



CENTER FOR EVALUATION AND RESEARCH

TOBACCO CONTROL EVALUATION CENTER

Combating Youth Access to Tobacco Products Through Tobacco Retail Policies

A summary and analysis of 39 Final Evaluation Reports
from California tobacco control programs
addressing Communities of Excellence Indicators
3.1.1, 3.1.10, 3.1.2 and 3.2.1
during the 2007-2010 funding cycle

Prepared by:

M. Susan Haun, MA
Tobacco Control Evaluation Center
UC Davis

October 2011

Funded by:

The California Department of Health Services,
Tobacco Control Program

Table of Contents

	Page
I. List of Tables, Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	iii
II. Introduction	
a. Purpose and Scope of This Study.....	1
b. Communities of Excellence (CX) Indicators Chosen.....	1
c. Primary Areas of Investigation.....	1
d. Methods.....	2
e. Final Evaluation Report (FER) Quick Facts.....	2
III. Overview	
a. LLAs Funded, Indicators Chosen and Project Outcomes.....	3
IV. Analysis of the Primary Areas of Investigation	
a. Elements of a Successful Campaign.....	7
Stage 1: Select an Issue.....	7
Stage 2: Develop a Strategy.....	13
Stage 3: Broaden Your Coalition and ID a Champion.....	13
Involvement of Youth	
Training Adult & Youth Volunteers	
Identifying a Champion	
Stage 4: Gather Information.....	18
Conducting Research and Compiling Educational Materials	
Gather Local Information	
Stage 5: Communicate With Target.....	24
Stage 6: Implement Activities.....	25
Use of Media for Education and Advocacy	
Involvement of Policy Makers and Law Enforcement	
Education of Merchants	
Stage 7: Evaluate the Campaign.....	31
Outcome Measures	
Process Measures	
b. Problems Encountered and Challenges.....	32
c. Conclusions.....	34
V. Appendices	
A. List of Local Lead Agency Grant Objectives for 2007-2010 Program Period.....	36
B. References.....	40

List of Tables, Acronyms and Abbreviations

List of Tables

- Table 1: CX Indicators Chosen: 3.1.1, 3.1.10, 3.1.2 and 3.2.1
- Table 2: Final Evaluation Report (FER) Quick Facts
- Table 3: LLAs Funded, Indicators Chosen and Project Outcomes
- Table 4: Objective Type and Project Outcomes
- Table 5: Campaign Stages of LLAs Addressing Indicators 3.1.1, 3.1.10, 3.1.2 and 3.2.1
- Table 6: Youth Roles Described in the FERs
- Table 7: Youth Tobacco Purchase Survey Results – Pre- and Post-Intervention
- Table 8: Public Opinion Poll Results
- Table 9: Media Used for Education and Advocacy
- Table 10: TRLPs Passed – Rural vs. Urban Areas
- Table 11: YTPS Results – Pre- and Post-TRLP Adoption

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BOS	Board of Supervisors
CCM	City Council Member
CX	Communities of Excellence
FER	Final Evaluation Report
LLA	Local Lead Agency
MASC	Midwest Academy Strategy Chart
PC	Penal Code
PD	Police Department
TA	Technical Assistance
TRL	Tobacco Retail Licensing
TRLP	Tobacco Retail Licensing Policy
YPS	Youth Purchase Survey
YTPS	Youth Tobacco Purchase Survey

Introduction

Purpose and Scope of This Study

Between the beginning of July 2007 and the end of June 2010, 39 Local Lead Agencies (LLAs), representing 39 county and city health departments in California, were funded by the California Department of Public Health, Tobacco Control Program, to pursue objectives related to tobacco use by minors. The purpose of this report is to provide a summary and analysis of the Final Evaluation Reports (FERs) submitted by these programs at the conclusion of the 2007-2010 funding cycle.

Communities of Excellence (CX) Indicators Chosen

Each of these 39 LLAs focused on addressing the Communities of Excellence (CX) Indicators that deal with prohibiting the sale of tobacco to minors: Indicators 3.1.1, 3.1.10, 3.1.2 and 3.2.1. These indicators are described in Table 1 below.

Table 1. CX Indicators Chosen: 3.1.1, 3.1.10, 3.1.2 and 3.2.1.

<p>3.1.1: Number of compliance checks conducted by enforcement agencies for violations of policies that prohibit the sale of tobacco to minors and that require ID checking. – or – Number of warnings, citations, and fines issued for violating policies that prohibit the sale of tobacco to minors and that require ID checking. – or – Proportion of tobacco retailers in compliance with policies that prohibit the sale of tobacco to minors and that require ID checking.</p>
<p>3.1.10: Number of compliance checks conducted by enforcement agencies for violations of policies that require tobacco retailers to post their tobacco retail license. – or – Number of warnings, citations, and fines issued for violating policies that require tobacco retailers to post their tobacco retail license. – or – Proportion of tobacco retailers in compliance with policies that require tobacco retailers to post their tobacco retail license.</p>
<p>3.1.2: Number of compliance checks conducted by enforcement agencies for violations of policies that require tobacco retailers to post the STAKE Act age-of-sale warning sign. – or – Number of warnings, citations, and fines issued for violating policies that require tobacco retailers to post the STAKE Act age-of-sale warning sign. – or – Proportion of tobacco retailers in compliance with policies that require tobacco retailers to post the STAKE Act age-of-sale warning sign.</p>
<p>3.2.1: Proportion of communities with a tobacco retail licensing policy that earmarks a portion of the license fee for enforcement activities.</p>

Primary Areas of Investigation

The purpose of this report is to examine certain elements or factors common to all projects. These were selected by the Tobacco Control Evaluation Center as primary areas of investigation due to their apparent link to successful outcomes in past analyses of FERs. These elements or factors are:

- Elements of a successful campaign, the steps involved, including:
 - Involvement of youth
 - Use of media for education and advocacy
 - Involvement of policymakers and law enforcement
 - Education of merchants
 - Youth Tobacco Purchase Surveys Results – pre- and post-intervention
- Problems encountered and barriers
- Conclusions and recommendations

This report is presented in several parts. The *Overview* recaps the CX Indicators and introduces the projects as described in their FERs with two summary tables. This is followed by an *Analysis of the Primary Areas of Investigation*, one by one, which together comprise the body of this report. The *Conclusions* drawn from this analysis are provided in the final section, providing findings and recommendations for successful project outcomes.

Methods

At the conclusion of the 2007-2010 funding cycle, the 39 LLAs produced FERs describing their experiences and revealing whether they were able to succeed in meeting their objectives. Contacting the LLAs directly to resolve ambiguities or to expand upon the information offered in the FERs was not an option in preparation of this report. As such, the data used here are drawn exclusively from the 39 FERs as they were submitted at the end of the project period. In considering what to include in each section of this report, if it was not specifically reported as a completed activity in the LLAs FER, it was not done.

Although these reports have indicators in common – CX indicators focused on prohibiting the sale of tobacco to minors – the resulting final reports demonstrate a wide variation in content and presentation. The FERs ranged in length from four to 60 pages and, upon reviewing the reports, it was apparent that there were no set of shared variables that could be used for convenient point-by-point comparison. For these reasons, definitive conclusions cannot be drawn from the limited information that many FERs provided. Instead, this report is limited to compiling information about activities and outcomes presented by the FERs themselves and making tentative observations based upon this information.

Final Evaluation Report (FER) Quick Facts

A brief summary of some of the characteristics of the projects as they are described in their FERs is provided in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Final Evaluation Report (FER) Quick Facts.

- **39** FERs were produced by 37 county and 2 city LLAs;
- **28** LLAs had tobacco retail licensing policy objectives and **11** had licensing compliance-related objectives;
- **4** LLAs **exceeded** the planned objectives (3 counties and 1 city); **2** LLAs **met** the objectives (1 county and 1 city), **14** **partially met** the objectives (13 counties); and **19** **did not meet** the planned objectives;
- **18** FERs reported activities conducted in **rural** areas, **4** reported activities in **rural and urban** areas, the rest (**17**) were **urban** projects;
- **28** FERs targeted policy makers in **city and/or county** areas, **13** of these LLAs **also targeted law enforcement**; **9** **also targeted merchants**);
- **11** FERs focusing on compliance with existing laws targeted **merchants** (6) or **merchants AND law enforcement** (5).

Overview

Between the beginning of July 2007 and the end of June 2010, 39 Local Lead Agencies (LLAs), representing 39 county or city health departments in California, were funded by the California Department of Public Health, Tobacco Control Program, to address Communities of Excellence (CX) Indicators that deal with prohibiting the sale of tobacco to minors: Indicators 3.2.1, 3.1.10, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.

In studying these FERs, it was apparent that there were no set of shared variables that could be used for convenient point-by-point comparison. Although these California county and city projects have a single point in common – in this instance, the CX Indicators mentioned above – the resulting reports demonstrate a wide variation in content and presentation. For example, the FERs ranged in length from four to 60 pages. Many FERs followed a pattern of reporting. Some FERs were models of coherence; others erred by providing too much or too little information, or were difficult to follow. Other differences among the projects included the following: differences among the cities/counties; differences in LLAs; and differences in approach. A brief description of each of these follows.

- **Differences Among the Cities/Counties.** The counties/cities included in this report vary geographically, economically, politically and demographically. Among the 39 FERs, 22 counties are rural or a rural/urban mix, and 17 of the projects are urban. The size of the counties/cities and the number of tobacco retailers within each jurisdiction varies widely. Modoc County, for example, has a countywide population of 9,686, only one incorporated city and one city council, and 13 tobacco retailers. This is in contrast to Los Angeles County which has a population of 9,818,605, 88 incorporated cities/city councils, and approximately 2,000 tobacco retailers. Most projects collected Youth Tobacco Purchase Survey (YTPS) data to demonstrate the problem of youth access to tobacco. For small counties, like Modoc, this was a particular challenge because “everyone knows everyone.” The Project Director “knew” anecdotally that minors were able to purchase tobacco among the counties 13 retailers, but was unable to substantiate it with the YTPS.
- **Differences in Local Lead Agencies.** Reflecting the differences in size and capabilities of their communities, most LLAs took on most of the tasks themselves, while others contracted with local community-based organizations (CBOs), usually coalition members, to perform some or all of the project activities. For example, Los Angeles County utilized 8 subcontractors to assist the LLAs staff with the 12 cities targeted in its campaign. Some projects were able to make extensive use of adult and youth volunteers in carrying their projects forward. Sacramento County, for example, recruited 88 youth to help with YTPSs. Other counties, such as Contra Costa County, were less successful in recruiting youth volunteers to help.
- **Differences in Approach.** While all LLAs focused on prohibiting the sale of tobacco to minors, 28 projects focused on activities related to adopting and/or implementing tobacco retail licensing policies in one or more jurisdictions, and in targeting policy makers. In most cases, the policy makers targeted were city councils or county boards of supervisors. In some cases, the policy maker targeted was a law enforcement official, such as a Chief of Police or the county Sheriff. The remaining 11 projects focused on tobacco retailer compliance with California youth access laws, targeting tobacco retailers and, in some projects, collaborating and coordinating with law enforcement on conducting YTPSs.

LLAs Funded, Indicators Chosen and Project Outcomes

At the conclusion of the 2007-2010 funding cycle, these LLAs produced 39 Final Evaluation Report (FERs) describing their experiences and revealing whether or not they were able to succeed in meeting their

objectives.¹ The names of the LLAs, the specific indicators chosen, as well as the outcomes of each project, are illustrated in more detail in Table 3 below.

Table 3. LLAs Funded, Indicators Chosen and Project Outcomes.

(Shading: blue = objectives exceeded, green = objectives met, grey = objectives partially met, no shading = objectives not met)

#	LLA (City)	TOBACCO RETAIL LICENSING INDICATOR CHOSEN:				OBJECTIVE MET?
		3.2.1	3.1.1	3.1.10	3.1.2	
1	Alameda Co. TCP (Oakland)	x				<i>Partially met objective:</i> 2 cities adopted a TRLP instead of 3
2	Berkeley TPP (City of Berkeley)		x			<i>Exceeded objective:</i> Attained 97.7% compliance with Penal Code 308(a) ² instead of 90%
3	Butte Co. TEP (Oroville)				x	<i>Partially met objective:</i> Compliance improved but 95% proper signage for STAKE Act age-of-sale and tobacco license was not attained ³
4	Calaveras Co. TPP (San Andreas)	x				<i>Did not meet objective:</i> A TRLP was not adopted in 1 city
5	Contra Costa Co. TPP (Martinez)	x				<i>Partially met objective:</i> A TRLP was adopted in 1 city but not yet implemented
6	Del Norte Co. TUPP (Crescent City)		x			<i>Partially met objective:</i> Illegal sales to minors were reduced from 33% to 20% instead of 5%
7	El Dorado Co. TUPP (Placerville)	x				<i>Did not meet objective:</i> A TRLP was not adopted in 1 jurisdiction
8	Fresno Co. TPP (Fresno)	x				<i>Did not meet objective:</i> A TRLP was not adopted in 1 jurisdiction
9	Humboldt Co. LLA (Eureka)		x			<i>Partially met objective:</i> Illegal sales to minors were reduced from 26.8% to 14.5% instead of 5%
10	Inyo Co. TCP (Bishop)	x				<i>Did not meet objective:</i> A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 1 jurisdiction
11	Kern Co. TEP (Bakersfield)	x	x			<i>Partially met objective:</i> A TRLP was adopted and implemented in 1 city instead of 3
12	Kings Co. TCP (Hanford)	x				<i>Did not meet objective:</i> A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 1 jurisdiction
13	Lake Co. TEP (Kelseyville)	x				<i>Did not meet objective:</i> A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 1 jurisdiction
14	City of Long Beach TEP (Long Beach)	x				<i>Met objective:</i> A TRLP was adopted and implemented
15	Los Angeles Co. TCPP (Los Angeles)	x	x			<i>Exceeded objective:</i> 18 cities adopted a TRLP instead of 12
16	Madera Co. TCP (Madera)			x		<i>Partially met objective:</i> Attained 97.4% compliance with Penal Code 308(a) instead of 60%, but 60% compliance with proper signage for STAKE Act age-of-sale and tobacco license was not attained ⁴

¹ A listing of each LLA and its objective is provided in Appendix A.

² California Penal Code 308(a) prohibits the sale of tobacco products to minors.

³ Butte County: There was improvement, but a total was not provided so it is unclear how much improvement was attained.

⁴ Madera County: The wording of the objective is unclear and the total percentage for signage was not provided.

#	LLA (City)	TOBACCO RETAIL LICENSING INDICATOR CHOSEN:				OBJECTIVE MET?
		3.2.1	3.1.1	3.1.10	3.1.2	
17	Mendocino Co. TCP (Ukiah)	x		x		Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 1 jurisdiction, however, the countywide policy was strengthened
18	Modoc Co. TEP (Alturas)		x		x	Exceeded objective: Illegal sales to minors were reduced by 100% to 0% instead of by 20% ⁵
19	Monterey Co. TCP (Salinas)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted in 3 jurisdictions
20	Nevada Co. TPP (Grass Valley)	x				Met objective: A TRLP was adopted and implemented in 1 city
21	Placer Co. TPP (Auburn)		x			Partially met objective: Attained 100% compliance with Penal Code 308(a) instead of 90%, but 90% compliance with proper signage for STAKE Act age-of-sale and tobacco license was not attained ⁶
22	Plumas Co. TURP (Quincy)		x			Partially met objective: Illegal sales to minors were reduced from 12.5% to 8.3% instead of 5%
23	Riverside Co. TCP (Riverside)	x				Exceeded objective: 8 cities adopted and implemented a TRLP instead of 3
24	Sacramento Co. TEP (Sacramento)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 1 city
25	San Bernardino Co. TURN Program (San Bernardino)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 2 jurisdictions
26	San Diego Co. TCRP (San Diego)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 3 jurisdictions
27	San Luis Obispo Co. TCP (San Luis Obispo)	x		x		Partially met objective: A TRLP was adopted in 1 jurisdiction instead of 2
28	San Mateo Co. TPP (San Mateo)	x				Partially met objective: A TRLP was adopted in 1 jurisdiction instead of 2, however, a countywide policy affecting 13 other jurisdictions was strengthened
29	Santa Barbara Co. TPSP (Santa Barbara)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted in 2 cities
30	Santa Clara Co. TPEP (San Jose)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 1 city, however a CUP was adopted in 1 city
31	Santa Cruz Co. TEP (Santa Cruz)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 1 jurisdiction
32	Sierra Co. TURP (Loyalton)		x			Partially met objective: Illegal sales to minors were reduced from 25% to 17% instead of 0%
33	Siskiyou Co. TEP (Yreka)		x		x	Partially met objective: Attained 94% compliance with Penal Code 308(a) with 15 stores instead of 63; attained 68% compliance with proper signage for STAKE Act age-of-sale and tobacco license, and self-service display

⁵ Modoc County: The objectives, as written, indicates a 20% reduction based on a starting buy rate of 8%. A 20% reduction would mean a 6.4% buy rate.

⁶ Placer County: The baseline for proper signage is 53.8. It is clear that the goal was not met regarding signage. However, the exact figure is not provided in the report.

#	LLA (City)	TOBACCO RETAIL LICENSING INDICATOR CHOSEN:				OBJECTIVE MET?
		3.2.1	3.1.1	3.1.10	3.1.2	
						bans instead of 100%
34	Solano Co. TPEP (Fairfield)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted and implemented in 1 city; however, 1 city passed a policy that restricts locations for significant new tobacco retailers ⁷
35	Stanislaus Co. TEP (Modesto)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted in 2 cities
36	Sutter Co. TC (Yuba City)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted in 1 jurisdiction
37	Tulare Co. TCP (Bakersfield)				x	Partially met objective: Attained 75.7% compliance with proper signage for STAKE Act age-of-sale and tobacco license, and self-service display bans instead of 90%
38	Tuolumne Co. TEP (Sonora)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted in 1 city
39	Ventura Co. TEP (Ventura)	x				Did not meet objective: A TRLP was not adopted in 1 city

Twenty-eight (28) LLAs defined objectives specific to Tobacco Retail Licensing in one or more jurisdictions. Of the 28 that chose to tackle Indicator 3.2.1, 27 chose policy adoption and sought to have tobacco retail licensing policies enacted by local city councils or boards of supervisors; 15 of these counties added implementation and further committed themselves to showing that, subsequent to policy enactment, illegal sales to minors would be reduced by a specified percentage from an established baseline; and one of these counties focused on implementing a tobacco retail licensing policy enacted in the previous project period (2004-2007). Eleven (11) LLAs defined objectives specific to compliance with Penal Code 308(a), STAKE Act Signage and/or the State Tobacco Retail Licensing Law (AB71) in one or more jurisdictions, Indicators 3.1.1, 3.1.10 and/or 3.1.2, and chose to have compliance with existing laws enforced by working with law enforcement and/or educating tobacco retailers. To what extent these projects met their objectives is summarized by objective type in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Objective Type and Project Outcomes.

Tobacco Retail Licensing Policy Objective 28 LLAs	Penal Code 308(a), STAKE Act and/or State Law Compliance Objective 11 LLAs
• 2 projects exceeded their objective (Los Angeles and Riverside County)	• 2 projects exceeded their objective (City of Berkeley and Modoc County)
• 2 projects met their objective (City of Long Beach and Nevada County)	• 0 projects met their objective
• 5 projects partially met their objective	• 9 projects partially met their objective
• 19 projects did not meet their objective	• 0 projects did not meet their objective

Twenty (20) of the 39 projects were successful, and in four (4) of these the LLAs were able to accomplish more than the minimum goals they set for themselves as defined in the objective.

⁷ Solano County: The policy also requires a major use permit for such new businesses, and requires both new and existing significant tobacco retailers to follow certain operating standards.

Analysis of the Primary Areas of Investigation

Twenty (20) of the 39 projects were successful. Why were some LLAs able to achieve their objectives and others not? The following pages provide an examination of these LLAs for common characteristics or combinations of characters that might illuminate why some projects were more successful than others. The primary areas of investigation were chosen by the Tobacco Control Evaluation Center. They were selected due to their apparent link to successful outcomes in past analyses of FERs. These areas or factors are:

- Elements of a successful campaign, the steps involved, including:
 - Involvement of youth
 - Use of media for education and advocacy
 - Involvement of policymakers and law enforcement
 - Education of merchants
 - Youth Tobacco Purchase Surveys Results – pre- and post-intervention
- Problems encountered and barriers
- Conclusions and recommendations

Rather than attempt an exhaustive summary and analysis of every point as addressed by each FER, significant areas will be illustrated with examples provided by LLAs which actively addressed these areas.

ELEMENTS OF A SUCCESSFUL CAMPAIGN

According to the Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort (STORE), “most successful campaigns . . . go through similar stages on the way to victory.”⁸

- Stage 1: Select an Issue
- Stage 2: Develop a Strategy
- Stage 3: Broaden Your Coalition and ID a Champion
- Stage 4: Gather Information
- Stage 5: Communicate with Target
- Stage 6: Implement Activities
- Stage 7: Evaluate Your Campaign

In reviewing the FERs, the specific activities and the order in which they were performed depended upon the unique circumstances of each campaign. For example, broadening your coalition (stage 3) might occur after the decision to gather information and document the problem (stage 4). Some functions overlapped; for example, the decision to seek out champions could be made when selecting an issue (stage 1), researched when developing a strategy (stage 2), and the champions themselves (identified in stage 3) would be deployed while the LLA was working with decision makers (stages 5 and 6).

Stage 1: Select an Issue

Typically, LLAs select the issue on which their objective is based during the Communities of Excellence (CX) needs assessment process prior to the beginning of the three-year project period. As indicated in Table 5, 30 of the 39 projects specifically mentioned selection of the issue – tobacco retail licensing or enforcement of existing state laws – during the CX process. Twenty-two (22) projects mentioned that the CX process included their Tobacco Coalition members, one project mentioned the inclusion of local youth, and one project mentioned conducting the CX process with a local Substance Abuse Prevention Coalition.

⁸ Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort (STORE), retrieved at <http://tcsstore.org/stages/index.html>. Note that the 7 stages presented here are adapted from the STORE Model.

Table 5. Campaign Stages of LLAs Addressing Indicators 3.1.1, 3.1.10, 3.1.2 and 3.2.1.
(Shading: blue = objectives exceeded, green = objectives met, grey = objectives partially met, no shading = objectives not met)

#	LLA (City)	Rural or Urban	CAMPAIGN STAGES										POLICIES PASSED
			SELECT AN ISSUE (When Selected?)	DEVELOP A STRATEGY (How Developed?)	GATHER INFORMATION		BROADEN YOUR COALITION / ID CHAMPION	COMMUNICATE WITH TARGET	IMPLEMENT ACTIVITIES				
					COMPILE EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS	DOCUMENT THE PROBLEM			Outreach & Media	New Policy	Enforcement	Merchant Education	
1	Alameda Co. TCP (Oakland)	Urban	-	Midwest Academy Strategy Chart (MASC) ⁹	TRL Info Kits?	Baseline YTPS	PD identified as champion	8 law enforcement agencies; city council and staff	-	TA regarding TRL policies, 1-on-1 meetings with 15 policymakers	Penal Code 308(a); 2 annual trainings for PDs and 1-on-1 meetings; "Extensive" training re: retailer licensing, illegal sales, and on implementation; collaboration and coordination on YTPS	-	2: cities
2	Berkeley TPP (City of Berkeley)	Urban	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	Merchant Educational Packets	YTPS 2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS 2010	PD identified as champion	Law enforcement, tobacco retailers	YTPS Results	-	Penal Code 308(a); Collaboration and coordination on YTPS	Supplied Environmental Health (as enforcing agency) with packets for merchants; thank you certificates were given to compliant sites	N/A
3	Butte Co. TEP (Oroville)	Urban (& Rural)	- w/Coalition	-	Merchant Educational Packets	Obs. Survey POP	-	Law enforcement, tobacco retailers in 2 cities	Obs. Survey Results	-	Educational visits with "heads of local law enforcement such as police chiefs, the sheriff and/or their top-ranking officers or deputies to discuss tobacco laws;" TA & training regarding laws and signage	Mailed 150 pre-made education packets from TECC which contained age-of-sale decals, posters, a tobacco laws brochure, new FDA legislation; "conducted educational, in-person visits to tobacco retailers"; Follow-up congratulatory letter and certificate if compliant	N/A
4	Calaveras Co. TPP (San Andreas)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Alliance for Substance Abuse Prevention Coalition	-	TRL Info Kits; Merchant Educational Packets	4 YTPS	-	1 city council, tobacco retailers	YTPS Results	Presentations on buy rate; later on model policies and implementation procedures; TRL information kits ¹⁰ to Health & Safety Committee	Collaborated to provide 1-on-1 merchant education for those that sold	Mailed cover letter and YTPS results; mailed educational packets STAKE Act stickers and instruction guide for training employees; face-to-face education for those who sold in 11/08 YTPS.	None
5	Contra Costa Co. TPP (Martinez)	Urban	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	MASC w/Coalition, Licensing Work Group & Partners	TRL Info Kit	Existing Data (YTPS)	Established Coalition Licensing Work Group; city manager (CM) and city attorney, then 2 city council members (CCMs) identified as champions	1 city council	TRL	TA to city officials re: TRL policy, model policies, etc; presentations on implementation procedures	Tried to coordinate and collaborate with law enforcement (didn't say how), "but it stalled efforts;" TA regarding setting fee schedule and implementation of TRL	-	1
6	Del Norte	Rural	CX Needs	-	Merchant	Existing Data	-	Tobacco	YTPS	Collaborated with city	Penal Code 308(a);	Direct mailings re: laws and	N/A

⁹ The Midwest Academy Strategy Chart is a campaign planning process that includes defining goals, organizational strengths/resources, constituents, allies/opponents, targets and tactics.

¹⁰ TRL Information Kits, when the contents were specified, were similar across the projects and typically consisted of a "Fact Sheet," Newsletter, Policy Brief, sample TRL policies, a list of California cities and towns that had passed TRL policies, etc. Local data, if available (such as Public Opinion Polls, Illegal Sales Rate and Letters of Support), were also included.

#	LLA (City)	Rural or Urban	CAMPAIGN STAGES										POLICIES PASSED
			SELECT AN ISSUE (When Selected?)	DEVELOP A STRATEGY (How Developed?)	GATHER INFORMATION		BROADEN YOUR COALITION / ID CHAMPION	COMMUNICATE WITH TARGET	IMPLEMENT ACTIVITIES				
					COMPLETE EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS	DOCUMENT THE PROBLEM			Outreach & Media	New Policy	Enforcement	Merchant Education	
	Co. TUPP (Crescent City)		Assessment		Educational Packets	(2005 YTPS & POP) 3 YTPS		retailers, law enforcement	Results	council (on YTPS?)	Collaborated with District Attorney, city council and training of law enforcement personnel (on YTPS?)	STAKE Act Signs annually; one-to-one educational visits; Congratulatory certificate if didn't sell during YTPS	
7	El Dorado Co. TUPP (Placerville)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment	MASC	TRL Info Kits; Merchant Educational Packets	Existing Data (2002, 2003 & 2006 YTPS) POP 2 YTPS	-	Retailers / 1 city manager	YTPS Results & TRL	TRL information kits to "policymakers;" met with City manager/attorney (and Chief of Police) pre- and post-POP	Presentations to Undersheriff, Sheriff and Police Detectives re: TRL; training and TA on "how to conduct merchant education"	Face to face merchant education (155 educational packets and 510 STAKE Act signs; follow-up letter indicated sale/no sale + available resources/training	None
8	Fresno Co. TPP (Fresno)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	MASC w/TF & Community Organizing Model	TRL Info Kits	Existing Data (YTPS)	Established TRL Task Force including Coalition members; no org. champion	1 city council	Illegal Sales Rate & TRL	TRL information kits; meetings and/or presentations re: illegal sales to minors; TA to address questions; strategized approach with city manager, police chief and retailer	Presentations to Police Chief and officers in 2 jurisdictions; Police Chief included in meeting with city manager and retailer	Retailer included in meeting with city manager and police chief	None
9	Humboldt Co. LLA (Eureka)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	TRL Info Kits; Merchant Educational Packets	3 YTPS	-	Law enforcement (2 cities), tobacco retailers	YTPS Results & Show You Care Campaign	-	1-30 min. presentation at Eureka School/Law Enforcement Network meeting; 10 meetings to collaborate and coordinate on YTPS (included District Attorney) and to provide TA and training on YTPS	3 mailings (STAKE Act info); Face-to-face educational meetings with TRL info packet; 2 trainings for Merchant training (ID checking, reducing sales) for 34 retailers; Thank you certificates	N/A
10	Inyo Co. TCP (Bishop)	Rural	-	-	TRL Info Kits	1 YTPS 2 POPs	Established TRL Task Force	Law enforcement, 1 city council, county BOS	YTPS Results & TRL	30 to 45 min. presentations to BOS and city council re: TRL. Meetings to discuss TRL policy; recruited for TRL Task Force	Educational presentations and 1-on-1 meetings to Police/Sheriff; recruited for TRL Task Force; Probation was contacted to get info on numbers of current drug offenders who smoke	15-25 min. presentations semi-annually to owners/manager (26 stores) re: TRL; recruited for TRL Task Force; sent YTPS results	None
11	Kern Co. TEP (Bakersfield)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment	MASC	-	Annual ? YTPS	Established TRL Task Force, Coalition identified as champion	3 city councils, law enforcement, retailers	YPS Results, Penal Code Warning, State Laws	Annual presentations re: TRL	TA annually re: Penal Code 308(a) and STAKE Act law; Collaboration and coordination on annual YTPS	Training & TA annually re: state laws	1
12	Kings Co. TCP (Hanford)	Urban & Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	Community Organizing Model	TRL Info Kits	Existing Data (2007 YTPS) 2010 YTPS	-	City council, law enforcement, retailers	Illegal Sales & TRL	TRL information kits; meetings with "local decision makers"	-	-	None
13	Lake Co. TEP (Kelseyville)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	TRL Info Kits	Existing Data (YPS Results & Anecdotal) 2007 YPS 2008 YPS 2009 YPS 2010 YPS	No champion	City council, county BOS	YPS Results	TRL information kits to city council and staff; presentations on TRL	TRL educational packet to Police Chief (included in presentations?)	-	None
14	City of Long Beach TEP (Long Beach)	Urban	CX Needs Assessment	MASC	-	Existing Data ("many years of documenting illegal sales")	TEP staff joined City's Business Licensing	City council, merchants	-	"Educate council members and their staff," meetings w/city attorney and other administrative depts. To	-	-	1

#	LLA (City)	Rural or Urban	CAMPAIGN STAGES										POLICIES PASSED	
			SELECT AN ISSUE (When Selected?)	DEVELOP A STRATEGY (How Developed?)	GATHER INFORMATION		BROADEN YOUR COALITION / ID CHAMPION	COMMUNICATE WITH TARGET	IMPLEMENT ACTIVITIES					
					COMPILE EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS	DOCUMENT THE PROBLEM			Outreach & Media	New Policy	Enforcement	Merchant Education		
						2009 YPS 2010 YPS	Committee, CCM identified as champion				develop TRL policy			
15	Los Angeles Co. TCPP (Los Angeles)	Urban	CX Needs Assessment	MASC for each of 10 campaigns	TRL Info Kits	Existing Data (2005-2010 YTPS) At least 1 YTPS for each of 10 cities POP	Established LLA sponsored countywide coalition, Established TRL Task Force Subc. which organized local coalitions	City councils, city staff	TRL	Meetings to provide TRL info and YTPS results; press conferences, information kits and "other educational materials"	-	-	18	
16	Madera Co. TCP (Madera)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment	Community Organizing Model	Merchant Educational Packets	2 YTPS	-	Tobacco retailers	Calif. Retail Licensing Law Compliance Results	-	Meetings with Sheriff's Dept., 2 city PDs	Information kits on State Laws; 130 1-on-1 meetings with high-risk merchants	N/A	
17	Mendocino Co. TCP (Ukiah)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment	-	TRL Info Kits; Merchant Educational Packets	Existing Data (annual YTPS) 2007 YTPS 2008 (2) YTPS 2009 YTPS POP	-	1 city council, county BOS	YTPS Results, TRL, Results of POP	TRL information kit to 2 cities; public presentations on local sales and POP; private meetings to provide TA and address questions	-	Information kits on State Laws; TA to retailers and training kits	None but strengthened county policy	
18	Modoc Co. TEP (Alturas)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	-	2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS 2010 YTPS	-	Tobacco retailers	-	-	Coordinated and collaborated on YTPS?; Modoc PD also trained Siskiyou youth and did part of YTPS in Siskiyou County	PD visited 1 store that was "going to sell;" merchant education after each YTPS	N/A	
19	Monterey Co. TCP (Salinas)	Urban	-	-	SHS Info Kits	YTPS	Recruited members from Latino pop., no champion	City council, staff and elected officials?	-	Presentations at 3 meetings re: SHS ordinance; SHS information kits and ALA Report Card	-	-	None	
20	Nevada Co. TPP (Grass Valley)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	TRL Info Kits	Existing Data (2007 YTPS and before), 2007 YTPS	Police Chief identified as champion	2 police chiefs, 1 city council	TRL Policy Passage	4 presentations to city council and TRL information kits including POP and YPS data	Presentations to 2 police chiefs; TRL information kits; TA and training regarding implementing and enforcing TRL (after policy adoption); collaborated and coordinated on YTPS	-	1	
21	Placer Co. TPP (Auburn)	Rural	-	-	Merchant Educational Packets	2007 YTPS 2008 YTPS? 2010 YTPS	-	Tobacco retailers	-	-	-	1-on-1 merchant education/signs provided at time of observational survey; Letters of appreciation to merchants that did NOT sell to minors	N/A	
22	Plumas Co. TURP (Quincy)	Rural	-	-	Merchant Educational Packets	2007 YTPS 2008/09 YTPS 2009/10 YTPS	-	Tobacco retailers	-	-	-	Information kits re: STAKE Act and AB71	N/A	
23	Riverside	Urban	-	MASC	TRL Info	Existing Data	Coalition	City councils	TRL Policy	Presentations at city council	-	-	8	

#	LLA (City)	Rural or Urban	CAMPAIGN STAGES										POLICIES PASSED
			SELECT AN ISSUE (When Selected?)	DEVELOP A STRATEGY (How Developed?)	GATHER INFORMATION		BROADEN YOUR COALITION / ID CHAMPION	COMMUNICATE WITH TARGET	IMPLEMENT ACTIVITIES				
					COMPILE EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS	DOCUMENT THE PROBLEM			Outreach & Media	New Policy	Enforcement	Merchant Education	
	Co. TCP (Riverside)	(& Rural)		w/Coalition & key community leaders	Kits	(YTPS) 2007/09 YTPS	identified as champion		Passage	meetings re: TRL info and YTPS data			
24	Sacramento Co. TEP (Sacramento)	Urban	CX Needs Assessment	MASC w/TRL Task Force	TRL Info Kits	Existing Data (2005 & 2006 YPS) 2008 YPS 2009 YPS 2010 YPS	Created TRL Task Force	City officials, law enforcement, tobacco retailers	-	Presentations to Mayor (1 city), local collaborative and chief of police; 3 hrs. TA to city officials and enforcement agencies on TRL	Noted at left	Mailed 855 Compliance Report Cards and certificates to retailers scoring 100%	None
25	San Bernardino Co. TURN Program (San Bernardino)	Urban	-	MASC	TRL Info Kits; Merchant Educational Packets	Existing Data (2005 Statewide YPS) 2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS	-	4 city councils, law enforcement, tobacco retailers	-	Presentations to city council members and law enforcement on TRL and TA	Noted at left; also collaborated and coordinated on training youth for YPS	In-person merchant education/signs provided at time of YPS	None
26	San Diego Co. TCRP (San Diego)	Urban	-	MASC for each of 3 campaigns	TRL Info Kits; Merchant Educational Packets	Existing Data (past YPS) Baseline YPS in 5 cities + follow-up (not clear)	-	City councils, city staff, law enforcement	YPS Results & TRL	Meeting with council members, city staff and law enforcement personnel; TRL information kits	Training and TA to deputies regarding YTPS and how to spot teen smokers; Merchant educational kits; collaboration and coordination on 3 rd YTPS?	Sheriff's dept. mailed educational kits	None
27	San Luis Obispo Co. TCP (San Luis Obispo)	Urban & Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	MASC for each of 4 cities w/coalition & youth	TRL Info Kits; Merchant Educational Packets	Existing Data (undefined) During 07/10 said they did 22 YTPS!	Recruited youth, PD identified as champion?	County BOS, city officials, law enforcement, tobacco retailers	YTPS Results & TRL	Meeting with BOS and Sheriff re: TRL; TRL information kits; 1-on-1 presentations to city council members and enforcement officers	Distributed TRL information kits; Meeting(s) with law enforcement; Coordinating and collaborating on YTPS	Distributed TRL information kits; Mailed YTPS results and congratulatory letters to merchants that did not sell; After TRL passed, 1-on-1 educational meetings with merchants; Training to 200 local retailers on STAKE Act and State Laws	1: county
28	San Mateo Co. TPP (San Mateo)	Urban	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	MASC for each of 7 targeted jurisdictions w/Youth Access Workgroup and contractors	TRL Info Kits	Existing Data (2003 YTPS) 1 YTPS in each of 3 Jurisdictions (2007, 2008, 2009) POP	Developed a Youth Access Workgroup (Subc. of Coalition which included contractors)	County BOS, city councils, law enforcement	TRL	Public and 1-on-1 meetings with city council members; After county upgraded policy sent letters to all jurisdictions and offered TA	TA on YTPS; Coordination and collaboration on YTPS	Sent YTPS letters to merchants; assisted PD in training retailers during rollout period	1 city; + 1 countywide policy upgraded affecting 13 cities
29	Santa Barbara Co. TPSP (Santa Barbara)	Urban (& Rural)	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	-	Annual YTPS: 2008 YTPS? 2009 YTPS? 2010 YTPS?	-	County BOS, 1 city council	YTPS & Penal Code 308(a)	Presentations to high-ranking school and community leaders, and influential opinion leaders; Sent YTPS data to 113 individuals	Collaboration and coordination on YTPS and to send press releases	-	None
30	Santa Clara Co. TPEP (San Jose)	Urban (& Rural)	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	MASC	-	YTPS Obs. Survey POP	Formed Tobacco Licensing Workgroup (Subc. of TRL Committee), Champion?	City council, law enforcement and tobacco retailers	-	Meeting with city officials	-	-	None
31	Santa Cruz	Urban	CX Needs	MASC	TRL Info	Existing Data	Recruited	3 city councils,	-	TRL information kits to	Noted at left	-	None

#	LLA (City)	Rural or Urban	CAMPAIGN STAGES										POLICIES PASSED
			SELECT AN ISSUE (When Selected?)	DEVELOP A STRATEGY (How Developed?)	GATHER INFORMATION		BROADEN YOUR COALITION / ID CHAMPION	COMMUNICATE WITH TARGET	IMPLEMENT ACTIVITIES				
					COMPILE EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS	DOCUMENT THE PROBLEM			Outreach & Media	New Policy	Enforcement	Merchant Education	
	Co. TEP (Santa Cruz)		Assessment w/Coalition	w/Coalition	Kits	(YTPS) 2008 (2) YTPS	new coalition members	county BOS		administrative staff and elected officials countywide; 1-on-1 meetings with city council members, county BOS?			
32	Sierra Co. TURP (Loyalton)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	Merchant Educational Packets	Existing Data (2003-2006 YTPS) 2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS 2010 YTPS	-	Tobacco retailers countywide, law enforcement	YTPS Results & How To Speak Up When Witnessing an Illegal Sale	Presentations to BOS re: YTPS results	Coordination and collaboration on YTPS; Training & TA on Penal Code 308(a) and STAKE Act; YTPS results to Sheriff & DA	Sent YTPS letters to merchants; 1-on-1 visit to do merchant education; Tobacco Retailer Training to interested retailers	N/A
33	Siskiyou Co. TEP (Yreka)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	Merchant Educational Packets	Existing Data (2005 Survey) 4 YTPS Obs. Survey	-	Tobacco retailers	-	-	PD from Modoc County trained youth!	2 waves of merchant education provided at time of compliance check (brief presentation and informational packet to owners/managers)	N/A
34	Solano Co. TPEP (Fairfield)	Urban	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition & Youth	MASC	TRL Info Kits	Existing Data (5/2007 YTPS) POP 10/2007 YTPS	Formed TRL Subc. of Coalition	City council, city officials	TRL & CUP	TRL information kits; 1-on-1 meetings with city council and Planning Commission members	TA on TALC model policy for 1 Police Chief	-	None
35	Stanislaus Co. TEP (Modesto)	Urban & Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	TRL Info Kits	Existing Data (2004-06 CA Healthy Kids Survey) 2009 YTPS 2010 YTPS	Previously Formed Stop Tobacco Sales to Youth Subc.	City councils, county BOS	YTPS Results, TRL, ALA Report Card	TRL information kits to elected officials and key leaders; Presentations at city council meetings	-	-	None
36	Sutter Co. TC (Yuba City)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	MASC	TRL Info Kits; Merchant Educational Packets	YTPS (date?) POP	Formed Licensing Task Force w/city police, no champion?	Law enforcement, county BOS	YTPS Results, CHK Survey, ALA Report Card	TRL information kits to policymakers	Recruited city Police Lt. for TRL Task Force; Collaboration and coordination on 1 YTPS	1-on-1 educational visits and information kit with non-compliant retailers (75 ?)	None
37	Tulare Co. TCP (Bakersfield)	Urban & Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	-	Merchant Educational Packets	Existing Data (2004-05 YTPS) 2007 YTPS 2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS	-	Tobacco retailers	State Laws	Presented YTPS results to city council	-	Media release acknowledging retailers that didn't sell; 1-on-1 educational visits to noncompliant sites	N/A
38	Tuolumne Co. TEP (Sonora)	Rural	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	MASC w/Coalition?	TRL Info Kits	-	-	1 city council, county BOS	TRL	TRL information packets to city administrator with follow-up letter	-	-	None
39	Ventura Co. TEP (Ventura)	Urban	CX Needs Assessment w/Coalition	MASC w/Coalition	-	2008/09 YTPS	CCMs in Santa Paula identified as champions	2 city councils, law enforcement	-	Meetings (that included law enforcement) re: YTPS results	Noted at left; Officer accompanied youth on 1 YTPS in 1 city	-	None

Stage 2: Develop a Strategy

Once an issue is selected, project staff need to gain access to the people who can make the decision to go forward with policy adoption, and also to those who will live with that decision. Of the 28 LLAs focused on adoption and/or implementation of a TRL policy, 20 of the projects discussed the planning stages in detail. Of these 20, 19 projects noted that they, their coalitions and, in some cases, their subcontractors used the Midwest Academy Strategy Chart (MASC) to work out specific campaign strategies, potential allies and opponents, and specific tactics (Table 5). In some projects, such as San Diego and San Luis Obispo counties, MASC was used for each targeted jurisdiction. Los Angeles and Fresno counties combined the use of MASC with additional planning methods:

- Los Angeles County described also using the Phase Model campaign approach, the purpose of which is “to build the capacity of tobacco control advocates to organize and facilitate local policy campaigns.” The five phases are 1) Community Assessment, 2) Campaign Strategy, 3) Coalition Building/Broadening, 4) Campaign Implementation, and 5) Campaign Evaluation.
- Fresno County described using a Community Organizing Model and the application of the model’s concepts, “empowerment, community competence, participation, relevance, issue selection, and critical consciousness.”

Two LLAs, Kings and Madera counties, reported that they used the Community Organizing Model in lieu of MASC.

Of the 28 LLAs with objectives focused on TRLPs, nine were successful at getting policies passed affecting 46 California cities and the unincorporated areas of 2 counties (Table 5). Of the nine, eight stated that they used the MASC during the planning stages of the campaign.

Of the 11 LLAs focusing on compliance with existing laws, two were successful at reaching the compliance rates stated in their objective. Neither of these two LLAs reported using a specific tool to develop their campaign strategy.

Stage 3: Broaden Your Coalition and ID a Champion

Some LLA staff, particularly in the smaller, more rural counties, perform the majority of the tasks associated with getting a tobacco retail licensing policy adopted and implemented, or conducting compliance checks of tobacco retailers, in their chosen jurisdiction themselves. Sometimes, assistance is provided by coalition-based adult and youth volunteers. Other LLAs contracted some or all of their intervention activities to local CBOs and the numerous volunteers available to them. For example, Los Angeles County LLA staff deployed eight subcontractors to help conduct all of the major interventions in the 12 cities they targeted during their three-year scope of work. The City of Long Beach recruited, trained and utilized 68 youth volunteers to conduct two YTPSs.

In reviewing the FERs, either recruitment of new coalition members was not reported or it was difficult to tell. For many LLAs, discussion of their coalitions focused specifically on establishing or utilizing a TRL task force, often a subcommittee of the coalition, which was reported by 11 LLAs. Some LLAs, such as Del Norte and Inyo counties, did not even mention their coalition. In sharp contrast, Los Angeles County created a countywide coalition with a TRL Task Force as the coalition’s subcommittee. The TRL Task Force organized coalitions local to each of the 12 targeted jurisdictions, contributing to successful outcomes in each of these areas.

In terms of recruiting youth, only San Luis Obispo’s LLA mentioned recruiting youth specifically for its coalition. However, youth were included in campaign activities in a variety of other ways, which is described more in the following section.

Involvement of Youth. Involving youth volunteers was an important component of the LLAs work during the 2007-2010 project period. As Table 6 shows, youth are recruited from a variety of venues: local youth coalitions (e.g., Butte County's Youth Now Anti-alcohol Coalition), local Friday Night Live chapters, local high schools, community-based organizations, and the general public. Less typical venues for recruiting youth were Juvenile Probation (reported by Santa Cruz County) and police department-related youth groups, e.g., Youth Cadets and Sheriff's Explorers (reported by Sutter and El Dorado counties, respectively).

Table 6. Youth Roles Described in the FERs.

(Shading: blue = objectives exceeded, green = objectives met, grey = objectives partially met, no shading = objectives not met)

#	LLA (City)	Rural or Urban	RECRUITED FROM	# RECRUITED	WAYS IN WHICH YOUTH WERE INVOLVED			TRAINING & TA PROVIDED			POLICIES PASSED
					DATA COLLECTION	PRESENTATIONS	OTHER	DATA COLLECTION	PRESENTATIONS	OTHER	
1	Alameda Co. TCP (Oakland)	Urban	?	36	Baseline YTPS	-	-	YTPS Protocol	-	-	2: cities
2	Berkeley TPP (City of Berkeley)	Urban	?	?	YTPS 2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS 2010	-	KII	2 YTPS Protocol	-	-	N/A
3	Butte Co. TEP (Oroville)	Urban (& Rural)	Butte Youth Now Anti Alcohol Coalition	?	Obs. Survey POP	-	-	Obs. Survey	-	-	N/A
4	Calaveras Co. TPP (San Andreas)	Rural	Local high school (Bret Harte), Friday Night Live (Calaveras County High School), Valley Springs Youth Center	?	4 YTPS	Presentations (city council, coalition + various groups)	Said they were included in "most intervention activities"	4 YTPS Protocol	Presenting data	-	None
5	Contra Costa Co. TPP (Martinez)	Urban	Tried to recruit; unsuccessful because the youth coalition from which they recruited had other priorities.	?	- Existing Data (YTPS)	-	-	-	Trained youth partner group on TRL fees and enforcement options, but youth ended up not getting involved.	-	1
6	Del Norte Co. TUPP (Crescent City)	Rural	?	?	Existing Data (2005 YTPS & POP) 3 YTPS	-	-	?	-	-	N/A
7	El Dorado Co. TUPP (Placerville)	Rural	Sheriff's Explorers and Youth Coalition	39 for merchant education and YTPS	Existing Data (2002, 2003 & 2006 YTPS) POP 2 YTPS	Presentations (were implied but not evident)	Included in meetings with law enforcement and city council; merchant education; Press conference and interview by MSNBC	4 YTPS Protocol	7 for youth access laws, YTPS results, benefits of TRL and public speaking skills	How to do a MASC	None
8	Fresno Co. TPP (Fresno)	Rural	?	?	- Existing Data (YTPS)	Presentations (but not specified)	-	-	Trainings for adult and youth TRL TF members – speaking tips, practice session.	-	None
9	Humboldt Co. LLA (Eureka)	Rural	Presentations (didn't say where) and Friday Night Live	94, but only 13 trained ¹¹	3 YTPS	-	Youth from Friday Night Live thanked merchants in press release and sent Thank You certificates to those that were in compliance	3 YTPS Protocol	-	-	N/A
10	Inyo Co. TCP (Bishop)	Rural	BUHS High School (didn't spell out) for high school focused POP; recruitment otherwise not defined	5 for 1 YTPS	1 YTPS 2 POPs	-	-	1 YTPS Protocol, 2 POPs	-	-	None
11	Kern Co. TEP (Bakersfield)	Rural	Kern High School District	20	Annual ? YTPS	-	-	YTPS Protocol	-	-	1
12	Kings Co. TCP (Hanford)	Urban & Rural	?	?	Existing Data (2007 YTPS) 2010 YTPS	-	-	?	-	-	None

¹¹ Humboldt County: "Due to additional youth training needs, lack of parent support, inability to complete the required paperwork, lack of a California identification card, and aging out of the required age range during the intervention period, there were only 13 surveyors trained during the intervention period and who participated in the youth purchase survey process."

#	LLA (City)	Rural or Urban	RECRUITED FROM	# RECRUITED	WAYS IN WHICH YOUTH WERE INVOLVED			TRAINING & TA PROVIDED			POLICIES PASSED
					DATA COLLECTION	PRESENTATIONS	OTHER	DATA COLLECTION	PRESENTATIONS	OTHER	
13	Lake Co. TEP (Kelseyville)	Rural	High school?	?	Existing Data (YPS Results & Anecdotal) 2007 YPS 2008 YPS 2009 YPS 2010 YPS	-	-	?	-	-	None
14	City of Long Beach TEP (Long Beach)	Urban	Local high schools and community based organizations (kids receive school community service hours)	68	Existing Data ("many years of documenting illegal sales") 2009 YPS 2010 YPS	-	-	2 YPS Protocol, PD conducted 3 rd YPS	-	-	1
15	Los Angeles Co. TCP (Los Angeles)	Urban	?	?	Existing Data (2005-2010 YTPS) At least 1 YTPS for each of 10 cities POP	-	?	At least 10 YTPS Protocol	-	Media Advocacy Training; social norm change	18
16	Madera Co. TCP (Madera)	Rural	?	?	2 YTPS	-	-	?	-	-	N/A
17	Mendocino Co. TCP (Ukiah)	Rural	Local high schools, Friday Night Live, Arbor on Main (youth drop in center)	?	Existing Data (annual YTPS) 2007 YTPS 2008 (2) YTPS 2009 YTPS POP	-	-	4 YTPS Protocol	-	-	None but strengthened county policy
18	Modoc Co. TEP (Alturas)	Rural	?	4	2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS 2010 YTPS	-	-	3 YTPS Protocol	-	-	N/A
19	Monterey Co. TCP (Salinas)	Urban	?	?	YTPS	-	-	?	-	-	None
20	Nevada Co. TPP (Grass Valley)	Rural	Youth Coalition members and from various communities within the county (didn't specify)	?	Existing Data (2007 YTPS and before), 2007 YTPS	Presentations (city council)	Included in various meetings	?	-	-	1
21	Placer Co. TPP (Auburn)	Rural	?		2007 YTPS 2008 YTPS? 2010 YTPS	-	Letters of Appreciation to merchants that did not sell to underage youth	?	-	-	N/A
22	Plumas Co. TURP (Quincy)	Rural	?	4-6 youth for each YTPS	2007 YTPS 2008/09 YTPS 2009/10 YTPS	-	-	3 YTPS Protocol	-	-	N/A
23	Riverside Co. TCP (Riverside)	Urban (& Rural)	TRL presentations and trainings (didn't specify)	?	Existing Data (YTPS) 2007/09 YTPS	Presentations (city council)	-	?	?	?	8
24	Sacramento Co. TEP (Sacramento)	Urban	General public; Tobacco Coalition members and community at large in 2008, two senior high school classes at Natomas Charter School in 2009/10.	88	Existing Data (2005 & 2006 YPS) 2008 YPS 2009 YPS 2010 YPS	?	-	Included at right?	8-30 min. to 2 hour trainings on YPS and how to present materials and serve as spokesperson.	-	None
25	San Bernardino Co. TURN Program (San Bernardino)	Urban	Community at large	?	Existing Data (2005 Statewide YPS) 2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS	Presentations (law enforcement and city council)	-	Included at right?	30-60 min. trainings on STAKE Act protocol	-	None
26	San Diego Co. TCRP (San Diego)	Urban	Community, i.e., Coronado youth for Coronado YPS)	45 youth and adult	Existing Data (past YPS) Baseline YPS in 5 cities + follow-up (not clear)	Presentations (city council)	-	17 YPS Protocol	?	-	None
27	San Luis Obispo Co. TCP (San Luis Obispo)	Urban & Rural	For YTPS – through local youth coalitions, Friday Night Live chapters and local high schools. For Presentations - Estero Bay Youth Coalition, Paso	34 Decoys	Existing Data (undefined) During 07/10 said they did 22 YTPS!	Presentations (during MASC and ?)	Participated in MASC for each of 4 cities; on coalition	?	?	-	1: county

#	LLA (City)	Rural or Urban	RECRUITED FROM	# RECRUITED	WAYS IN WHICH YOUTH WERE INVOLVED			TRAINING & TA PROVIDED			POLICIES PASSED
					DATA COLLECTION	PRESENTATIONS	OTHER	DATA COLLECTION	PRESENTATIONS	OTHER	
			Robles Youth Task Force, the Atascadero Youth Task Force, the South County Youth Coalition, Friday Night Live chapters								
28	San Mateo Co. TPP (San Mateo)	Urban	For YTPS – from a youth group affiliated with law enforcement of a nonprofit such as El Concilio, Youth Leadership Institute or Asian American Recovery Services.	?	Existing Data (2003 YTPS) 1 YTPS in each of 3 Jurisdictions (2007, 2008, 2009) POP	Presentations	MASC for each of 7? targeted jurisdictions w/Youth Access Workgroup and contractors	?	?	-	1 city + 1 countywide policy upgraded affecting 13 cities
29	Santa Barbara Co. TPSP (Santa Barbara)	Urban (& Rural)	?	2-6 youth each YTPS: 11 total	Annual YTPS: 2008 YTPS? 2009 YTPS? 2010 YTPS?	-	-	?	-	-	None
30	Santa Clara Co. TPEP (San Jose)	Urban (& Rural)	High schools and "community settings of youth"	?	YTPS Obs. Survey POP	-	-	Obs. Survey	Trained youth to do presentations, but didn't actually present at city council meetings	-	None
31	Santa Cruz Co. TEP (Santa Cruz)	Urban	REAL Youth Coalition, Juvenile Probation	?	Existing Data (YTPS) 2008 (2) YTPS	Presentations (city council)	Wrote letters to elected officials	2 YTPS Protocol	Spokesperson training to speak at public hearings on the topic of youth access	TA to write letters	None
32	Sierra Co. TURP (Loyalton)	Rural	Sierra County Youth Council, Downieville Friday Night Live and Loyalton Friday Night Live	20 trained, net 10	Existing Data (2003-2006 YTPS) 2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS 2010 YTPS	-	-	3 YTPS Protocol	-	-	N/A
33	Siskiyou Co. TEP (Yreka)	Rural	General community and neighboring Modoc County!	4	Existing Data (2005 Survey) 4 YTPS Obs. Survey	-	-	YTPS & LE Protocols	-	-	N/A
34	Solano Co. TPEP (Fairfield)	Urban	Vallejo High School through Health Promotion and Education Bureau staff, Boys & Girls Club	9 youth and 5 adults for YTPS	Existing Data (5/2007 YTPS) POP 10/2007 YTPS	Attended city council meetings	CX Needs Assessment included youth: collected petition signatures	1 YTPS Protocol?	?	?	None
35	Stanislaus Co. TEP (Modesto)	Urban & Rural	School-based Anti-Tobacco Advocacy Program (PHAST)	16	Existing Data (2004-06 CA Healthy Kids Survey) 2009 YTPS 2010 YTPS	-	-	2 YTPS Protocol?	-	-	None
36	Sutter Co. TC (Yuba City)	Rural	PD Youth Cadets	2	YTPS (date?) POP	-	-	?	-	-	None
37	Tulare Co. TCP (Bakersfield)	Urban & Rural	Youth serving organizations	17	Existing Data (2004-05 YTPS) 2007 YTPS 2008 YTPS 2009 YTPS	-	-	3 YTPS Protocol?	-	-	N/A
38	Tuolumne Co. TEP (Sonora)	Rural	Local youth groups	?	-	-	Wrote letters to the editor	-	-	TA on writing letters?	None
39	Ventura Co. TEP (Ventura)	Urban	Community Education Project Group, the Oxnard Revival Center Youth Program	5 youth decoys and 5 adults	2008/09 YTPS	-	-	1 YTPS Protocol	-	-	None

All 39 LLAs reported engaging youth to varying degrees. Although many FERs did not report on the relationship between involving youth and their project's success, some FERs attributed at least some of their triumphs to the use of youth. For example, Calaveras County's FER noted that they incorporated youth in "most intervention activities" and that city council members were more receptive to the youth when they presented information. San Mateo County noted among the facilitators to its campaigns was

that youth are, “strong messengers in making the case to adopt policies that limit the harms caused by youth access to tobacco.” Not every county was successful in this area. Contra Costa County, for example, recruited and trained a youth partner group on TRLP, but the youth ended up not getting involved in the LLAs objective because they had a different priority project.

A snap shot summary of youth involvement and the number of LLAs that reported such involvement (indicated in parentheses) is provided immediately below:

- Served as “decoys” during the YTPSs conducted to document the local problem of illegal tobacco sales to minors (35 of 39 LLAs)
- Conducted an Observation Survey of tobacco retailers to document compliance with existing state laws regarding signage and licensing (3 LLAs)
- Conducted Public Opinion Polls to ascertain community support for TRLP and/or enforcement of existing laws (9 LLAs)
- Made presentations to policy makers, the coalition and other groups (11)
- Participated in various meetings with policy makers (2)
- Wrote thank you letters or mailed thank you certificates to merchants that were in compliance with existing laws (2)
- Included in Key Informant Interviews (1)
- Wrote letters to the editor or elected officials (2)
- Participated in the planning stages of the project, specifically in developing the Midwest Academy Strategy Chart (2)
- Collected petition signatures (1)
- The youth coalition chairperson spoke as a youth activist at a press conference in 2009 held by Senator Padilla announcing SB600, the new tobacco tax bill. The youth coalition spokesperson was also interviewed by MSNBC! (1)

Despite the various ways in which LLAs involve youth, and the benefits they experience by having youth involved, many LLAs expressed challenges with recruitment and training. Humboldt County, for example, recruited 94 youth to help conduct YTPSs and merchant education. Of the 94, only 13 were actually trained and served as decoys. The difference in the number of youth recruited versus those that conducted YTPSs was attributed to a variety of factors including: not having parental support, not having a California ID, or not completing the required paper work, as well as needing additional training beyond what the LLA provided.

Training Adult and Youth Volunteers. Many LLAs reported that they provided Data Collection Training (DCT) for adults and youth participating in each YTPS, a critical component to producing reliable and valid data. Some FERs mentioned educating their adult and/or youth coalition members regarding TRLPs, local YTPS results or providing training for policy-related activities. For example, King’s County invited the Center for Tobacco Policy Organizing (CTPO) to deliver a TRL Strategic Planning Session. The training included preparing for a council hearing, delivering your message, public speaking skills and dealing with opposition statements. LLA coalition members and staff that participated in this training indicated that it was “highly beneficial” to them. Other trainings reported by a few LLAs included media advocacy training to their coalition and/or contractors, technical assistance on writing letters to policy makers, and public speaking training specifically for youth. Although some LLAs noted that training youth to serve as spokespersons took considerable time, other LLAs attributed part of the successful activities of their campaigns to the fact that they took the necessary time to prepare coalition members and youth volunteers about the issue before they were expected to speak to the public or to decision-makers. For

some LLAs, not having taken this time was later a lesson learned. For example, in San Diego County's FER, they noted that the youth that spoke at city council meeting "began revealing names of the stores where they purchased." Since these stores represented constituents of city council members, LLA staff believed that this may have alienated city council members by embarrassing their constituents in public. With specific training for youth on *What to Say and What Not to Say*, this situation may have been avoided.

Identifying a Champion. For the purposes of this report, a champion is an individual who is a member of, or is respected by, the targeted body of decision makers and is dedicated to securing the passage of the proposed policy. Some LLAs reported that one of the coalition members, or a member of a TRL subcommittee, served as the policy champion. For other LLAs, a champion was identified inside the target organization. For example, in Alameda County, the biggest champions were the Police Chiefs in each of the eight targeted jurisdictions. The LLA obviously contributed to this successful relationship as they provided "extensive" training to law enforcement officers in 2 annual trainings and in one-on-one meetings regarding TRLP implementation; and coordinated with each Police Department to conduct YTPSs. Other LLAs were able to identify champions on the city councils in their targeted jurisdictions.

Some FERs reported that they experienced challenges in their policy campaigns when they lost their champions. For example, several LLAs reported that their TRLP champion unexpectedly retired, moved to another position or failed to help pursue the TRL policy due to other more pressing city issues. In the best cases, progress on the policy campaign was temporarily delayed; for other projects it was completely derailed.

For the City of Long Beach, in addition to having two city council champions, the LLA staff also joined the city's Business Licensing Committee to learn how other City of Long Beach departments that required fees and permits were funded and implemented, and to keep the issue pertinent within the City. They researched how the permit fee would be determined and justified and, in an atmosphere of city budget cuts, how the TRLP would benefit the city. This contributed to their success in getting the City of Long Beach to adopt a tobacco retailer licensing policy with sufficient fees to fund enforcement.

Of the 28 LLAs with objectives focused on TRLPs, nine were successful at getting policies passed affecting 46 California cities and the unincorporated areas of 2 counties (Table 5). All nine of these LLAs identified champions: two LLAs identified city council members as the TRLP champion, three LLAs identified the police department and four LLAs identified their coalition or its subcommittee as champions. Of the 19 LLAs that were not successful at getting policies passed in their jurisdiction, only one explicitly identified having a champion among the city council members. The remaining 18 LLAs did not mention it or explicitly stated that they did not identify a champion for their tobacco retail licensing policy campaign. A few FERs attributed their lack of success to not having a champion within the organization. However, this data suggests that the location of the champion is not important, only that a campaign have one.

Of the 11 LLAs focusing on compliance with existing laws, two were successful at reaching the compliance rates stated in their objective. One of these two LLAs reported having a champion – the police department – to help the LLA achieve its objective of increasing compliance with existing youth access laws about tobacco retailers. Otherwise, none of the remaining ten LLAs identified having a champion.

Stage 4: Gather Information

Conducting Research and Compiling Educational Materials. LLAs conducted research in three main ways: 1) by utilizing the information offered through the Tobacco Education Clearinghouse of California (TECC), the Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort (STORE), the Center for Tobacco Policy & Organizing (CTPO), the Technical Assistance Legal Center (TALC), the California Youth Action Network (CYAN), California Smoke-Free Bars, Workplaces and Communities Program (BREATH); 2) by reviewing local, state and national

media for data they could use; and 3) by contacting other jurisdictions to learn about their experiences in tobacco retail licensing policies. Examples of the materials that LLAs collected include: YTPS fact sheets, key talking points, Penal Code 308(a) and STAKE Act Enforcement resources, Sample TRL policies, California licensing requirements, How to Become a Policy Wonk, Survey of California Rural and Small Town Voters, CYAN Mission Impossible, Tobacco Retailer Licensing in Rural Communities, and the American Lung Association (ALA) Report Card. Materials that were collected were assembled into different types of educational “kits” or “packets.” A summary of the type of kits and the number of LLAs that assembled each type follows (Table 5):

- Tobacco Retail Licensing Information Kits (23 LLAs)
- Merchant Education Packets (17 LLAs)
- Second Hand Smoke Information Kits (1 LLA)

Of the 28 LLAs with objectives focused on TRLPs, only two LLAs did not develop some kind of informational kit to offer policy makers in their decision making process. Of the nine LLAs that were successful at getting policies passed, seven reported that they developed informational kits/packets.

Of the 11 LLAs focusing on compliance with existing laws, only one LLA did not develop some kind of educational kit to provide to merchants or policy makers. The value of providing information to the campaign targets cannot be over emphasized. Los Angeles County’s FER said it the best when reflecting on their lessons learned and specific factors that contributed to their success: “Developing effective educational materials is important in ensuring that community members and local key decision makers have the necessary information to make informed decisions.”

Gathering Local Information. In addition to compiling educational materials, many LLAs made an effort to learn about the decision makers that they would be working to convince. Most LLAs used Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) as a method to get to know their policymakers, law enforcement officers, tobacco retailers, and other key stakeholders. The number of key informants described in the FERs varied widely, from 1 to 64 (in the Solano County and Los Angeles County FERs, respectively). The local definition of who qualified as a key informant also varied. Some LLAs included their coalition members in these interviews; one LLA (the City of Berkeley) included a youth. Regardless, the use of KIIs helped the LLAs learn about the person’s specific point of view and often information about the political climate, as well. For example, Fresno County commented that through KIIs it learned that key concerns were the economic impact on business, that there were budgetary constraints within local government, and that there was confusion about city, county and federal laws. In addition to these barriers to policy adoption, they also learned what could help facilitate the process; key informants suggested, “make a comprehensive, easy to implement plan and timeline. This includes a full business budget and regulations/restrictions.” Through KIIs, LLAs in rural counties learned that they needed to work with local officials who tended to be conservative in nature and were sensitive to how tobacco control policies might affect local businesses.

The biggest complaint among the LLAs regarding the use of KIIs were limitations resulting from having small sample sizes, e.g., three versus a targeted eight key informants. Nonetheless, they were commonly used, with 23 of 39 LLAs using KIIs as a tool. Of the 11 LLAs that were successful at getting policies passed or achieving a specific compliance rate, 10 stated that they used KIIs as part of their campaign arsenal.

Policy Record Review. Some LLAs planned to get to know their decision makers by studying the meeting records of the city councils or boards to learn about key issues related to adopting a TRLP. Kern County stated that, “notes from meetings were used by project staff to adjust the intervention and determine strategies that may be most effective at getting TRL policies passed.” However, for most of these LLAs, the proposed policy never made it to formal discussion. Consequently, there were no meeting records to analyze for either support for or opposition to the proposed policy.

Youth Tobacco Purchase Surveys (YTPSS). When working on reducing tobacco sales to minors, the importance of collecting local data on the illegal sales cannot be overstated. Ventura County noted the value of the YTPS to their campaign saying it “would be a conversation starter with policy makers and the media.” Of the 39 LLAs, 36 conducted local YTPSSs.

Upon reviewing the FERs, there was a wide variation in content and reporting of the YTPS results (please see Table 7). Sixteen of the LLAs indicated that the local YTPSSs were coordinated with law enforcement. In these cases, an officer served as part of the three-person survey team that included a youth decoy and an adult chaperone. In some cases, such as with City of Long Beach, law enforcement conducted the Data Collection Training. For most LLAs, project staff coordinated the YTPS, trained the adult and youth volunteers, and sometimes served as the chaperone on the survey team as well.

Of the 20 LLAs that identified the protocol used during the YTPS, 13 used the Standard Protocol, five used the Standard Protocol – Lying Variation, and two LLAs used the FLASH ID Protocol. Each of these protocols include a “consummated buy.” However, six LLAs adapted these protocols by utilizing an “unconsummated buy” procedure.

When it comes to the rate of illegal sales to minors, most LLAs were able to document the problem. Pre-intervention buy rates ranged from 4% to 91% (one city in Humboldt County and one city in Riverside County, respectively). Twenty-one LLAs also reported collecting at least a second YTPS or conducting the surveys annually, with the last survey often conducted toward the end of the three-year project period. The post-intervention buy rates reported by these 21 LLAs ranged between 0% and 54%.

Some of the LLAs noted challenges related to conducting YTPS. For rural counties, the geographic distance between incorporated and unincorporated areas can be significant. Siskiyou County’s FER indicated that the survey team had to drive 45 minutes to conduct a YTPS in one locale. One of the most obvious challenges related to local YTPS data, however, was the small sample sizes reported in the FERs. For example, Calaveras County has 43 tobacco retailers countywide. In the targeted jurisdiction, the City of Angels Camp – there are only 9 tobacco retailers. In a conservative politic climate, such as Calaveras County, a buy rate of 11% (1 out of 9 tobacco retailers) did not make the case for a TRLP in the City of Angels Camp.

When it comes to a relationship with the District Attorney’s office specific to conducting the YTPSSs, only seven of the 36 LLAs that conducted buy surveys mentioned involvement by the local D.A. The District Attorney can provide support to local projects by granting immunity for underage decoys. Having immunity means that, if an illegal sale of tobacco to a minor occurs during a YTPS, the underage youth decoy would not be subject to prosecution (for buying tobacco products as a minor). Naturally, having immunity can put some youth – and their parents – at ease. However, only four of the seven LLAs reported that the D.A. in their county had granted immunity to the youth surveyors.

Observational Survey. Several LLAs reported that they conducted Observational Surveys to determine rates of compliance with STAKE Act signage and California Tobacco Retail Licensing Laws. For all but one LLA, these observations were conducted at the same time as the YTPS, rather than as a separate survey. Although the remaining LLA, Butte County, did not achieve its objective as stated in the FER, pre- and post-Observational Survey data in two targeted cities showed tobacco retailer compliance improved for both age-of-sale warning signs and posting tobacco retail licensure.

Public Opinion Polls. Nine LLAs conducted Public Opinion Polls (POPs) prior to implementing their activities with local decision makers. The specific purpose of the POPs was to determine awareness of the prevalence of youth access to tobacco products and support for a TRLP to reduce tobacco sales to minors. Butte County reported conducting two surveys by telephone, through random digit dial population-based computerized sampling. In most cases, the surveys were conducted in-person, using a

Table 7. Youth Tobacco Purchase Surveys: Pre and Post-Intervention Results.

(Shading: blue = objectives exceeded, green = objectives met, grey = objectives partially met, no shading = objectives not met)

LLA (City)	Collaborated & Coordinated w/LE?	Immunity by DA?	PRE-INTERVENTION YTPS RESULTS					# of YTPS Conducted	POST-INTERVENTION YTPS RESULTS				
			Survey Date	Sample Selection	Population & # Surveyed	Protocol Used	Buy Rate		Survey Date	Sample Selection	Population & # Surveyed	Protocol Used	Buy Rate
Alameda Co. TCP (Oakland)	Yes	?	2007 LE	?	?/609	?	4.8%	3	2009 LE	?	?/482	?	9.3% countywide
Berkeley TPP (City of Berkeley)	Yes	Yes, NR ¹²	2007 LE	?	101/32	?	18.75%	3	4/2010	Stratified purposive	101/42	?	2.3%
Butte Co. TEP (Oroville)	No	N/A	10/2009	2 cities, census	150/124	STORE Obs.	N/A	2 Obs.	6/2010	2 cities, census	150/121	STORE Obs.	N/A
Calaveras Co. TPP (San Andreas)	No	?	11/2007	Census	42/31	?	16%	4	4/2010	Census	43/42	?	21% (13% avg. for targeted city, Angels Camp)
Contra Costa Co. TPP (Martinez)	N/A												
Del Norte Co. TUPP (Crescent City)	Yes	?	1/2009	Conv.	?	?	15%	3	6/2010	Conv.?	?	?	20%
El Dorado Co. TUPP (Placerville)	?	?	2007	Conv.	?/104	?	10% / 12% Western Slope	2	2010	Conv.	?/103	?	14.5% / 20% Western Slope
Fresno Co. TPP (Fresno)	N/A												
Humboldt Co. LLA (Eureka)	Yes	?	2007 Eureka / 2008 Fortuna	2 cities, census	E43/F13	?	30.2%E/15.4%F; 26.8% combined	3	2010	Census	H43/F12	?	13.9%E/16.7%F; 14.5% combined
Inyo Co. TCP (Bishop)	?	"Full Approval"	5/2009	Census	?/26	Std.	26%	1	N/A				
Kern Co. TEP (Bakersfield)	Yes	?	10/2009	Random (1 city and uninc.), census for remaining cities	?/400	Std.	0-38%	Annual	?	?	?	?	?
Kings Co. TCP (Hanford)	No	?	?	?	?	?	?	2	4/2010	?	?	?	2 sold out of ?

¹² They reported that immunity by the District Attorney was not required as teens were accompanied by an adult chaperone and an officer. However, San Diego County later reports that, despite police involvement in the buy surveys, they later got into trouble when the findings were challenged.

LLA (City)	Collaborate d& Coordinated w/LE?	Im-munity by DA?	PRE-INTERVENTION YTPS RESULTS					# of YTPS Conduc-ted	POST-INTERVENTION YTPS RESULTS				
			Survey Date	Sample Selection	Population & # Surveyed	Protocol Used	Buy Rate		Survey Date	Sample Selection	Population & # Surveyed	Protocol Used	Buy Rate
Lake Co. TEP (Kelseyville)	No	?	2007	Census	Avg. 59	?	8%	4	2010	Census	Avg. 59	?	44% ¹³
City of Long Beach TEP (Long Beach)	No	?	2009	20% random sampling	636/129	Std.	25.6% (n=33)	?	2010	20% random sampling	636/111	Std.	18.0% (n=20); (PD stings 23.5%)
Los Angeles Co. TCPP (Los Angeles)	No	?	2007-2010	22	?/1,114	Std., uncons. buy	9.2% to 47.1%; avg. 30.2%	1+	Some did post-adoption but not reported				
Madera Co. TCP (Madera)	No	?	?	Purposive	161/86	Std., uncons. buy	9.3%	2	?	Purposive	161/79	Std., uncons. buy	2.6%
Mendocino Co. TCP (Ukiah)	No	No	12/2007	Countywide, census	116/109	Std.	Uninc. 29%; Inc. 24%; Countywide 24%	4	10/2009	Census	?/105	Std.	Uninc. 16%; Inc. 15%; Countywide 15%
Modoc Co. TEP (Alturas)	Yes	?	7/2008	Census	13/13	Std., uncons. buy	8% (1 of 13)	3	6/2010	Census	13/13	Std., uncons. buy	0%
Monterey Co. TCP (Salinas)	?	?	July ?	?	?	?	23%	?	?	?	?	?	?
Nevada Co. TPP (Grass Valley)	Yes	Yes	10/2007	Census	38/38 Grass Valley 12/12 Truckee	Std.	7%GV/ 33%T	2?	2 nd survey reported anecdotally by officer				
Placer Co. TPP (Auburn)	No	?	8-11/2007	Census	72?/72	?	5.5%	3	6/2010	Census	?	?	0?
Plumas Co. TURP (Quincy)	No	?	2007	Census	34/32	?	12.5%	3	2009-10	Census?	?/26	?	8.3%
Riverside Co. TCP (Riverside)	No	?	2007	?	? / 1,700	?	27% - 91%	2	2009?	?	?	?	0% to 17% in 5 cities
Sacramento Co. TEP (Sacramento)	No	?	2008	Random sampling	934 countywide/313	Std.- Lying Variation	9.9% countywide; Folsom 18.8%; Citrus Heights 27.3%	3	2010	Random sampling	700 countywide / 295	?	15.9% countywide; Folsom 12.5%; Citrus Heights 11.1%
San Bernardino Co. TURN Program	Yes	?	4/2008	Redlands, census	60/51	Std.	17.6% Redlands	4	2009	Census? Fontana	?/27	PD (didn't)	38.5% Fontana

¹³ Didn't explain what protocol was used, but changed the methodology for this survey from weekdays to weekends.

LLA (City)	Collaborated & Coordinated w/LE?	Immunity by DA?	PRE-INTERVENTION YTPS RESULTS					# of YTPS Conducted	POST-INTERVENTION YTPS RESULTS				
			Survey Date	Sample Selection	Population & # Surveyed	Protocol Used	Buy Rate		Survey Date	Sample Selection	Population & # Surveyed	Protocol Used	Buy Rate
(San Bernardino)												explain	
San Diego Co. TCRP (San Diego)	Yes, in 3rd	No	Baseline in 5 cities	Census (3 cities), Sample size calculations (2 cities)	?	Std. - Lying Variation	40% - 83%	3	?	?	?	PD	42% - 54%
San Luis Obispo Co. TCP (San Luis Obispo)	Yes	?	4/2009	Uninc. area	55/13 ¹⁴	Flash ID ¹⁵	23%	22	?	?	?	?	?
San Mateo Co. TPP (San Mateo)	Yes	?	?	?	?	?	?	3	?	?	?	?	?
Santa Barbara Co. TPSP (Santa Barbara)	Yes	? ¹⁶	?	Census	?	?	?	3?	2010	Census?	373/276	?	6% - 42%; avg. 25%
Santa Clara Co. TPEP (San Jose)	No	?	?	?	?	?	?	1?	?	?	?	?	?
Santa Cruz Co. TEP (Santa Cruz)	No	?	2008	Uninc. county and City of Santa Cruz	?/83, 84/39 (46%)	Std. - Lying Variation, uncons. buy	19%/13%; avg. 17.2%	1	N/A				
Sierra Co. TURP (Loyalton)	Yes	?	4/2008	Census	7/7	Std.	14%	3	2010	Census	6/6	Std.	17%
Siskiyou Co. TEP (Yreka)	Yes ¹⁷	?	7/2008	Purposively, Randomly along I-5	5/5, ?/10	Std., uncons. buy	?	2?	?	?	?	?	?
Solano Co. TPEP (Fairfield)	No	?	10-11/2007	Randomly	115/49	Std.	4.1%	1	N/A				
Stanislaus Co. TEP (Modesto)	No	?	6/2009	?	?	Std., uncons. buy	15%	2	6/2010	?	?	Std., uncons. buy	19% countywide, 30% Modesto
Sutter Co. TC (Yuba City)	Yes	?	?	?	100/35	Flash ID	11.4%	1	N/A				
Tulare Co. TCP (Bakersfield)	No	No	9/2009	?	?	Std. - Lying Variation	14.5%	2?	1/2010	?	?	?	?
Tuolumne Co. TEP (Sonora)	N/A												
Ventura Co. TEP (Ventura)	Yes	Yes	2008-2009	2 cities	?	Std. - Lying Variation	36% and 16%?	1	N/A				

¹⁴ Police officer got called to an emergency.

¹⁵ Flash ID includes showing true ID and not lying about age. If the sale was consummated, the officer then entered the store and cited the clerk.

¹⁶ Reported that "all operations follow express DA protocols that replicate those used by the state" but didn't say what they were.

¹⁷ Modoc PD trained Modoc youth that participated in the buy survey for Siskiyou County; a nice collaboration across counties. Otherwise, the Siskiyou County TCP Project Director trained and accompanied the youth.

convenience sample of people attending community health fairs and other public events, or visiting a shopping mall. Table 8 below summarizes the results of these surveys.

Table 8. Public Opinion Poll Results

(Shading: blue = objectives exceeded, green = objectives met, grey = objectives partially met, no shading = objectives not met)

LLA	<i>Strongly Support or Somewhat Support TRLP</i>	
	Pre-Intervention	Post-Intervention
Butte Co.	59% (n=200)	49.8% (n=200)
El Dorado Co.	82% (n=61)	N/A
Inyo Co.	68% (n=253)	N/A
Los Angeles Co.	82.9% (n=14,748)	N/A
Mendocino Co.	83% (n=146)	N/A
San Mateo Co.	76% (n=868)	N/A
Santa Clara Co.	89% (n=444)	N/A
Solano Co.	75% (n=72)	N/A
Sutter Co.	83.7% (n=129)	N/A

Elected officials, city council members and county supervisors are influenced by the attitudes of their constituents. As such, Public Opinion Polls can be a powerful tool. In fact, El Dorado County noted that they conducted a POP *at the request of* the City of Placerville’s City Manager/Attorney. Solano County reported that they shared the results of the POP during a public hearing in 2009 and during a city council meeting in 2010. Even under conditions such as these that did not result immediately in adoption of a TRLP, these counties believe that the POP helped plant the TRLP seed.

Reviewing the types of local data gathered during the 2007-2010 funding period by the 39 LLAs revealed that 38 projects compiled information and/or collected data of some kind during the three-year project period to document the problem of illegal sales or to inform decision makers of the benefits of TRLP. Of the nine LLAs that passed a TRLP during the 2007-2010 period, eight gathered YTPS data (even though many had existing data from previous project periods), six developed TRL information kits, and one developed a Merchant Education packet. In fact, some LLAs, such as the City of Long Beach, attributed its success in part to having had not just current information, but “many years of documenting the continued rate of illegal tobacco sales to minors.”

Stage 5: Communicate with Target

Approaching decision makers is an important first step in the campaign for TRLPs. Many LLAs offered suggestions or lessons learned in this regard. For example, among the things that contributed to Nevada County’s success was that “staff determined the level of readiness by meeting with key stakeholders in the first phase of the intervention.” Lessons learned by various LLAs included the following:

- “Targeting the correct tobacco enforcement official in charge of tobacco activities in each city was crucial to begin collaborative efforts.” (Santa Clara County)
- “Fully evaluate the political environment prior to taking on a licensing project. Is the agency for which the LLA works willing to support the project . . . ? Does a champion exist for the cause – a person who has the respect of the licensing agency? Will the coalition be willing to be outspoken, actively engaged and enthusiastic enough [to] help change decision-makers minds as needed? . . . Consider a strong role for the coalition in a licensing project . . . The best chance for success in rural areas is when the agency enforcing the policy/licensing change is the instigator of change.” (Tuolumne County)

- “Staff capacity to learn about legislated policies is imperative. Because each policy process unfolds differently in each jurisdiction, there is not one approach that fits, and staff has to be readily available and able to utilize resources to assist in the process.” (Solano County)

For some fortunate LLAs, an important campaign target fell in their laps. For example, San Luis Obispo County noted that they were contacted by a police officer that believed one city was ready for a TRL ordinance. A YTPS establishing a baseline buy rate in this jurisdiction was scheduled for the following month. In San Diego County, the Mayor of Chula Vista contacted the LLA after she had seen a group of kids smoking near a local park.

Further discussion regarding communicating with targets is provided in Stage 6: Implement Activities.

Stage 6: Implement Activities

Use of Media For Education And Advocacy. Use of the media to help inform the community of the need for tobacco control, to build support for tobacco retail licensing and enforcement of laws that keep tobacco out of the hands of youth, and to place some pressure on decision makers at the same time was reported in most of the FERs.

Urban settings offer a variety of media outlets – newspapers in multiple languages, newsletters for business and the retail industry, radio and TV stations serving audiences of many cultures, billboards and bus shelter ads. Rural settings have limited coverage – often a single newspaper and perhaps one radio station that serves the area. In addition, there is considerable independence on the part of the owners of the paper and the station in rural areas and, as reported in several FERs, a conservative environment in which smoking is protected. Consequently, paid advertisements may be accepted. However, letters to the editor, op-ed pieces, and contributed articles may simply not get published in the paper. Similarly, paid radio commercials may get played at peak listening times, but interviews and news items may not get played at all.

Table 9 summarizes the use of media in education and advocacy as reported in the 39 FERs. Important to note, however, is that Table 9 includes media that was achieved, i.e., a news release that was printed in a local newspaper, aired on the local radio, placed on a billboard, etc. It does not include media that was attempted, e.g., a letter to the editor that was submitted but not printed. A brief analysis of the use of media resulted in the following observations:

- 27 of the projects reported media activity; 12 projects reported no media activity, paid or free (some of these projects planned to send out media only after adoption of a TRLP).
- 13 projects purchased space for ads, 12 in some form of print media, 2 on radio, 2 on television and 1 on an electronic billboard (1 project used all five outlets). Of these, 1 was in a language other than English.
- 21 projects received free coverage via articles in newsletters and newspapers (21), mention or interviews on radio (3), and segments on television (3). Of the articles, news reports and talk shows, 1 was in Spanish.
- 14 projects were from urban areas, 18 from rural areas, and 7 from urban and rural areas.

Few FERs commented extensively on their use of media as a resource; only a few, in fact, stated which outlets they used for ads and press releases. For more details specific to each LLA, please see Table 9 beginning on the next page.

Table 9. Media Used for Education and Advocacy.

(Shading: blue = objectives exceeded, green = objectives met, grey = objectives partially met, no shading = objectives not met)

#	LLA (City)	Urban or Rural	FOCUS	MEDIA USED				
				Print	Radio	TV	Other	Purchased?
1	Alameda Co. TCP (Oakland)	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	Berkeley TPP (City of Berkeley)	Urban	3? YTPS/PC308a results and acknowledging merchants that did not sell tobacco to minors	1 ad - placed in Berkeley Daily Planet	-	-	-	Purchased print ad
3	Butte Co. TEP (Oroville)	Urban (& Rural)	2? Obs. Survey results and acknowledging merchants that did not sell tobacco to minors	1 ad	-	-	-	Purchased print ad
4	Calaveras Co. TPP (San Andreas)	Rural	4? YTPS results	1 press release, but wasn't featured	-	-	-	-
5	Contra Costa Co. TPP (Martinez)	Urban	Licensing, enforcement and ALA Report Card	8 total press releases	-	-	-	-
6	Del Norte Co. TUPP (Crescent City)	Rural	4 YTPS results, Articles, Letters to the editor	17 total press releases	-	-	-	-
7	El Dorado Co. TUPP (Placerville)	Rural	Reporter written article, included 07 YTPS results	1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
			09 TRL, Tobacco Retail Licensing Day of Action	1	-	-	-	-
			2010 1 YTPS results	1 – but not featured	-	-	Posted on county website, Public Health website, included in Health Services Briefing Minutes	-
8	Fresno Co. TPP (Fresno)	Rural	Illegal sales and TRL	1 Letter to the Editor	1 - 30 s PSA	-	-	-
9	Humboldt Co. LLA (Eureka)	Rural	3 YTPS results to 4 papers and 1 TV	1 press release in 1 paper	-	-	-	-
			Show You Care Campaign to 4 papers and 1 TV	1 ad - placed in 4 papers	-	1 ad	-	Purchased print and TV ad
10	Inyo Co. TCP (Bishop)	Rural	TRI, policy adoption, gateway drug issues, local illegal sales rates	2 x per year paid print media; Articles in English and Spanish language newspaper	2x per year paid radio ads	-	-	Purchased print and radio ads
			Letters of support and endorsement petitions	2x /year	-	-	-	-
11	Kern Co. TEP (Bakersfield)	Rural	Annual YPS / PC 308a results/ violators	3 press releases, 1 print media website	1	1 CBS News 3 Press Conf.	Newsletters 2 Law Enforcement Press Releases 2	-
			Penal Code 308a Warning	4 press releases	Yes	Yes	Newsletters, websites, Electronic billboard 1, Condor Hockey Games ?	-
			Issue of illegal sales, laws prohibiting sales of tobacco ads	1 ad	1 ad, 173 spots	1 ad, 154 spots	Developed electronic billboard tag to warn the community about the legal consequences when selling tobacco products to minors; Media Advisory 2	Purchased print, radio, TV and billboard ads
12	Kings Co. TCP	Urban &	Educational efforts of	1 article in 1	-	-	-	-

#	LLA (City)	Urban or Rural	FOCUS	MEDIA USED				
				Print	Radio	TV	Other	Purchased?
	(Hanford)	Rural	LLA and local volunteers	paper				
			Illegal tobacco sales locally	2 articles in ? papers	-	-	-	-
			TRL & CC decision to further investigate issue	1 article in 1 paper	-	-	-	-
13	Lake Co. TEP (Kelseyville)	Rural	YPS results and ad acknowledging merchants that did not sell tobacco to minors	1 ad, 2 x / year	-	-	-	Purchased print ad
14	City of Long Beach TEP (Long Beach)	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Los Angeles Co. TCP (Los Angeles)	Urban	TRL-related	Press releases, letters to editor, print ads, op eds, media coverage via articles and interviews	-	Participating at press conferences	-	Purchased print ads
16	Madera Co. TCP (Madera)	Rural	Acknowledging retailers in compliance with State Retail Licensing Law AB17	1 ad in 4 papers	-	-	Movie review authored by youth coalition members and educational display ¹⁸	Purchased print ad
17	Mendocino Co. TCP (Ukiah)	Rural	YTPS results and promoting TRL, Public Opinion Poll	Not specified	-	-	-	-
18	Modoc Co. TEP (Alturas)	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-
19	Monterey Co. TCP (Salinas)	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-
20	Nevada Co. TPP (Grass Valley)	Rural	Passage of TRLP	2 articles – one paid	Radio Interview	-	Tobacco coalition website	Purchased print ad
21	Placer Co. TPP (Auburn)	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-
22	Plumas Co. TURP (Quincy)	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-
23	Riverside Co. TCP (Riverside)	Urban (& Rural)	Passage of TRLP	Press releases, letters to the editor in targeted cities	-	-	Bus shelter ads were created and displayed in the three cities that adopted the ordinance; TRL website was developed and maintained with the cities that adopted the ordinance	Purchased bus shelter ads
24	Sacramento Co. TEP (Sacramento)	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-
25	San Bernardino Co. TURN Program (San Bernardino)	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-
26	San Diego Co. TCRP (San Diego)	Urban	Illegal sales and promoting TRL	3 ads, 5 articles, 4 op-eds, 2 letters to the editor	-	2 stories	-	Purchased 3 print ads
27	San Luis Obispo Co. TCP (San Luis Obispo)	Urban & Rural	YTPS results, acknowledging merchants that did not sell tobacco to minors and promoting TRL	20 articles and letters to the editor	-	2 stories	-	-
28	San Mateo Co. TPP (San Mateo)	Urban	TRL	Print media, but not specified	-	-	-	-
29	Santa Barbara Co.	Urban	YTPS and PC308a	Press releases	-	-	-	-

¹⁸ The movie review was intended to be posted in newspapers, health department newsletter and local middle school papers – unclear if it was done. The educational materials and photographs were displayed in 3 high traffic locations throughout the county to educate residents (but didn't identify where).

#	LLA (City)	Urban or Rural	FOCUS	MEDIA USED					
				Print	Radio	TV	Other	Purchased?	
	TPSP (Santa Barbara)	(& Rural)		annually (4?) and letters to the editor					
30	Santa Clara Co. TPEP (San Jose)	Urban (& Rural)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
31	Santa Cruz Co. TEP (Santa Cruz)	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
32	Sierra Co. TURP (Loyalton)	Rural	YTSP results and How to Speak UP When Witnessing Sales to Minors	Ads, letters to the editor, and articles	-	-	-	-	Purchased print ads
33	Siskiyou Co. TEP (Yreka)	Rural	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
34	Solano Co. TPEP (Fairfield)	Urban	Promote TRL / CUP	Press release	-	-	-	-	-
35	Stanislaus Co. TEP (Modesto)	Urban & Rural	YTSP results and promoting TRL	Press releases and letters to the editor	-	-	-	-	-
			ALA local grades and Tobacco Slam Youth Training	Press releases	-	-	-	-	-
36	Sutter Co. TC (Yuba City)	Rural	YTSP results, youth perception of local access and California Healthy Kids Survey data	1 article – “Underage Smoking Puffs Up in Sutter County.”	-	-	Youth members of the Substance Abuse Steering Coalition to the editor of the Appeal-Democrat, the letter was not published.	-	-
			ALA Report Card – Grade F	1 article	-	-	-	-	-
37	Tulare Co. TCP (Bakersfield)	Urban & Rural	State Tobacco Retailer License (AB71) Compliance	?	?	?	?	?	?
38	Tuolumne Co. TEP (Sonora)	Rural	Youth access and TRL	1 ad, letters to the editor	?	-	-	-	Purchased print ad
39	Ventura Co. TEP (Ventura)	Urban	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Of the 28 LLAs with objectives focused on TRLPs, 21 reported use of the media. The characteristics of these 21 LLAs vis-à-vis media follows:

- 15 were urban, 10 were rural, and 3 were urban and rural projects
- Of the 21, the use of media varied widely from 1 printed article to 17 press releases and print/radio ads

Of the 28 LLAs with objectives focused on TRLPs, nine were successful at getting policies passed. Comparing the use of media among the nine projects resulted in the following:

- 5 were urban, 2 were rural, and 2 were urban and rural projects
- Of the 9, 7 reported use of the media; 2 reported no media activity at all
- 4 reported a significant use of media – paid and free – e.g., press releases, letters to the editor, bus shelter ads and websites (Kern County, Los Angeles County, San Luis Obispo, and Riverside)

Of the 11 LLAs focusing on compliance with existing laws, two were successful at achieving the targeted compliance rate. Comparing the use of media among these 11 projects resulted in the following:

- 1 was urban, 8 were rural, 2 were urban and rural projects

- Of the 11, 7 reported use of the media; 4 reported no media activity at all
- Of the 2 projects that achieved the targeted objective, 1 was rural and 1 was urban; 1 purchased a print ad; and 1 had no media at all.

Some FERs noted the positive impact that the media had on their campaign. For example, San Luis Obispo County credited its success at getting one policy passed during the 2007-2010 project period as a result of media attention in the previous project periods, "Whenever an ordinance was passed, there was media support which was positive. Newspapers regularly printed press releases associated with youth compliance checks, including identifying stores that sold. In addition, there were editorials supportive of enforcing tobacco laws." Los Angeles County attributed its success in part to the adoption of five TRL policies in the previous three years and the "considerable media attention with one news conference, four paid advertisements in local papers, and 12 published newspaper articles since 2005."

In reviewing the use of the media during these interventions and attempting to assess its importance in contributing to successful outcomes, it appears that the projects that benefited most from media coverage were those that worked with local officials, given the occupational interest in media coverage of this target population. For example, Contra Costa County's FER reported that they were invited to attend a meeting with City staff and two City Council members about the need for licensing fees, "on the heels of the ALA's Tobacco Control Report Card," which indicated poor performance specific to Richmond. With respect to rural projects and the conservative political environments in which they worked, media coverage was achieved only because they paid for it.

Involvement of Policymakers and Law Enforcement. For the 28 LLAs with objectives focused on TRLPs, the policy makers targeted for the campaign were typically local government officials – the city council, the county board of supervisors, and the heads of city or county departments. In addition, some LLAs worked with law enforcement at several levels, to interface with decision makers and to coordinate the technical assistance component. With an understanding of the political climate (discussed in Stage 3: Build Your Coalition and ID a Champion), LLAs focused on educating policy makers and law enforcement in an effort to combat youth access to tobacco. This section focuses on building on existing laws and precedents, demonstrating support for the proposed policy, providing technical assistance on policy development, as well as policy implementation and enforcement.

Building on Existing Laws and Precedents. LLAs found it beneficial to build on existing laws and precedents which provided a legal basis and/or public acceptance that was helpful to the campaign. Santa Clara County's FER noted that, "California Cigarette and Tobacco Products Tax Laws provided leverage and legislation to present to city officials and tobacco retail merchants to strengthen the current local tobacco control policies." Santa Clara County also included their local Communities Health on Tobacco Report Card which, "provided a solid indicator of the level of compliance and enforcement of youth access to tobacco and storefront advertising as well as other tobacco control policies for each city . . . City officials were 'very concerned of the image of their city if it was compromised on TPEP's Communities Health on Tobacco Report Card or media event.'"

Precedents, including local precedents, were particularly beneficial to the campaign for LLAs. Santa Cruz County's FER noted that its key informants said, "Successful experiences of other jurisdictions around the state was useful and convincing." San Mateo County attributed at least part of its success to having had in recent years, "adopted a variety of smoke-free laws, tobacco related policies, and youth development campaigns." Riverside County, having had already passed TRLPs in 14 jurisdictions prior to the current project period, was able to demonstrate through YTPSs "a significant (near to 0%) reduction in sales to minors," thus paving the way to adopting and implementing TRLPs in 8 more cities during the 2007-2010 project period.

Presentations. Of the 39 projects, 32 LLAs mentioned conducting presentations to decision makers who would determine whether or not a TRLP would be adopted. These presentations were made at regularly

scheduled city council or county board meetings with public access or in private meetings. Presentations were generally led by LLA staff and frequently involved the active support of coalition members, and adult and youth community volunteers. Many FERs reported bringing youth to the presentations. San Diego County's FER noted that this made a big impact on the city council. Other FERs, such as Riverside County's, reported that the youth *made the presentations*, providing policy makers with information on youth access, sales rates, the positive impacts in cities that adopted a TRLP, as well as the results of local public opinion polls or letter-writing campaigns.

The informational packets and fact sheets, described under Stage 4: Gather Information, were used in a variety of ways to educate policy makers, as well as law enforcement, merchants, and sometimes the general community present at these meetings. These informational packets included the results of local public opinion polls (discussed in Stage 3: Gather Information), as well as the results of petitions and letter writing campaigns, which were mentioned in a couple FERs. For example, Los Angeles County conducted public opinion polls countywide and demonstrated 82.9% public support for TRL, which contributed to 18 TRLPs being adopted and implemented during the 2007-2010 project period.

Demonstrating Support for the Proposed Policy. Public support for reducing youth access and adopting TRLPs is important to show policy makers. Several LLAs reported conducting public opinion polls, getting petition signatures and conducting letter-writing campaigns. For example, Solano County's advocates collected 686 signatures for its petition of support. The results of these processes were included in the TRL information kits, communicated during presentations and/or submitted to the local media for release. Sometimes, the message was sent directly to policy makers, e.g., Santa Cruz County reported that youth wrote letters regarding youth access and the benefits of TRL and sent them to elected officials.

The effectiveness of educating, making presentations to, and communicating with policy makers cannot be overstated. In fact, Lake County, which did not achieve its policy-related objective, noted among its lessons learned the following: "Efforts should have included more frequent contact with decision makers, email updates to decision makers regarding current news and information about other jurisdictions passing LRL ordinances."

Providing Technical Assistance. For the 28 LLAs focused on policy adoption, the technical assistance provided to decision makers concentrated on the issue of policy development. Most of the FERs described offering decision makers sample policies for their consideration. A few LLAs prepared a policy for the decision-making body's acceptance. Many of the FERs acknowledged the help of the Technical Assistance Legal Center (TALC) in providing guidance for LLAs in creating and adapting policies to suit the specific circumstances of each intervention. Among the nine LLAs that achieved success in getting policies passed, technical assistance provided to law enforcement regarding enforcement of Penal Code 308(a) was particularly beneficial in engaging law enforcement and getting TRLPs passed in Alameda, Kern, Nevada, San Luis Obispo and San Mateo counties. However, for the most part, the policy development process was not discussed in the FERs with any detail. Only one FER commented specifically that staff had provided *a mere* 3 hours of technical assistance in policy development (the adjective and emphasis are mine). There was little mention in the FERs about technical assistance on implementation, except where collaboration and coordination with law enforcement occurred. Los Angeles County, among the most successful of the 39 LLAs noted among its lessons learned that, "more should be done to assist cities in implementing and enforcing newly adopted TRL policies."

For the 11 LLAs focused on compliance with existing laws, two LLAs – the City of Berkeley and Modoc County – were able to achieve their stated objectives. This can also be attributed to their focus on law enforcement – in contrast to city and county officials – by providing technical assistance on Penal Code 308(a) enforcement, as well as coordinating YTPSs and, in some cases, the publication of results.

Education of Merchants. Twenty-three LLAs reported educating tobacco retailers about the issues involved. These issues included the prevalence of smoking among youth, the rate of illegal sales to

minors, and arguments for TRL. Seventeen LLAs prepared merchant education packets (discussed under Stage 4: Gather Information). Most LLAs distributed these materials through the mail or worked with other county departments, e.g., the Sheriff's Office or Environmental Health, to distribute the packets. A few LLAs distributed materials in one-on-one educational visits, or conducted annual trainings for merchants regarding state laws. Some FERs reported also sending letters of appreciation to tobacco retailers that did not sell tobacco to the underage minors during YTPSs. The importance of educating merchants was stated nicely by El Dorado County in its FER: "... a licensing ordinance by itself will not automatically decrease sales rates; proper merchant education and enforcement about the local ordinance and state youth access laws are always needed."

Stage 7: Evaluate Your Campaign

Many FERs described their efforts to gauge how effective newly enacted TRLPs were. In a number of cases, the policies were adopted so close to the end of the grant period that it would have been premature to conduct the planned post-intervention YTPSs. Those LLAs which had not been successful in getting a TRLP adopted or implemented were, of course, unable to do post-policy adoption work.

Outcome Measures. Outcome measures varied by the type of objective chosen by each Local Lead Agency (LLA). For LLAs that focused on policy adoption and/or implementation, the outcome measures used were the number of citations issued post-policy adoption and/or the reduction in the number/percent of youth purchases as reflected in the YPTS.

At the conclusion of the 2007-2010 project period, nine LLAs passed TRL policies affecting 46 California cities and the unincorporated areas of two counties (reported in Table 10). With more policies passed in urban areas, this set of FERs made it clear that decision makers in the more affluent, more populous counties with longer histories of proactive tobacco control tended to be more receptive to well-mounted campaigns than did those in rural counties where tobacco use was more prevalent and still relatively acceptable.

Table 10. TRLPs Passed – Rural vs. Urban Areas.

(Shading: blue = objectives exceeded, green = objectives met, grey = objectives partially met, no shading = objectives not met)

LLA	RURAL or URBAN	# OF POLICIES PASSED
Alameda Co.	Urban	2 cities
Contra Costa Co.	Urban	1 city
Kern Co.	Rural	1 city
City of Long Beach	Urban	1 city
Los Angeles Co.	Urban	18 cities
Nevada County	Rural	1 city
Riverside Co.	Urban	8 cities
San Luis Obispo Co.	Urban & Rural	1 countywide
San Mateo Co.	Urban	1 city; countywide upgraded affecting 13 cities

Process Measures. Of the nine LLAs that passed a TRLP during the 2007-2010 project period, pre- and post-TRLP adoption buy rates were reported as follows:

Table 11. YTPS Results – Pre and Post-TRLP Adoption.

(Shading: blue = objectives exceeded, green = objectives met, grey = objectives partially met, no shading = objectives not met)

LLA	YTPS Pre-TRLP Adoption	YTPS Post-TRLP Adoption
Alameda Co.	4.8%	9.3%
Contra Costa Co.	Not reported	Not reported
Kern Co.	0-38%	Not reported
City of Long Beach	25.6%	18.0% - 23.5%
Los Angeles Co.	9.2% - 47.1%	Not reported
Nevada County	7% - 33%	Not reported
Riverside Co.	27-91%	0-17%
San Luis Obispo Co.	23%	Not reported
San Mateo Co.	Not reported	Not reported

Of the three LLAs that reported post-policy adoption YTPS results, two – the City of Long Beach and Riverside County – showed a reduction in the rate of illegal sales to minors after the TRLP was adopted and implemented. Two jurisdictions in Alameda County adopted a TRLP. However, the buy rate in these cities was not broken out. The countywide buy rate, which is provided in Table 11 above, does not allow for a city-to-city comparison pre- and post-TRLP adoption. Although San Luis Obispo did not report a post-intervention buy rate, they indicated that their “data does not indicate a reduction in sales rates to youth” after the ordinance was enacted. For some of these LLAs, implementation of the TRLP has just begun as the three-year project period was ending. Consequently, there may not have been enough time to see results.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED and CHALLENGES

The Economic Crisis. Almost all of the FERs reported that the economic crisis created a political environment that was unsympathetic to TRLPs and, therefore, for most LLAs, the proposed policy never made it to formal discussion. The reasons most often cited by local government officials and staff were: budget cuts and staffing issues, concern about creating an unfavorable environment for business by imposing more regulations and fees, and complaints about using law enforcement resources for tobacco control when there were other more pressing public safety issues. The attention that the economic crisis commanded was aptly described in Lake County’s FER which indicated that their city council champion “kept requesting that the presentation be held to a later date so that the city could manage other ‘more important and contentious’ issues. By Fall 2009, the council was mired in internal issues that prevented an in-person presentation by the coalition. The city council would accept information and recommendations only in a written form (File and Submit). If the city council wanted to move forward with a particular issue, then an in-person presentation would be scheduled. This did not happen by June 30, 2010.”

There were challenges even in environments more sympathetic to TRLPs. For example, Los Angeles County reported that five cities adopted a TRLP without sufficient fees to fund regular enforcement reporting that “the city councils acknowledged the importance of licensing tobacco retailers to curb sales, but cited poor economic conditions as the primary factor in omitting a license free for the ordinance . . . these jurisdictions are currently contributing funds from other sources (e.g., city general fund), to ensure

that there is at least one annual retailer compliance check. However, these cities could re-direct this funding for other uses if needed.”

Different Priorities. LLAs that targeted law enforcement agencies for policy adoption, or that collaborated and coordinated with the local police departments to conduct YTPSs noted different kinds of challenges. Contra Costa County’s FER stated that “efforts to pursue licensing through the police department were unsuccessful and slowed down the campaign in its initial stages.” El Dorado’s FER notes that, “despite support, the Chief of Police expressed concerns about the effectiveness of TRL for a small amount of tobacco retailers [20-22] located in Placerville. The police department utilizes a community policing philosophy and an ordinance could disrupt the relationships built within the community.” Although Alameda County reported that “the process of utilizing law enforcement agencies as a champion [vis-à-vis implementation of PC308(a)] has worked well, its FER also stated, “law enforcement is not experienced in implementing a TRL nor do they have the staffing to coordinate the TRL process.” Among the lessons learned stated in their report was that “more technical assistance hours are needed from TCP to implement the TRL than anticipated.” San Luis Obispo County noted that coordinating YTPS with law enforcement officers was difficult because it is not their priority, “during one YTPS, the officer was called to respond to a crisis call, and the staff members and the youth had to wait in the car for over an hour while the situation was resolved.” Contra Costa County’s FER noted, “police department support for TRL policy implementation may be difficult to garner, particularly in cities with other pressing public safety issues.”

More Technical Assistance Needed. For LLAs that were successful in getting TRLPs passed, several noted that more technical assistance was needed than anticipated. Among the recommendations offered by Los Angeles County were: “incorporating TRL post-policy adoption activities, such as technical assistance and consultation to ensure that the new policies are effectively implemented and enforced.”

Other Surprises. Mendocino County’s FER reported working actively with one city to adopt a TRLP. However, the process was derailed by a lawsuit filed by a group of retailers against the county board of supervisors. Although the lawsuit was not directed at the targeted city council, they feared they would be sued, as well. Consequently, a TRLP was not adopted in the City of Fort Bragg. This was despite strong public support (83%) and a high buy rate ranging from 21% to 33% in the targeted jurisdiction over the three-year project!

San Luis Obispo’s FER reported a very unique set of events that occurred during its June 2010 YTPS, “The clerk sold to the minor without asking for identification. The sheriff’s deputy went in and started to cite the clerk, who became so upset that he collapsed. As he fell to the floor, he hit his head twice on counter tops and started bleeding fairly profusely. It then appeared that he had a seizure, and his heart stopped. Paramedics were called; he was revived and sent to the hospital in an ambulance. While this was going on, the man’s wife came to the store, started shouting that she was going to sue the county, and got her attorney on the telephone. Needless to say, the results of that particular sting were not publicized.”

Changes in Leadership / Management. Several FERs reported changes in leadership and management causing a delay in implementation activities or forcing LLAs to start all over to develop new partners in the tobacco control effort. Several FERs described working hard to develop relationships with key people in local government, departments and administrations, only to have the individuals move on before the tobacco control policies could be adopted or augmented. For example, the Del Norte County LLA reported, “changes in the city council office caused activities to be delayed and modified. Without city council leadership, building a relationship between TCP staff and law enforcement did not proceed as expected.” San Diego County reported that the, “policy champion [the Mayor] resigned from the council to become the city’s new Fire Chief. About the same time, a political scandal hit the city council involving the Mayor and his assistant, which distracted the council from addressing the TRL issue.”

When an opponent leaves the decision-making group and is replaced by more supportive newcomers, changes in management can be beneficial. This sometimes occurs with elected officials and key staff, and sometimes within LLAs, and offers new opportunities for the LLA hoping to promote a particular proposal. For example, Sutter County learned early on that its Public Health Officer would be the biggest barrier to TRL in the county. A few months after that person retired, the county board of supervisors asked the LLA to collect more information, indicating an openness to discussing a TRLP.

Turnover Among Tobacco Retailer's Managers/Clerks. For the LLAs that focused on compliance with existing laws and educating tobacco retailers on a regular basis to support compliance, challenges included a high turnover rate among managers and employees. Placer County's FER, for example, stated that "this situation made it difficult to build rapport and maintain the educational level among retailers."

Staffing Shortages / Problems. Several LLAs noted challenges related to staffing changes and vacancies. For example, the San Luis Obispo County FER noted that TCP staff vacancies in 2007 delayed work on the ordinance despite support being expressed by several county board of supervisor members. Madera County reported that the change in the Project Director and the Evaluation Consultant halfway through the procurement period was disruptive to the LLA. "Records of what activities were completed indicated that very little had been done." The retirement of a staff Health Education Specialist in December 2007, and the inability to fill this position for 7 months, was a challenge reported by Solano County.

Policy Change Takes Time. The length of time that it takes to get a proposed policy introduced, let alone accepted and implemented, was expressed by several LLAs. One FER acknowledged the effort it took as follows: "The journey to a Tobacco Retail Permit policy in the City of Long Beach took over 5 years and two California Tobacco Control Program contract periods." And, the effort paid off. Ultimately, policy makers recognized that addressing the problem of illegal sales to minors required a strong legislated policy to address the issue.

CONCLUSIONS

The 39 FERs produced by the California county and city LLAs focusing on CX indicators that deal with prohibiting the sale of tobacco to minors – Indicators 3.2.1, 3.1.10, 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 – described differences among the cities and counties, differences in local lead agencies, and differences in approach. Despite these unique characteristics, there were factors or elements that emerged for these LLAs – large and small, rural and urban – that were found to be instrumental to their campaigns. These steps are presented below in order, but may be applied in a different sequence based on the uniqueness of each situation.

- Establish, train and deploy a Community Coalition.
- Involve youth in as many aspects of the campaign as possible. People tend to respond positively to youth, and policy makers are people.
- Understand the local political climate and get to know as much as possible about individual policy makers, their public records, and their alliances and concerns, before designing a campaign.
- Find champions within the organization or within the Coalition that are known and respected by decision makers.
- Utilize precedents from neighboring areas, similar areas throughout the state or from local history to demonstrate how mainstream and desirable tobacco control is in California.
- Demonstrate that there is a problem by documenting the rate of illegal sales.
- Show public support for the policy via public opinion polls, letters of support, and presence at meetings.

- Provide support and technical assistance to decision makers to make their job of adopting and implementing a TRLP as easy as possible. Technical assistance can include sample policies, developing a local policy, collaborating and coordinating with law enforcement on YTPS, and educating tobacco retailers. It can also include post-policy adoption activities, e.g., consultation, to ensure that the new policies are effectively implemented and enforced.
- Utilize the media and make the most of them through press releases, articles, one-on-one interviews, letters to the editor and op-ed pieces. Purchase ads, if necessary, to ensure that the message gets out to the public.

Each of the 39 LLAs utilized the above steps in the effort to reduce the sale of tobacco products to minors. Whether they achieved their specific goals or not, each LLA was successful at raising awareness of their community, in general, of law enforcement and of their local policy makers regarding the problem of the illegal sale of tobacco products to minors and paving the way for TRLP adoption in the future.

Appendix A

List of Local Lead Agency Objectives for the 2007-2010 Grant Period

3.2.1-related objectives. 28 reports

3.2.1 The proportion of communities with a tobacco retail licensing policy that earmarks a portion of the license fee for enforcement activities.

Alameda County: (Objective 2) *By June 30, 2010, at least three cities/unincorporated areas in Alameda County will adopt a tobacco retail licensing policy that funds local enforcement of tobacco laws.*

Calaveras County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, the City Council of Angels Camp will adopt a tobacco retail licensing policy as a result of the advocacy efforts of the Calaveras County LLA and the Alliance for Substance Abuse Prevention Coalition.*

Contra Costa County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, at least one city in the county will implement its tobacco retailers licensing policy, including establishment of a tobacco-retailer licensing fee that provides sufficient fees to conduct compliance checks for all tobacco retailers at least twice a year.*

El Dorado County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, one city and or the unincorporated areas of the county will adopt a policy to require all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products and include sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Fresno County: (Objective 5) *By June 30, 2009, at least one city in Fresno County and/or the unincorporated area of Fresno County will adopt a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license to sell tobacco products with a portion of the fees earmarked to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Inyo County: (Objective 1) *By May 30, 2010, at least one city in Inyo County and/or the unincorporated area of Inyo County will adopt and implement a policy establishing mandatory licensing for all retail tobacco outlets that includes sufficient fees to conduct compliance checks of retailers.*

Kern County: (Objective 1) *By June 30, 2010, at least three incorporated cities in Kern County (Bakersfield, Delano, and Ridgecrest) will adopt and implement a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a special permit in order to sell tobacco products and include sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Kings County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, at least one of the four cities or unincorporated areas within Kings County will adopt and implement a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products and includes sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Lake County: (Objective 1) *By June 30, 2010, at least one jurisdiction in Lake County will adopt and implement a tobacco retail licensing requirement that includes sufficient fees to conduct compliance checks of retailers at least 2 times per year.*

Long Beach: (Objective 1) *By June 30, 2010, the City of Long Beach will adopt and implement a Tobacco Retail Permit (TRP) policy and Tobacco Retail Enforcement Program (TREP) with an annual fee and regular compliance checks.*

Log Angeles County: (Objective 1) *By June 30, 2010, a minimum of 12 cities in Los Angeles County will adopt and implement a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products and includes sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Mendocino County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, at least one of the two remaining jurisdictions within Mendocino County (the City of Fort Bragg and/or the City of Point Arena) will adopt and implement a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products and includes sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Monterey County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, at least three of the 13 jurisdictions in Monterey County will adopt a tobacco retail licensing policy. Licensing policy will include a fee sufficient enough to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Nevada County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, at least one incorporated city (Truckee or Grass Valley) in Nevada County will join Nevada City in adopting and implementing a tobacco retail licensing policy that earmarks a portion of the licensing fees for enforcement activities.*

Riverside County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, at least three cities will adopt and implement a tobacco retailer licensing policy with a fee that supports enforcement.*

Sacramento County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, at least one city in Sacramento County will adopt and implement a tobacco retail licensing policy.*

San Bernardino County: (Objective 4) *By June 30, 2010, a minimum of two cities and/or the County of San Bernardino will adopt and implement a tobacco retail licensing policy that includes sufficient fees to conduct annual compliance checks of retailers at least once a year. As a result, illegal sales to minors will decrease by 15% over the baseline as determined by observational surveying completed in conjunction with police department assistance and the CA Food and Drug Branch.*

San Diego County: (Objective 2) *By June 30, 2010, at least three cities in San Diego County with baseline youth purchase sales rates of 15% or higher will adopt and implement a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products that includes sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks.*

San Luis Obispo County: (Objective 2) *By June 30, 2010, at least two of the four remaining jurisdictions without tobacco retail licensing policies in San Luis Obispo County will adopt a tobacco retail licensing policy.*

San Mateo County: (Objective 1) *By June 30, 2010, at least two jurisdictions in San Mateo County will adopt a tobacco licensing policy and/or strengthen an existing policy that mandates compliance checks of retailers at least two times a year and includes sufficient fees to conduct checks.*

Santa Barbara County: (Objective 1) *By June 30, 2010, two cities in Santa Barbara County will adopt and implement a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products and includes sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks. One-year post TRL policy adoption, 100% of all identified tobacco retailers will obtain a license.*

Santa Clara County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, at least one city in Santa Clara County will adopt and implement a policy requiring tobacco retailers to have an annual license to sell any form of tobacco products and that earmarks a portion of the license fee for enforcement activities.*

Santa Cruz County: (Objective 1) *By June 30, 2010, at least one of five jurisdictions in Santa Cruz County will adopt and implement a tobacco retail licensing policy that includes sufficient annual fees to conduct regular compliance checks of retailers.*

Solano County: (Objective 1) *By December 31, 2009, at least one city in Solano County will adopt a policy that 1) establishes mandatory licensing for all tobacco retailers and/or mandatory conditional use permits for any new tobacco retail outlet, and that 2) includes sufficient fees for local law enforcement to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Stanislaus County: (Objective 1) *By June 30, 2010, at least two cities or unincorporated areas in Stanislaus County will adopt a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products and includes sufficient fees to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Sutter County: (Objective 3) *By June 30, 2010, at least one jurisdiction in Sutter County will adopt a tobacco retail licensing policy that includes sufficient annual fees to conduct compliance checks of retailers at least two times a year.*

Tuolumne County: (Objective 2) *By June 30, 2010, the City of Sonora will adopt a policy that requires all tobacco retailers to obtain a license in order to sell tobacco products, with a portion of the fees earmarked to conduct regular compliance checks.*

Ventura County: (Objective 1) *By June 30, 2010, at least one Ventura County jurisdiction will adopt 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.*

3.1.1-related objectives. 7 reports

3.1.1 Number of compliance checks conducted by enforcement agencies for violations of policies that prohibit the sale of tobacco sales to minors and that require ID checking –or– Number of warnings, citations, and fines issues for violating policies that prohibit the sale of tobacco to minors and that require ID checking –or– Proportion of tobacco retailers in compliance with policies that prohibit the sale of tobacco to minors and that require ID checking.

City of Berkeley: *By June 30, 2010, Berkeley tobacco retailers will increase their compliance with Penal Code 308(a) from 81%, established in 2007, to 90%. Staff will provide technical assistance to the Berkeley Police Department and the Environmental Health Division to help support the implementation of State and local sales to minors, and tobacco retail licensure laws.*

Del Norte County: *By June 30, 2010, the illegal tobacco sales to minors rate among all tobacco retailers in Del Norte County will decrease from the 33% baseline to meet the Centers for Disease Control Healthy People 2010 goal of 5%, as determined by comprehensive compliance checks conducted by LLA two times per program year.*

Humboldt County: *By June 30, 2010, the rate of illegal retail tobacco sales to minors among approximately 80 retailers in two jurisdictions in Humboldt County will not exceed the Centers for Disease Control Healthy People 2010 goal of 5% as documented by five comprehensive compliance checks conducted by LLA.*

Modoc County: *By May 31, 2010, reduce the number of teens who purchase tobacco or tobacco-related products by 20% from a baseline Youth Tobacco Purchase Survey.*

Placer County: *By June 2010, 90% of Roseville tobacco retailers (64 out of 71) will be compliant with both Penal Code 308(a) and STAKE Act signage laws as demonstrated through baseline (Winter 2008) and follow-up (Spring 2010) Youth Tobacco Purchase Surveys.*

Plumas County: *By June 30, 2010, among 34 retail establishments in Plumas County, the rate of illegal sales of tobacco to minors will decrease from 10% (2006) to 5% or less, as determined by an annual youth purchase survey.*

Sierra County: *By June 30, 2010, 100% of tobacco retailers in Sierra County receiving annual compliance checks for tobacco sales to minors will refrain from selling tobacco products to minors, as determined by the Youth Tobacco Purchase Surveys.*

3.1.10-related objectives. 1 report

3.1.10 Number of compliance checks conducted by enforcement agencies for violations of policies that require tobacco retailers to post their tobacco retail license –or– Number of warnings, citations, and fines issued for violations of policies that require tobacco retailers to post their tobacco retail license –or– Proportion of tobacco retailers in compliance with policies that require tobacco retailers to post their tobacco retail license

Madera County: *By June 30, 2010, sixty percent (60%) of all Madera County's approximate 160 tobacco merchants will be in compliance with state laws addressing tobacco sales to minors, STAKE Act signage and tobacco licensure.*

3.1.2-related objectives. 3 reports

3.1.2 Number of compliance checks conducted by enforcement agencies for violations of policies that require tobacco retailers to post the STAKE Act age-of-sale warning sign –or- Number of warnings, citations, and fines issued for violations of policies that require tobacco retailers to post the STAKE Act age-of-sale warning sign –or- Proportion of tobacco retailers in compliance with policies that require tobacco retailers to post the STAKE Act age-of-sale warning sign

Butte County: *By June 30, 2010, at least 95% of 150 tobacco retailers in Oroville and Chico will be in compliance with state or local policies which mandate posting the STAKE Act age-of-sale warning sign and required proper posting of the state tobacco retailer license.*

Siskiyou County: *By June 30, 2010, 90% of the approximately 70 tobacco retail merchants in Siskiyou County will be in compliance with the sales to minors provision of the STAKE Act, and 100% will be in compliance with the State Licensing Act requiring tobacco retailers to post their tobacco retail licenses, STAKE Act signage posting requirements and the self-service display law.*

Tulare County: *By June 30, 2010, the compliance rate for posting of the Tobacco Retailer License (AB 71), compliance with the self-service display ban (AB 1173) and compliance with the STAKE Act sign and no-sales to minors provision (SB 757) will be 90% in the incorporated cities of Dinuba, Visalia and Lindsay, as determined by an annual observational survey.*

Appendix B

References

- _____, 2010. *Objective PC308(a) and STAKE Act Signage Final Evaluation*. California: Placer County Tobacco Prevention Program.
- Aved, B. 2010. *Engaging Retail Establishments in Complying With State Laws Prohibiting Tobacco Sales to Minors*. California: Plumas County Public Health Agency Tobacco Use Reduction Program.
- Coronado, G. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: County of Monterey Public Health Department Tobacco Control Program.
- Cummings, P. 2010. *Final Report Primary Objective II: Tobacco Retailer Licensing*. California: Alameda County Health Care Services Agency Public Health Department, Oakland, California.
- Davis, A. 2010. *Smoke-free Public Areas Final Report*. California: Santa Cruz County Health Services Agency Tobacco Education Program.
- Dunn, D. and Long, T. *Santa Barbara County Tobacco Retail Licensing Policies: Looking to the Future*. California: Santa Barbara County Public Health Department Tobacco Prevention Settlement Program.
- Eby-Carl, R. 2010. *Local Retailer Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: Lake County Tobacco Education Program.
- El-Askari, G. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: Nevada County Tobacco Use Prevention Program.
- Fletcher, J.E. 2010. *Butte County Tobacco Retailer Compliance Final Evaluation Report*. California: Butte County Department of Public Health.
- Fletcher, J.E. 2010. *Inyo County Tobacco Retailer Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: Inyo County Health and Human Services Tobacco Control Program.
- Flores-Workman, F.A. and D'Onofrio, C.N. 2010. *Finding the Policy Path to Regulate Tobacco Retailers in Vallejo Final Evaluation Report*. California: Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education.
- Haun, S. 2010. *Mendocino County Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: Mendocino County Tobacco Control Program.
- Huddleston, J. 2010. *Final Evaluation Report: Tobacco Retail Licensing (TRL) in Kern County*. California: Kern County Tobacco Education Program.
- Hurt, C. 2010. *Reducing Tobacco Sales to Minors Final Evaluation Report*. California: Modoc County Tobacco Education Project.
- Hurt, C. 2010. *Store Compliance With State Tobacco Laws Final Evaluation Report*. California: Siskiyou County Tobacco Education Project.
- Jones, P. 2010. *Policy Final Evaluation Report*. California: Tuolumne County Tobacco Reduction Program.

Karele, K. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: San Luis Obispo County Tobacco Control Program.

Kessler, C. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: El Dorado County tobacco Use Prevention Program.

Krenz, V.D., 2010. *Final Evaluation Report on Tobacco Merchant Compliance in Madera County*. California: Madera County Tobacco Control Program.

Krenz, V.D., 2010. *Final Evaluation Report on Tobacco Retail Licensing in Kings County*. California: Kings County Tobacco Control Program.

Krenz, V.D. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report for Fresno County*. California: Fresno County Tobacco Prevention Program.

Lifshay, J., Dennis, D. and Jenett, J. 2010. *Adoption of a tobacco Retailer Licensing Fee and Tobacco Retailer Licensing Implementation in One Contra Costa City*. California: Contra Costa Health Services Tobacco Prevention Project.

Marleau, K. and Blake, M. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: Sutter County Tobacco Control.

Marshak, H.H. and Jacknik, M. 2010. *Adoption & Implementation of Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: San Bernardino County Department of Public Health Tobacco Use Reduction Now Project.

Marshak, H.H. and Edmond, C. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Policy Adoption (with fee)*. California: Riverside County Department of Public Health Tobacco Control Project.

McCubbrey, J.P. 2010. *Reducing Illegal Tobacco Sales to Youth in Del Norte County Final Evaluation Report*. California: Del Norte County Tobacco Use Prevention Program.

Midwest Academy Strategy Chart. <http://www.partnersinpolicymaking.com/curriculumchangechart.html>

Ohlson, B. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: San Mateo County Tobacco Prevention Program.

Perales, D.C., Perales, D.P. & Wong, A.S. 2010. *Advocating for Tobacco Retail Licensing Policy Adoption in the City of Angels Camp*. California: Calaveras County Tobacco Prevention Program.

Preacely, P. 2010. *Tobacco Retail permit Final Evaluation Report*. California: City of Long Beach Department of Health and Human Services Tobacco Education Program.

Roberts, C. and Marsh, L. 2010. *Sierra County Compliance Checks Final Evaluation Report*. California: Sierra County Tobacco Use Reduction Program.

Rodriguez, Y. and Sheffield, M. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: Sacramento County Chronic Disease Prevention Program.

Roussos, S. and Gonzalez, E. 2010. *Adoption of Tobacco Retail Licensing Policies*. California: Stanislaus County Health Services Agency.

Strategic Tobacco Retail Effort (STORE). Campaign Stages, retrieved at <http://tcsstore.org/stages/index.html>.

Sumaraga, L. 2010. *Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: Santa Clara County Public Health Department Chronic Disease & Injury Prevention, Tobacco Prevention & Education Program.

Transforming Local Communities, Inc. 2010. *Reducing Youth Access to Tobacco Through Retailer Compliance Checks and Youth Purchase Surveys*. California: Tulare County Tobacco Control Project.

Traylor, A., Brown-Machen, M., Yang, B. 2010. *The City of Berkeley's Efforts Reduce Youth Access to Tobacco*. California: City of Berkeley Tobacco Prevention Program, Berkeley, California.

Vanderhorst, M. 2010. *Tobacco-Free Humboldt Campaign to Reduce Youth Tobacco Sales in Humboldt County*. California: Humboldt County Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Branch.

Waltman, N. 2010. *Final Evaluation Report, Tobacco Retailer Licensing Objective*. California: Ventura County Tobacco Education Program.

Weber, M.D., Reyes, C., Wong, J., Urgiles, L., and Sze, D. 2010. *Los Angeles County Tobacco Retail Licensing Final Evaluation Report*. California: Los Angeles County Tobacco Control & Prevention Program.

Woodson, G., Reed, D., Verastigue, E., and Brown, M. 2010. *Are Tobacco Products Really That Easy To Purchase? San Diego County's Efforts to Adopt Retail Licensing Policies in Lemon Grove, National City and Chula Vista*. California: County of San Diego Tobacco Control Resource Program.