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Abstract

The Bear County Tobacco Reduction Program (BCTRP) has conducted several Youth Tobacco Purchase Surveys (YTPS), which have documented a high rate of tobacco sales to minors. Specifically, the sales rate was 41% countywide in 2002; and the 2004 YTPS (conducted at the beginning of the project described in this report) found a sales rate of 38%. During the Communities of Excellence (CX) needs assessment, staff and coalition members decided that something needed to be done to reduce the availability of tobacco products to minors. Tobacco retail licensing was selected as a way to address this issue. A license would be required in order to sell tobacco products, and the annual fee paid by retailers would fund enforcement of existing retail-related tobacco laws.

Objective

By June 30, 2007, at least two cities and the unincorporated area of Bear County will adopt and implement a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products and that includes sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks.

This is a primary objective and addresses CX indicator # 3.2.1. The three areas with the highest rates of sales to minors in the 2002 YTPS, Gold Town, Pacific Canyon, and the unincorporated area of the county, were targeted. Sales to minors in these areas ranged from 42-47%.

Intervention Activities

The intervention activities targeted four groups: (1) members of the Board of Supervisors and City Councils, as the decision-makers who can adopt the tobacco retail license for their jurisdiction, (2) leaders of the local enforcement agencies who would be responsible for implementing the license policy, (3) the general public, and (4) tobacco retailers. The intervention activities included:

- Representatives of the Board of Supervisors and City Councils for the unincorporated area and two cities were sent educational packets about sales to minors and tobacco retail licensing, including copies of policies passed by other cities.
- These packets were followed up with presentations of data on local sales to minors and public support for the policy, and statements of support from local youth-serving agencies.
- Individual members of the Board of Supervisors and City Councils were then contacted for follow-up visits to provide additional information and answer questions that may not have been addressed previously.
- Local media were provided with press releases about the results of the 2004 YTPS and public opinion survey, both of which were conducted during this project period.
- Youth-serving agencies were visited to obtain endorsements of the policy.

In the areas that adopted tobacco retail licensing policies:

- Local law enforcement administrators were visited and provided with information about policy implementation.
- Trainings on conducting compliance checks were arranged for law enforcement personnel.
- Press conferences were held to announce the new policy and to recognize the action of the City Council/Board of Supervisors.
- In-person visits were conducted with retailers that sell tobacco products to further educate them on the new policy and requirements, how and when to obtain licenses, and penalties for violations. Packets with this same information were also left with retailers.

**Evaluation Methods**

The evaluation collected process data through the YTPS, public opinion polls, key informant interviews, and policy record reviews. The youth and adults who participated in the YTPS received training to ensure that the protocol was followed consistently. The YTPS was conducted to determine the extent of the problem of tobacco sales to minors; public opinion data were collected to assess the extent of public support for a licensing policy. Key informant interviews provided information about the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention activities. Informants included City Council/Board of Supervisors members, retailers, and legal and law enforcement representatives. The reviews of City Council/Board of Supervisors meeting minutes also looked at the strengths and weaknesses of the intervention strategies. Policy implementation was measured by determining the proportion of known tobacco retailers in the area who had obtained retail licenses. The design used was non-experimental, since there was no pretest and no comparison group.

**Conclusions**

BCTRP achieved its objective: One city (Gold Town) and the unincorporated area of Bear County adopted and implemented a tobacco retail licensing policy. The presentations of data on public support for the policy and the high rate of sales to minors were cited by the key informants as primary reasons for supporting the policy. Enforceability was identified as one of the challenges to getting the policy adopted. The plans for educational visits to the retailers and the visits themselves were identified as facilitators of policy adoption and implementation in data from the City Council/Board of Supervisors members, law enforcement personnel, and retailers. On the other hand, some members of the City Council and the review of City Council/Board of Supervisors meeting minutes indicated that concern about enforceability was a barrier to supporting the policy. A compliance check conducted six months after the policies had been passed found that 76% of the retailers in Gold Town and 79% in the unincorporated area had obtained licenses. The project is hopeful that, with continued efforts and education, compliance will be at 100% by December 2007.
Project Description

Background

Bear County is a rural community with a population of approximately 214,000 people. There are six small to mid-sized cities in the county (ranging in population from 10,250 to 62,200 people), as well as an unincorporated area (with approximately 37,500 people). Illegal sales of tobacco products to minors have been an issue for several years in all areas throughout the county. The Bear County Tobacco Reduction Program (BCTRP) has conducted several Youth Tobacco Purchase Surveys (YTPS), which have documented a high rate of tobacco sales to minors. Overall, the county rate was 41% in 2002, with sales rates ranging from 23% to 47% in various parts of the county. Such data made it apparent that this was an issue that needed to be addressed by the BCTRP during the 2004-2007 funding cycle. This decision was confirmed by the 38% countywide sales rate (with a range of 24% to 47%) found in the 2004 YTPS conducted at the beginning of the project described in this report.

Objective

_By June 30, 2007, at least two cities and the unincorporated area of Bear County will adopt and implement a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products and that includes sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks. This is a primary objective, addressing indicator # 3.2.1._

This objective was chosen by staff and coalition members through the Communities of Excellence (CX) Needs Assessment process in January 2004. Thirty-six members of the community including staff, adult and youth coalition members, and partners representing law enforcement, the schools, media and youth groups participated in a three-hour forum to select indicators for inclusion in the upcoming three year plan. Of the indicators selected, tobacco retail licensing as a strategy to reduce sales to minors was one of the highest rated, and became the basis for a primary objective.

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. In Bear County, the prevention of illegal sales has been inconsistent due to budgetary constraints with local law enforcement. With a tobacco retail licensing policy 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.

Intervention

After conducting a YTPS in 2004 after the 2004-2007 plan was approved, BCTRP selected the three areas with the highest rates of tobacco sales to minors as the target of the intervention, with the goal of having at least two areas adopt a tobacco licensing policy.
targeted areas included two cities, Gold Town and Pacific Canyon, and the unincorporated portion of the county, with rates ranging from 42-47%. The intervention activities targeted four groups: (1) the City Council and County Board of Supervisors members, (2) local law enforcement, (3) the general public, and (4) tobacco retailers.

Activities targeting the City Council and County Board of Supervisors members included:

- Distribution of educational materials on tobacco retail licensing, including model policies and experiences from neighboring counties.
- Presentations at Board of Supervisors and City Council meetings, including data on local sales to minors, results of a public opinion survey about community support for the policy, and information on how a tobacco retail licensing policy can be adopted and implemented locally.
- Visits to individual members of the Board of Supervisors and City Councils to provide additional information and answer questions that may not have been addressed previously.

Activities targeting local law enforcement included:

- Visits to the Chief of Police and other law enforcement administrators to inform them about the tobacco retail licensing policy and to arrange training for law enforcement personnel.
- Coordination of training on PC308 enforcement to local law enforcement personnel.
- Ongoing collaboration with law enforcement in support of their compliance checks.

Activities targeting the general public included:

- Collaboration with local youth-serving organizations to obtain endorsements for the tobacco retail licensing policy.
- Press releases about the results of the YTPS and public opinion surveys.
- Press conferences to announce new policies and to recognize the actions of the City Council/Board of Supervisors.

Activities targeting tobacco retailers included:

- In-person visits to educate store owners, managers, and clerks about the new policy, requirements for retailers, how and when to obtain licenses, and penalties for violations.
- Development of educational packets with the same information communicated in the in-person visits. The packets were left with retailers as a reference and to use in educating new employees.
Evaluation Methods

Evaluation Design

The evaluation of the outcome of this objective used a non-experimental design, with a posttest measure and no comparison group. The outcome -- implementation of the policy -- was measured by comparing the number of retail licenses that had been issued to the list of known tobacco retailers in the areas. The design does not have a pretest because there were no licenses before the intervention. Similarly, there is no comparison group because there is not a comparable outcome measure in jurisdictions without a policy.

Process data were collected through the YTPS and public opinion polls to determine the extent of the problem of tobacco sales to minors and the extent (if any) of public support for a licensing policy. This information was used in the presentations to the City Councils/Board of Supervisors. The YTPS also included a data collection training activity, which was assessed by simulations (see below for more details). To examine the process of policy adoption (or the decision not to adopt) and implementation, key informants were interviewed about the strengths and weaknesses of the strategies implemented by the project. Reviews of Board of Supervisors and City Council records were used to document the policymakers’ discussion about and votes on the tobacco retail licensing policy. (BCTRIP did not conduct a participant survey of the law enforcement personnel who participated in the PC 308 training, but received a copy of the results of the training survey.)

The major limitations of this design are: (1) not having a comparison group to provide another perspective in assessing the intervention’s impact on the adoption or implementation of the policy and (2) not having the resources to assess the longer-term implications of the policy on sales to minors.

Sampling, Data Collection, and Analysis¹

Data were collected from the three areas that received the intervention: Gold Town, Pacific Canyon, and the unincorporated area of the county. In each area, the YTPS, public opinion polls, key informant interviews and a review of City Council/Board of Supervisors records were conducted. For areas that passed the policy, a separate policy record review provided information on compliance with the new policy. The samples used for each method, the data collection process, and data analysis are described in detail below.

Youth Tobacco Purchase Survey (including data collection training)

A Youth Tobacco Purchase Survey was conducted in 2004, at the start of this project, to have updated data on the prevalence of tobacco sales to minors. Since this is a small county, all 177 tobacco retailers in the six cities (described in the “Background” section above) and in the unincorporated area were visited. To identify the 177 stores, BCTRIP started with the list of stores used for the previous YTPS. This list was checked against information about retailers available from the California State Board of Equalization and the California

¹ NOTE: In your report, the data collection instruments (YTPS, public opinion survey, key informant interview questions and record review forms) referred to in this section would be included as appendices.
Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, and updated with information obtained from coalition members and other local sources. The resulting list was used for the 2004 YTPS. During the YTPS, the list was further updated by removing stores on the list that had gone out of business or moved, and adding new stores discovered by the surveyors.

The YTPS was conducted using the standard protocol with a consummated purchase (in which the youth buys the tobacco product but does not lie about his or her age). The protocol is available on the STORE website (http://www.tcsstore.org/stages/1_documentIllegal.html). The evaluator simplified the standardized YTPS data collection instrument, which is also provided on the STORE website, by taking out several items that would not be used by the project, such as questions about vending machines and the timing of any questions that the clerk asked the youth.

Seven youth, four female and three male, and ranging from 15 to 17 years of age, participated in the YTPS. In addition, six adults were recruited to accompany the youth. Both adults and youth were trained on the data collection instrument and protocol. The training included a simulation of the actual survey, in which they enter a store, observe the surroundings, leave the store, and then complete the data collection tool. To reduce error in the data by ensuring that both adults and youth were seeing and documenting the same thing, this activity was continued until there was 98% agreement between the two observers about what had been observed. As indicated by the standard protocol, stores were visited by an adult and a youth, who attempted to purchase tobacco. The protocol states, “When the child enters the store, s/he will ask, ‘Can I have a pack of Marlboros?’ If the retailer proceeds to sell the merchandise without any additional questions, the youth is to pay for the purchase and leave. If the retailer asks for identification or asks the youth’s age, the child is instructed to tell the truth.” The adult and youth then complete the data collection instrument together upon leaving the store before going on to the next store.

Frequencies and percentages of stores where purchases were completed were calculated with the YTPS data. Sales rates were calculated for the county as a whole and by individual city and the unincorporated area. As noted above, the three jurisdictions with the highest sales rates (Gold Town, Pacific Canyon, and the unincorporated area of the county) were selected for intervention in this project.

Public opinion polls (public intercept surveys)

Public opinion polls were conducted in each of the three areas targeted for intervention activities. The data were collected in October, November, and December, 2004. The surveys were conducted at community events and locales in each city with a high number of people visiting, such as shopping centers, movie theaters and grocery stores. A variety of locations were targeted in each area to obtain responses from a cross-section of the adult public. Altogether, 473 surveys were completed (147 in Gold Town, 165 in the unincorporated area, and 161 in Pacific Canyon).

The survey instrument was developed by the local evaluator in partnership with the Tobacco Control Evaluation Center (TC Evaluation Center). Respondents to the survey were asked whether they were concerned about the sale of tobacco to minors, whether they supported retail establishments being required to obtain a license to sell tobacco products, and whether
they currently smoke. The evaluator developed the instructions for completing the survey and provided training to the project staff who collected the data. Survey responses were then entered into a spreadsheet developed by the evaluator. Analysis consisted of calculating frequencies and percentages for yes/no questions for the three areas individually, as well as combined for an overall indication of support. The results were included in presentations to the Board of Supervisors and City Councils.

**Policy record review—Board of Supervisors and City Council meeting minutes**

Board of Supervisors and City Council meeting minutes were reviewed in order to document which of the three targeted areas adopted a tobacco retail license, identify the representatives involved in the decision, and describe the issues raised in support of or opposition to the licensing policy. In addition to recording the votes by representative in each of the areas, content analysis was used to identify themes in the discussion about the policy. This analysis provided guidance for the questions developed for the post-intervention key informant interviews. It also served to identify concerns that could be addressed proactively in future activities.

**Key informant interviews**

Key informant interviews were conducted with members of the Board of Supervisors and City Councils, retailers, and administrators of local law enforcement agencies. The overall response rate was 68%, with 17 of the 25 key informants successfully interviewed. The breakdown by type of informant is:

- Each jurisdiction had five representatives on its City Council or Board of Supervisors, for a total of 15. Of these, project staff were able to interview five in Gold Town, four in the unincorporated area of Bear County, and two in Pacific Canyon, for a response rate of 73%.

- Four (57%) of the seven retailers contacted were interviewed -- two in Gold Town, one in the unincorporated area and one in Pacific Canyon.

- Two (66%) of three representatives of law enforcement were interviewed. (Locations are not identified to protect their confidentiality.)

The interviews were conducted by telephone, and were conducted three months after the vote on the tobacco retail licensing policy was taken in each jurisdiction. The questions, which were developed by the local evaluator in consultation with the TC Evaluation Center, asked about key factors in deciding to support or oppose the tobacco retail licensing policy, barriers to and facilitators of policy adoption/implementation, and suggestions for other cities implementing similar tobacco retail licensing policies.

Content analysis of the open-ended responses was used to identify strengths and weaknesses of the project’s intervention, and recommendations for the future.

**Policy record review—licenses issued**

In the two areas that passed tobacco retail licensing policies (Gold Town and the unincorporated area of the County), implementation was assessed by calculating the percentage of known retailers who had obtained a license. Licensing information was
collected through a record review six months after the policy was adopted. Records of the licenses issued were obtained from the local agency that issues licenses or permits: the City Manager’s office in Gold Town and the County Treasurer for the unincorporated area of the county. To determine the comparison number of all possible tobacco retailers in Gold Town and the unincorporated area, the list developed from the 2004 YTPS was used (see above).

The local evaluator created an Excel spreadsheet for recording the data from the record review. The spreadsheet included the name, address, and type of each store that had obtained a license, the date the store’s license was issued, and the number of citations for violating the policy. The evaluator developed instructions for using the data collection form and then provided training to the project staff who conducted the record reviews. After the record reviews were completed, the analysis consisted of calculating the percentage of retailers who had obtained a license for each area.

Evaluation Results

Process Data Collection Results

Extent of the Problem

In total, 177 stores were visited in six cities plus the unincorporated area of the county. The three jurisdictions with the highest sales rates were selected for this project (highlighted in table below). Data on sales to minors for all areas in the County are presented below in Table 1.

Table 1. 2004 Sales to Minors for All Areas in Bear County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Area</th>
<th># of Sales to Minors</th>
<th>Total # retailers</th>
<th>Sales Rate (# sales/total # of retailers)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gold Town</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Canyon</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Area</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Valley</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear City</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Creek</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
<td><strong>38%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This was a slight reduction from the 41% rate found in 2002.

Public Support for Licensing

Across the two cities and the unincorporated area, 473 respondents completed the public opinion survey that was implemented at the beginning of the project. Many of the respondents were concerned about the high rate of illegal sales of tobacco to minors, and reported a high level of support for adopting the tobacco retail licensing policy. Overall, 75% of the respondents reported that they were concerned that minors were able to purchase tobacco in that area. Slightly less, 73%, said that they supported a policy requiring retailers
to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products. Nine percent of the respondents identified themselves as smokers. Table 2 shows the data broken out by the three areas.

### Table 2. Extent of Support for Tobacco Retail Licensing by City (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Questions</th>
<th>Gold Town (n=147)</th>
<th>Unincorp. area (n=165)</th>
<th>Pacific Canyon (n=161)</th>
<th>Total (n=473)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>− A recent survey shows that more than 40% of retail outlets in this area have sold tobacco products to minors. Are you concerned that minors are able to illegally purchase tobacco products in this city/area?</td>
<td>109 (74%)</td>
<td>129 (78%)</td>
<td>115 (71%)</td>
<td>353 (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Do you support requiring retailers to obtain a license to sell tobacco products (similar to what is needed for alcohol)?</td>
<td>103 (70%)</td>
<td>121 (73%)</td>
<td>119 (74%)</td>
<td>343 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Do you currently smoke?</td>
<td>16 (11%)</td>
<td>20 (12%)</td>
<td>7 (4%)</td>
<td>43 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adoption of a Tobacco Retail Licensing Policy

The review of the City Council minutes in Gold Town and Pacific Canyon, and the Board of Supervisors minutes for the unincorporated area determined that the policy was adopted by Gold Town (4 in favor, 1 opposed) and the unincorporated area of the county (3 in favor, 2 opposed). The policy was not adopted by Pacific Canyon, with a vote of 2 in favor, 3 opposed.

The key informant interviews with members of the Board of Supervisors and City Councils and review of meeting minutes were analyzed to identify the facilitators and barriers to policy adoption.

### Table 3. Facilitators and Barriers to Policy Adoption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th># of Key Informants (n=11)*</th>
<th># of Jurisdictions (n=3)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Factors contributing to support for the policy:</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Public opinion data in support of the policy that came from across the city/unincorporated area</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Data presented on the problem of sales to minors in their area</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− Plans for educational visits to retailers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>− In-person visits and presentations to City Council/Board of Supervisors by project staff</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes | # of Key Informants (n=11)* | # of Jurisdictions (n=3)**
--- | --- | ---
- Information about other California cities that had already passed similar ordinances | 3 | 1
- The sample policy in the informational packet | 2 | 2

Factors contributing to lack of support for policy:

- Doubts about the enforceability of the policy (i.e., small number of businesses and distances between stores might make license sufficient to cover enforcement costs very expensive) | 6 | 3
- Belief that such policies (and the expense and regulation that come with them) are an undue burden on businesses | 4 | 3
- Concern that the policy was not the way to address sales to minors | 2 | 0
- Lack of interest in retail licensing policies at the local level | 2 | 1

*The number indicates how many of the 11 City Council/Board of Supervisors members made comments that could be categorized for each theme.

**The number indicates how many of the three jurisdictions (two cities and one county) had comments in the City Council or Board of Supervisors minutes that could be categorized within each theme.

Policy Implementation Process

The key informant interviews with local retailers and law enforcement identified concerns about and facilitators of policy implementation. The retailers identified educational visits and media coverage as primary facilitators, and the burden on small businesses as the primary barrier to implementation. One respondent particularly identified the newspaper coverage of the extent of public support for the policy as influential in obtaining retailer buy-in. Although three of the four retailers felt that the educational visits were useful, the fourth questioned their value and recommended a follow-up visit in a few months to ask whether retailers actually used the information from the educational visit and materials. In contrast, the only facilitator of policy implementation that was not mentioned by the law enforcement interviewees was the media coverage. Both law enforcement interviewees stated that more resources were needed for enforcement, despite the fees associated with the license.

With such small sample sizes, the information from these interviews should not be given much weight. Only the educational visits were identified as useful by both groups (see table 4).

Table 4. Policy Implementation – Supports and Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Retailers (n=4)</th>
<th>Law Enforcement (n=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supports for policy implementation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Retailers (n=4)</th>
<th>Law Enforcement (n=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational visits to retailers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient fees to pay for enforcement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage of policy adoption and requirements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training for law enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenges to policy implementation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Retailers (n=4)</th>
<th>Law Enforcement (n=2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources for enforcement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information on policy requirements, on the part of both retailers and law enforcement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burden on small businesses to comply with policy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recommendations**

In addition to discussing the issues associated with policy adoption and implementation, the key informants who were interviewed were also asked if they had recommendations for other cities considering the adoption of a tobacco retail licensing policy. Their recommendations were:

- Provide local data on the extent of the problem of sales to minors and the extent of public support for (or opposition to) the policy,
- Ask for retailer input first, before beginning formal consideration of the policy,
- Provide retailer training, and
- Use the media to get retailer and public support

**Outcome Data Collection Results**

**Compliance with Policy**

By the conclusion of this project, two jurisdictions (Gold Town and the unincorporated area of the county) adopted and implemented a tobacco retail licensing policy. Pacific Canyon, which had also been targeted, did not adopt a policy, and is therefore not included in the analysis of policy implementation. Implementation was assessed by looking at rates of compliance. Specifically, the number of licenses issued was compared to the total number of tobacco retailers for each area. Gold Town had a compliance rate of 76%, with 26 of the 34 stores identified as tobacco retail outlets obtaining licenses in the six months following passage of the policy. In the unincorporated area, 15 licenses were issued out of a total of 19 stores, for a compliance rate of 79%. Clearly there is still work to be done in both areas to increase the level of compliance with obtaining licenses. Further analysis should be done to determine if there are specific patterns or differences in the stores that have or have not obtained licenses. For example, compliance may vary by location in the city/county or store type.
Conclusions and Recommendations

The objective of getting at least two cities or unincorporated areas to adopt and implement a tobacco retail licensing policy was met. Two jurisdictions adopted and implemented a policy requiring retailers to obtain a license to sell tobacco products. In addition, the evaluation shows that, while full compliance with the new policies has not yet been achieved, the majority of stores (76% and 79%) in the two areas have already obtained a license. The BCTRIP is optimistic that with continued efforts and education it will be at or near 100% within the next six months.

The evaluation of this project indicates that the intervention of providing data and education through presentations to City Councils and Board of Supervisors and in-person meetings was effective in gaining support for the policy. Board of Supervisors and City Council members cited the data presented on public support for the policy and the high rate of sales to minors as primary reasons for supporting the policy. These were also themes identified in the Council and Board meeting minutes as reasons for supporting the policy. Although not mentioned in the meeting minutes, individual interviews also revealed that the in-person visits to Council and Board representatives were also important to their decision to support the policy.

As for the implementation of the policy, the majority of stores have already obtained their licenses. The stores that have not will be notified again about the policy and the requirement to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products. From the few interviews with retailers and law enforcement, the educational visits were identified as an important facilitator of policy implementation. However, this finding should be tested with follow-up interviews to ask about the extent to which the information and materials were used.

Lessons learned from this project and recommendations for future projects include:

- Key informant interviewees were able to describe which parts of the intervention were most effective. For example, the data on public support for the policy and local sales to minors were the most frequently cited reasons given by the City Council/Board of Supervisors members for supporting the policy.

- The combination of key informant interviews and reviews of meeting minutes provided a more complete picture of the issues considered in adopting or rejecting the policy. For example, while only one person raised doubts about the enforceability of the policy in the key informant interviews, concerns about enforceability were found in the meeting minutes from all three jurisdictions. This suggests that enforceability is an issue that should be addressed in the educational presentations and meetings that projects have with policymakers.

- Including key informants such as retailers and law enforcement provided insight from various perspectives that would not have been captured otherwise. In the future, we would like to increase the number of representatives from each group in order to get a better understanding of their perspectives.

- The educational visits to retailers were identified as facilitators of both policy adoption and policy implementation.
Stronger evaluation designs would help strengthen the statements that can be made about the impact of intervention activities. For example, designs could be strengthened by including comparison cities, increasing the amount of information obtained from retailers and law enforcement on the process of implementation, and conducting a post-intervention public opinion survey to measure public awareness of the new policy.

Because of time limitations, this evaluation did not examine the adequacy of the fees for regular compliance checks. If possible, this is an issue that should be reviewed in the future to ensure that fees for the licenses provide sufficient resources to support enforcement of the ban on sales to minors.

This project shows that City Councils and Boards of Supervisors are open to adopting and implementing policies that require retailers to obtain tobacco retail licenses. According to the key informant interviews and reviews of meeting minutes, the intervention activities used in the project can be influential in getting these policies passed. Future work should focus on getting other cities to adopt tobacco retail licensing policies or encouraging the county to pass this policy on a larger scale. The lessons learned from this project will be useful in accomplishing this goal.

Your evaluation report should include two components that are not included in this sample report. First, any sources that you cited should be included in a list of references at the end of the report. Second, the data collection instruments used in the evaluation should be attached to the report.