



# **Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Compliance Checks, 2008**

WYSAC Technical Report No. SRC-811

October, 2008

# Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Compliance Checks, 2008

By

W. Trent Holder, Assistant Research Scientist

With the assistance of

Bistra Anatchkova, Ph.D., Survey Research Center Manager  
Brianne Wold, Research Aide  
Perrin Recks, Research Aide

## Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center

University of Wyoming  
1000 E. University Ave, Dept. 3925  
Laramie, WY 82071  
(307) 766-2189 • [wysac@uwyo.edu](mailto:wysac@uwyo.edu)  
[www.uwyo.edu/wysac](http://www.uwyo.edu/wysac)

Citation for this document: WYSAC (2008) *Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Compliance Checks, 2008*, by Holder, W. T. (WYSAC Technical Report No. SRC-811). Laramie, WY: Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center, University of Wyoming.

Short reference: WYSAC (2008), *Alcohol and Tobacco Compliance*.

© Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center, 2008.

## Table of Contents

1. Summary .....	4
2. Method .....	4
3. Results .....	5
3.1. Alcohol Compliance Results .....	5
3.2. Tobacco Compliance Results .....	8
4. Recommendations .....	11
4.1. Recommendations for Compliance Inspection Forms .....	11

## List of Tables

Table 3.3. Alcohol Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by City .....	6
Table 3.4. Alcohol Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by County .....	7
Table 3.1. Tobacco Compliance Rate and Number of Infractions by City.....	9
Table 3.2. Tobacco Compliance Rate and Number of Infractions by County.....	10

# Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Compliance Checks, 2008

## 1. Summary

In January, 2008 the Wyoming Association of Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police (WASCP) enlisted the Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center (WYSAC) to enter into a database and analyze Wyoming law enforcement tobacco and alcohol compliance inspection forms.

Data entry began in March and concluded on September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2008. After the inspection forms were entered, the dataset was analyzed. Summary tables are found in Section 3 of this report. A total of 1133 alcohol and 819 tobacco inspection compliance forms were entered. Of those, 1083 alcohol and 817 tobacco forms were found to be valid and subsequently included in analyses.

## 2. Method

Inspection forms were delivered to WYSAC by the Wyoming Association of Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police. Forms were hand entered by trained WYSAC staff into a custom-built Microsoft Access Database.

Once data input was completed, the database was imported into SPSS 15.0 where cross-tabulations and frequency tables were generated. Finally, the database was converted into a Microsoft Excel file for electronic delivery to WASCP.

Inspection forms indicating only a warning was issued were considered a violation of compliancy for data analysis purposes, though no citations were issued. Data which represented an unsuccessful attempt (i.e., business closed, no longer selling alcohol/tobacco, educational check) were considered a null attempt and not included in the total compliance check count or calculations. Compliance rates were calculated by dividing the number of non-infractions reported by the number of compliance checks performed. This rate is considered valid because all compliance forms had a resolution resulting in no data considered missing.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Alcohol Compliance Checks Results

1133 alcohol compliance check forms were submitted to WYSAC. After removing null attempt checks, because the establishment was closed or did not serve alcohol or the check was for educational purposes, a total of 1083 valid checks were used for calculations.

Inspection forms indicating only a warning was issued were considered a violation of compliance for data analysis purposes, though no citations were issued. Data which represented an unsuccessful attempt because the business was closed were considered a null attempt and not included in the total compliance check count or calculations. Compliance rates were calculated by dividing the number of non-infractions reported by the number of compliance checks performed. Each qualifying establishment received one of three values: no violation, a citation (for prohibited sales to minors, knowingly allowed minors in licensed room, or both), or a warning.

Forms were returned for 16 counties, the same number as in 2007, and 40 cities, which is 9 more than in 2007. Table 3.1. displays the alcohol compliance rate and infraction listed by city. Overall statewide compliance for all reporting counties and cities was 79.1%, which is a decrease of 2 percentage points from 81.1% in 2007. It should be noted that different cities submitted different amounts of checks between 2007 and 2008 so this comparison should not be considered as a "statewide compliance" but rather a comparison of the overall compliance rates of 2007 and 2008.

The cities of Alcova, Barnum, Hillsdale, Hudson, Kinnear, LaBarge, Pavillion, Shoshoni, and Thayne all had perfect compliance rates of 100%. Afton, Riverton, and Torrington had compliance rates between 90% and 99.9%. Cheyenne, Cody, Douglas, Evanston, Glenrock, Green River, Kemmerer, Lander, and Powell all had compliance rates between 80% and 89.9%. The cities of Casper, Gillette, Jackson, Laramie, Lovell, Rock Springs, and Sheridan had rates between 70% and 79.9%. Alpine, Cokeville, Dubois, Evansville, and Rawlins had rates between 60% and 69.9% while Midwest, Thermopolis, and Wilson were between 30% and 50%. The cities of Burns, Edgerton, Star Valley, and Teton Village all had compliance rates of 0%. It should be noted that for many of these cities there were very small sample sizes (5 or less) which can result in more extreme rates (100% or 0%).

Results by county, presented in Table 3.2, indicate that Goshen county had the highest compliance rate at 94.6% and Fremont county was also above 90% compliant. The counties of Converse, Laramie, Lincoln, Park, and Uinta all had compliance rates between 80% and 89.9%. Albany, Big Horn, Campbell, Natrona, Sheridan, and Sweetwater counties all had rates between 70% and 79.9% while Carbon and Teton counties were between 60% and 69.9%. Hot Springs county had the lowest reported alcohol compliance rate at 44.4%.

Table 3.1. Alcohol Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by City

County	City	Compliance Checks	No Infractions	Prohibited Sales Violation	Allows Minor Access Violation	Warning	Compliance Rate
Lincoln	Afton	18	17	1	0	0	94.4%
Natrona	Alcova	3	3	0	0	0	100.0%
Lincoln	Alpine	15	10	5	0	0	66.7%
Johnson	Barnum	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Laramie	Burns	1	0	1	0	0	0.0%
Natrona	Casper	158	122	35	0	1	77.2%
Laramie	Cheyenne	136	114	20	0	2	83.8%
Park	Cody	47	40	6	0	1	85.1%
Lincoln	Cokeville	3	2	1	0	0	66.7%
Converse	Douglas	15	12	3	0	0	80.0%
Fremont	Dubois	3	2	1	0	0	66.7%
Natrona	Edgerton	2	0	2	0	0	0.0%
Uinta	Evanston	71	57	14	0	0	80.3%
Natrona	Evansville	6	4	2	0	0	66.7%
Campbell	Gillette	22	16	6	0	0	72.7%
Converse	Glenrock	12	10	2	0	0	83.3%
Sweetwater	Green River	12	10	2	0	0	83.3%
Laramie	Hillsdale	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Fremont	Hudson	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Teton	Jackson	83	60	17	0	6	72.3%
Lincoln	Kemmerer	18	15	2	0	1	83.3%
Fremont	Kinnear	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Lincoln	LaBarge	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Fremont	Lander	30	26	3	0	1	86.7%
Albany	Laramie	67	51	16	0	0	76.1%
Big Horn	Lovell	7	5	2	0	0	71.4%
Natrona	Midwest	2	1	1	0	0	50.0%
Fremont	Pavillion	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Park	Powell	66	57	7	0	2	86.4%
Carbon	Rawlins	33	23	9	0	1	69.7%
Fremont	Riverton	51	48	3	0	0	94.1%
Sweetwater	Rock Springs	88	63	25	0	0	71.6%
Sheridan	Sheridan	48	35	12	0	1	72.9%
Fremont	Shoshoni	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Lincoln	Star Valley	1	0	1	0	0	0.0%
Teton	Teton Village	2	0	2	0	0	0.0%
Lincoln	Thayne	4	4	0	0	0	100.0%
Hot Springs	Thermopolis	9	4	5	0	0	44.4%
Goshen	Torrington	37	35	2	0	0	94.6%
Teton	Wilson	3	1	2	0	0	33.3%
<b>Total</b>		<b>1083</b>	<b>857</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>79.1%</b>

Table 3.2. Alcohol Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by County

<b>County</b>	<b>Compliances Checks</b>	<b>No Infractions</b>	<b>Prohibited Sales Violation</b>	<b>Allows Minor Access Violation</b>	<b>Warning</b>	<b>Compliance Rate</b>
Albany	67	51	16	0	0	76.1%
Big Horn	7	5	2	0	0	71.4%
Campbell	22	16	6	0	0	72.7%
Carbon	33	23	9	0	1	69.7%
Converse	27	22	5	0	0	81.5%
Fremont	89	81	7	0	1	91.0%
Goshen	37	35	2	0	0	94.6%
Hot Springs	9	4	5	0	0	44.4%
Laramie	139	116	21	0	2	83.5%
Lincoln	61	50	10	0	1	82.0%
Natrona	172	131	40	0	1	76.2%
Park	113	97	13	0	3	85.8%
Sheridan	48	35	12	0	1	72.9%
Sweetwater	100	73	27	0	0	73.0%
Teton	88	61	21	0	6	69.3%
Uinta	71	57	14	0	0	80.3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>1083</b>	<b>857</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>79.1%</b>

### 3.2. Tobacco Compliance Checks Results

819 tobacco compliance checks were submitted and entered in the database. After removal of null attempts (business was closed) a total of 817 checks were analyzed.

Inspection forms indicating only a warning was issued were considered a violation of compliance for data analysis purposes, though no citations were issued. Data which represented an unsuccessful attempt because the business was closed were considered a null attempt and not included in the total compliance check count or calculations. Compliance rates were calculated by dividing the number of non-infractions reported by the number of compliance checks performed.

Forms were returned for 16 counties, the same as in 2007, and 33 cities, an increase of 7 from 2007. Table 3.3. displays the tobacco compliance rate and infraction frequency listed by city. Overall statewide compliance was 83.4%, a decrease of 3.6 percentage points from 87.0% in 2007. It should be noted that different cities submitted different amounts of checks between 2007 and 2008 so this comparison should not be considered as a "statewide compliance" but rather a comparison of the overall compliance rates of 2007 and 2008.

The cities of Afton, Cokeville, Dubois, Etna, Evansville, Green River, LaBarge, Midvale, Shoshoni, Ten Sleep, and Torrington all had perfect compliance rates of 100%. The cities of Cheyenne, Douglas, Jackson, Powell, and Riverton all had rates of 90% or greater. The rates for cities of Casper, Kemmerer, and Lander were between 80% and 89.9%. The cities of Alpine, Laramie, Mills, Rawlins, Rock Springs, and Thayne all had compliance rates between 70% and 79.9%, while Evanston and Sheridan were between 60% and 69.9%. Gillette, Thermopolis, and Worland were between 30% and 50% compliant. Lastly, Bar Nunn, Kinnear, and Pavillion had compliance rates of 0%, though these three locations had only a sample size of one.

Results by county, presented in Table 3.4, indicate that Goshen had a perfect compliance rate of 100%. The counties of Converse, Laramie, Park, and Teton all returned compliance rates below 100% and above 90.0%. Fremont, Lincoln, Natrona, and Sweetwater counties had rates between 80% and 89.9%. Albany and Carbon county compliance rates were between 70% and 79.9%. Sheridan and Uinta counties had compliance rates between 60% and 69.9%, while Campbell and Washakie counties were between 50.0% and 59.9% compliant. Hot Springs county was 33.3% compliant, the lowest rate reported.



Table 3.3. Tobacco Compliance Rate and Number of Infractions by City

County	City	Compliance Checks	No Infractions	Prohibited Sales Violation	Failure to Post Violation	Products Not In Line of Sight Violation	Warning Issued	Compliance Rate
Lincoln	Afton	11	11	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Lincoln	Alpine	13	10	3	0	0	0	76.9%
Natrona	Bar Nunn	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0%
Natrona	Casper	147	128	19	0	0	0	87.1%
Laramie	Cheyenne	150	135	15	0	0	0	90.0%
Lincoln	Cokeville	2	2	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Converse	Douglas	12	11	1	0	0	0	91.7%
Fremont	Dubois	7	7	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Lincoln	Etna	1	1	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Uinta	Evanston	35	24	11	0	0	0	68.6%
Natrona	Evansville	2	2	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Campbell	Gillette	18	9	9	0	0	0	50.0%
Sweetwater	Green River	9	9	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Teton	Jackson	50	46	0	0	0	4	92.0%
Lincoln	Kemmerer	11	9	1	0	0	1	81.8%
Fremont	Kinnear	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0%
Lincoln	LaBarge	2	2	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Fremont	Lander	33	27	6	0	0	0	81.8%
Albany	Laramie	68	54	14	0	0	0	79.4%
Fremont	Midvale	1	1	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Natrona	Mills	12	9	3	0	0	0	75.0%
Fremont	Pavillion	1	0	1	0	0	0	0.0%
Park	Powell	12	11	1	0	0	0	91.7%
Carbon	Rawlins	26	19	7	0	0	0	73.1%
Fremont	Riverton	37	34	3	0	0	0	91.9%
Sweetwater	Rock Springs	48	38	10	0	0	0	79.2%
Sheridan	Sheridan	33	23	10	0	0	0	69.7%
Fremont	Shoshoni	1	1	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Washakie	Ten Sleep	1	1	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Lincoln	Thayne	11	8	3	0	0	0	72.7%
Hot Springs	Thermopolis	9	3	6	0	0	0	33.3%
Goshen	Torrington	40	40	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Washakie	Worland	12	6	6	0	0	0	50.0%
<b>Total</b>		<b>817</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>83.4%</b>

Table 3.4. Tobacco Compliance Rate and Number of Infractions by County

County	Compliance Checks	No Infractions	Prohibited Sales Violation	Failure to Post Violation	Products Not In Line of Sight Violation	Warning Issued	Compliance Rate
Albany	68	54	14	0	0	0	79.4%
Campbell	18	9	9	0	0	0	50.0%
Carbon	26	19	7	0	0	0	73.1%
Converse	12	11	1	0	0	0	91.7%
Fremont	81	70	11	0	0	0	86.4%
Goshen	40	40	0	0	0	0	100.0%
Hot Springs	9	3	6	0	0	0	33.3%
Laramie	150	135	15	0	0	0	90.0%
Lincoln	51	43	7	0	0	1	84.3%
Natrona	162	139	23	0	0	0	85.8%
Park	12	11	1	0	0	0	91.7%
Sheridan	33	23	10	0	0	0	69.7%
Sweetwater	57	47	10	0	0	0	82.5%
Teton	50	46	0	0	0	4	92.0%
Uinta	35	24	11	0	0	0	68.6%
Washakie	13	7	6	0	0	0	53.8%
<b>Total</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>681</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>83.4%</b>

## 4. Recommendations

The following is a list of recommendations to consider regarding data collection for the Wyoming Tobacco and Alcohol Compliance Program. WYSAC believes that integration of all or some of these recommendations would sustainably improve the quality of data collected and increase the amount of analyses that could be performed. The following recommendations are for compliance forms in general. Some of these issues may already be addressed individually in either the alcohol or tobacco form, though not in both.

### 4.1. Recommendations for Compliance Inspection Forms

1. **Standardized forms:** A number of compliance forms differed from each other. This can cause inconsistency in filling them out as well as limiting comparative ability between cities or counties. If at all possible, it would be recommended that all cities and counties use the same forms in order to make valid comparisons. Additionally, creating alcohol and tobacco forms that are more similar may help relieve issues of incomplete forms and make data more consistent and useful.
2. **Warnings:** Warnings are neither a citation nor do they warrant “congratulations.” On some forms this fact posed a problem because it was impossible to assign a value for warnings when one was given. All forms should have a warnings checkbox.
3. **Bond Schedule Limits:** Often forms were not completely filled out; especially the bond schedule section. In addition, the bond schedule section was usually limited to 1-3 offenses; however, in some cases the bond schedule needs to be adjusted for 4 (or greater) offenses. A few forms included this option already, and it is recommended that a box be placed on all other forms to allow for a ‘4 or more’ value.
4. **Null Attempts:** Occasionally officers would attempt to check the compliance of an establishment but the establishment was closed, out of business, or no longer selling alcohol or tobacco. It is suggested that a null attempt variable or value be added to the form in order to denote that an attempt was made but was unsuccessful. This would help prevent officers from coding a null attempt incorrectly as a “congratulations” or “no infractions.”
5. **Measurement Error:** In order to minimize measurement error or entry error, it might be helpful to produce a guide for officers on how to fill out this form. There was a great deal of variation concerning how officers completed these forms, both between officers and between cities/counties. Standardizing the completion of these forms by creating a short list of guidelines for officers to reference is suggested.

6. **Statewide Compliance Rate:** It is impossible to make direct comparisons between years of statewide tobacco compliance with different counties and cities being measured. The composite statewide score could be more accurate if it included all counties and cities in Wyoming. However, it is acknowledged that this is a very tenuous and difficult task, but any effort that could increase measurements of compliance for the same counties and cities each year would be an improvement.
  
7. **Attempts vs. Purchases:** Often officers recorded an item on the “purchased” line but completed the inspection form as “congratulations.” It is recommended that a new variable be created on the forms which would allow officers to record an item and then indicate if it was “purchased” or “attempted” in order to avoid confusion.