 residents, and is the seat of government for the State of California and also serves as the county seat. Several smaller cities (ranging from 23,500 to 135,000 residents) have expanded greatly in the last several years, based in large part on the housing market and new development in these areas. Isleton is the smallest of the cities, with just over 800 residents. The unincorporated area has the most residents of any jurisdiction in the County, with approximately 560,000 residents.

The ethnic composition of Sacramento County is approximately: 58% Caucasian, 16% Hispanic/Latino, 11% Asian, 10% African American and 5% as other ethnicities combined. Approximately 28% of the county’s population is under 18 years of age.

Selecting This Topic:
Based on data presented during the Communities of Excellence (CX) process, from previous Youth Purchase Surveys (YPS), sales to minors was identified as an ongoing problem in Sacramento County. The YPS conducted by the Sacramento County Tobacco Education Program monitors the proportion of retail outlets that illegally sell tobacco to youth in Sacramento County and found this rate to be 21% in 2003 and 26% in 2001. In order to address this high rate of sales to minors, tobacco retail licensing (TRL) as a strategy to reduce this rate was selected to be a part of the 2004-2007 Sacramento County plan. Other cities throughout the state have been working to reduce youth access to tobacco products by adopting tobacco retail licenses. The license requires retailers to pay an annual fee which is then used to fund enforcement of tobacco laws, including prohibiting tobacco sales to minors. The prevention of illegal sales has been inconsistent due to budgetary constraints with local law enforcement. With a tobacco retail license in place, enforcement can occur on a regular basis. Then, if a retailer is convicted of selling tobacco to a minor, the license can be suspended or revoked. The sale of tobacco products is quite lucrative for many retailers, so the potential loss of these sales provides an incentive to follow applicable laws. The objective developed and work put forth to achieve it, are described in further detail below.

Objective 8: By June 30, 2007, the cities of Folsom and Citrus Heights will adopt and implement a tobacco retail licensing policy. This is a non-primary objective addressing CX indicator # 3.2.1.

Project Activities:
Coordination/Collaboration
- Tobacco Retail Licensing Task Force was established to work towards adoption of local tobacco retail licensing ordinances and provide technical assistance as needed.
- Members of the staff/coalition met with Chief of Police in Folsom to discuss illegal tobacco sales to minors and to coordinate sting activities.
Community Education
- Educational materials were sent to city council members in Citrus Heights and Folsom in order to inform them about the issue of TRL and illegal sales to minors.
- A presentation was made to the city council in Citrus Heights 6/14/07 regarding TRL and reducing youth access to tobacco products.
- Information packets were sent to police departments and given to retailers in each city.
- Report cards of compliance were sent to retailers in Citrus Heights and Folsom who were surveyed during 2005 and 2006 YPS. The report cards provided merchants with ratings of their store for youth sales attempt, tobacco control materials and signage.

Incentives
- Certificates were sent to merchants scoring 100% on their compliance with youth access tobacco laws in each city.

Policy
- Midwest Academy Strategic Chart was completed for licensing activities with input from the Tobacco Retail Licensing Task Force.

Media
- Press releases with results from 2005 and 2006 YPS were distributed to the Sacramento Bee and Sacramento News and Review. Additionally, an article in the Sacramento Bee was printed about tobacco retail licensing and ongoing stings.

Training/Technical Assistance
- Code Enforcement Training session was provided to law enforcement, local lead agencies, and individuals interested in tobacco control on May 9, 2007. The training lasted 6 hours and topics included Tobacco Retail Licensing in Sacramento, Code Enforcement Protocols, and Youth Purchase Survey Reports from 2003-2007.

Evaluation Design and Data Collection:
Evaluation of this objective included only process data collection of a YPS in 2005 and 2006 to document the rate of sales to minors for each city and a policy record review to determine the number of policies adopted. Outcome data collection would have been a count of the number of licenses issued, in order to determine implementation of the adopted policies in each city. This was not necessary or appropriate by the end of the project as neither city had adopted a TRL policy. This evaluation used a non-experimental design, with no comparison cities included.

Youth Purchase Surveys
In order to determine the rate of sales to minors, the Sacramento County Tobacco Education Program conducted two waves of the YPS during this project period, one in 2005 and another in 2006. The instruments used to the collect the YPS data differed somewhat, with the 2005 survey attached as Appendix A, and the 2006 survey attached as Appendix B. The 2006 survey was modified based on feedback provided from the 2005 data collection, which found the various signage and other observations to be too much data to be collected at once. Data that was not being readily used by the project was removed from the survey to make the remaining items easier to observe and remember until they were recorded.
Lists of potential tobacco retailers throughout the county were secured from several sources including previous YPS lists of stores and updated lists from: Sacramento County Environmental Management Department, Alcohol Beverage Control, and from licensing agencies for areas in the county that have tobacco retail licenses. Stores were contacted to verify that they currently sold tobacco products. This process resulted in a list of 1,042 retail outlets throughout the county in 2005 and 906 stores in 2006. In Citrus Heights there were 41 stores identified and in Folsom there were 30 stores in 2006. To select stores, a random sampling technique was used, meaning that all stores had an equal likelihood of being selected. After considering available resources (in time, money and number of volunteers) and the level of error the project considered acceptable (95% confidence level and +/- 5% confidence interval), 217 stores were selected countywide in 2005 and 270 stores selected in 2006. The random sampling technique and large number of stores selected were used to ensure a sample that was representative of the county as a whole. It should be noted that the current Evaluator and Project Director were not involved in the project during the 2003 or 2005 sampling and data collection; therefore some inconsistencies in the data collection methodology and sampling between the various waves exist.

In this survey, an assumption was made that underage teens would not go to a store to purchase tobacco and offer an identification (ID) that shows them as underage. Therefore, in this survey, teens did not show an ID if asked for it during purchase attempts. If teens were asked their age, they said they were 18 years old. This protocol most closely portrays what happens in "real life" when underage teens attempt to purchase tobacco.

Survey teams of youth and adult volunteers were trained, then proceeded to visit the stores on their list. In each instance the teen and adult volunteers completed the store survey form prior to visiting the next store on the list. All participants received a one-hour training on the Youth Purchase Survey protocol, which included youth and adult roles and responsibilities, overview of the survey instrument, how to purchase tobacco, tobacco product placement and signage.

Results from the completed surveys were entered into an Excel database and analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Descriptive statistics and tests of statistical significance (chi-square and regression) were conducted with the YPS data.

Policy Record Review
Copies of the TRL policies were to be reviewed to verify adoption of the policy. Analysis would include a simple count of the number of policies adopted and the areas covered by the policy.

Main Evaluation Findings:

Youth Purchase Surveys
Number of stores actually surveyed for each area individually, and the county overall, in the 2003, 2005 and 2006 YPS are presented in Table 1. The cities of Citrus Heights and Folsom are highlighted in grey.
Table 1. Number of Stores Surveyed in 2003, 2005 & 2006 YPS by Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>2003 Stores Surveyed (#)</th>
<th>2005 Stores Surveyed (#)</th>
<th>2006 Stores Surveyed (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Heights</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isleton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Cordova</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sacramento</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Countywide</strong></td>
<td><strong>212</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
<td><strong>250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to document the problem of sales to minors, Figure 1 below compares sales rates from 2003, 2005 and 2006 for each of the areas surveyed and the County overall. The number of sales for each of these areas is given, to help put each sales rate into the proper context (i.e. Isleton had a 100% sales rate in 2005, but this is from only one store that sold to a minor). Areas within the county that have adopted a retail licensing ordinance are highlighted in yellow.

Figure 1. Comparison of Sales Rates from 2003, 2005 & 2006 YPS by Area and Overall County

In Citrus Heights, the rate of illegal tobacco sales to minors increased from 20% in 2003, to 21.4% in 2005 then dropped to 6.3% in 2006. Folsom, on the other hand, saw a steady increase
throughout this same period, from 0% in 2003 to 14.3% in 2005 to an astonishing 42.9% in 2006. It should be noted that due to small sample sizes, each of these sales rates occurred from only a few sales during the YPS in each city. As can be seen, the rate of sales to minors for the County overall started at 20.8% in 2003, then went down to 10.6% in 2005 and back up to 20.4% in 2006. The reason for this increase from 2005 to 2006 is still unknown, though it being investigated by the Sacramento County Tobacco Education Program.

At a county-wide level, factors significantly related to sales to minors included: clerks asking for identification and type of store (in 2005 and 2006) and youth decoy’s gender (in 2006 only). Neither tobacco industry nor Stake Act signage were found to be significantly related to sales to minors. Statistical significance was determined through chi-square analysis for data collected in 2005 and 2006. Significance testing was not conducted on data specific to Citrus Heights or Folsom due to small sample sizes. Further information on this YPS data and factors significantly related to these sales to minors can be found in Sacramento County’s Brief Evaluation Report for Objective #7.

Policy Record Review
TRL policies were not adopted in either Folsom or Citrus Heights. A presentation was made to the city council in Citrus Heights, though a formal vote has not yet taken place. The city of Folsom was not yet responsive to addressing this issue.

Limitations:
It should be noted that neither the current Project Director or Evaluator were part of this project during the planning period nor when these TRL policies were attempted for adoption, therefore some inconsistencies in data collection and methodology exist. Additional data collection, such as adding key informant interviews with city council members would enable a better understanding of the particular aspects of the intervention that could be improved and made more effective in order to get the policies passed in the future.

Conclusions and Next Steps:
The Sacramento County TEP did not achieve its objective of having TRL policies adopted and implemented in the cities of Citrus Heights and Folsom. Neither city adopted a TRL policy, therefore there was no further action to implement this policy.

As measured by the YPS, in Folsom the rate of illegal tobacco sales to minors has consistent risen from 2003-2005, whereas the sales rate in Citrus Heights increased from 2003-2005, then decreased in 2006.

Future steps should include ongoing work with city council members in Citrus Heights and Folsom to move toward adoption of a TRL policy. In the 2007-2010 Sacramento County LLA plan, it is anticipated that TRL implementation activities will continue in all areas that have TRL policies adopted and with any remaining areas in the county targeted for adoption.

As a way to keep coalition members and other interested parties informed, a summary report of the 2005 and 2006 YPS results were developed and disseminated. This Final Evaluation Report will also be shared with these groups. Abstracts have been submitted related to Sacramento County’s experience with TRL to both the National Tobacco or Health conference (accepted) and the American Evaluation Association (in review).
Sacramento County Youth Tobacco Survey - June 2005

PURCHASE ATTEMPT
1. Sale outcome:  1 Yes, a “sale” was made   2 No, a “sale” was not made
2. Price of tobacco purchased: $____________
3. Type of tobacco requested:  1 Cigarettes  2 Smokeless tobacco/chew   3 Other (Bidis, Cigars) ________
4. Brand of tobacco requested/purchased ______________________
5. Type of outlet:  (without gas)  1 Gas Only Station  2 Convenience (with gas)  3 Convenience
4 Tobacco Store  5 Small Market  6 Supermarket
7 Liquor Store  8 Drug Store/Pharmacy  9 Discount Store
10 Other, specify type ______________________
6. Was the store primarily an ethnic market?  1 Yes   2 No
   If Yes, Type (Example: Asian, Latino, Indian, etc.) ______________________
7. Ownership:  1 Chain   2 Independent
8. The tobacco you attempted to purchase was (choose only one):
   1 Requested from the clerk   2 Self-service   3 Other ________________
9. When you attempted to purchase tobacco:
   Were you asked your age?  1 Yes   2 No
   Were you asked for identification?  1 Yes   2 No
   Were you asked whom the tobacco product was for?  1 Yes   2 No
   Did the clerk make any comments?  1 Yes   2 No
   If yes, what did the clerk say? ______________________
10. Clerk Characteristics:
    Gender  1 Male   2 Female
    Age  1 25 or younger   2 Over 25
    Ethnicity  1 Caucasian   2 African American   3 Asian
               4 Hispanic/Latino   5 Middle Eastern   6 Other ______________________
11. How many other people were within 10 feet from where you were standing?
    ______ Customers    ______ Clerks

**OBSERVATION OF STORE ENVIRONMENT**

**Tobacco products for sale**

12. Did you observe any of these tobacco products for sale?
    Bidis    1 Yes    2 No
    Herbal cigarettes    1 Yes    2 No
    Kiddie packs    1 Yes    2 No
    Single cigarettes    1 Yes    2 No
    Candy look a like    1 Yes    2 No

13. Where were tobacco products located? (check all that apply)
    Near the cash register    1 Yes    2 No
    Behind the counter    1 Yes    2 No
    Open racks/shelves in store (self-service)    1 Yes    2 No
    Locked cases or enclosed areas (clerk access only)    1 Yes    2 No
    Other, please specify ____________________________

**Tobacco-Related Signs**

14. Were any Federal, State or Local Anti-tobacco signs posted?
    STAKE Act/1-800-5-ASK-4-ID    1 Yes    2 No
    Penal Code 308    1 Yes    2 No
    FDA signs    1 Yes    2 No
    Other    1 Yes    2 No
    If YES to other, specify ____________________________

15. Were any Tobacco Industry signs posted?
    If You Ask/We Ask    1 Yes    2 No
    It’s the Law    1 Yes    2 No
    We Card    1 Yes    2 No
    Support the Law: It Works    1 Yes    2 No
    Other    1 Yes    2 No
    If YES to other, specify ____________________________

16. Additional observer comments or observations ____________________________

---

**Thank you for your efforts to eliminate tobacco sales to minors!**
Appendix B

Sacramento County Youth Tobacco Survey (June 2006)

Minor Name/Initials ________________ Store Name/ID _____________________________
Adult Name/ID ______________________ Survey Date ______________

PURCHASE ATTEMPT

1. Sale outcome: 1 Yes, a “sale” was made 2 No, a “sale” was not made

2. Type of outlet: 1 Gas Only Station 2 Convenience (with gas) 3 Convenience (without gas) 4 Tobacco Store 5 Small Market 6 Supermarket 7 Liquor Store 8 Drug Store/Pharmacy 9 Discount Store 10 Other, specify type __________________________

3. Was the store primarily an ethnic market? 1 Yes 2 No If Yes, Type (Example: Asian, Indian) __________________________

4. Ownership: 1 Chain 2 Independent

5. When you attempted to purchase tobacco:
   Were you asked your age? 1 Yes 2 No
   Were you asked for identification? 1 Yes 2 No
   Did the clerk make any comments? 1 Yes 2 No
   If Yes, what did the clerk say? __________________________

6. Clerk Characteristics:
   Gender 1 Male 2 Female
   Age 1 25 or younger 2 Over 25
   Ethnicity 1 Caucasian 2 African American 3 Asian 4 Hispanic/Latino 5 Middle Eastern 6 Other __________________________

OBSERVATION OF STORE ENVIRONMENT

Tobacco Products For Sale

7. Did you observe any of these tobacco products for sale?
   Bidis 1 Yes 2 No
   Kiddie packs 1 Yes 2 No
   Single cigarettes 1 Yes 2 No

8. Where were tobacco products located?
   Open racks/shelves in store (self-service) 1 Yes 2 No
   Area of clerk access only 1 Yes 2 No
   Locked cases or enclosed areas (clerk access only) 1 Yes 2 No
   Other, please specify __________________________

Tobacco-Related Signs

9. What signs were posted?
   STAKE Act/1-800-5-ASK-4-ID 1 Yes 2 No
   We Card 1 Yes 2 No
   Other 1 Yes 2 No If Yes, specify: __________________________

10. Additional observer comments or observations __________________________
Thank you for your efforts to eliminate tobacco sales to minors!