



Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center
UNIVERSITY OF WYOMING

Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks, 2019

WYSAC Technical Report No. SRC-1906

October, 2019

Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks, 2019

By

Mike Dorssom, M.A., Associate Research Scientist

With the assistance of

Bistra Anatchkova, Ph.D., Survey Research Manager

Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center

University of Wyoming

1000 E. University Ave, Dept. 3925

Laramie, WY 82071

(307) 766-2189 • wysac@uwyo.edu

<http://wysac.uwyo.edu>

Citation for this document: WYSAC (2019) *Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks, 2019*, by Dorssom, M. (WYSAC Technical Report No. SRC-1906). Laramie, WY: Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center, University of Wyoming.

Short reference: WYSAC (2019), *Alcohol and Tobacco Sales Compliance*.

© Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center, 2019.

Table of Contents

1.	Summary	4
2.	Methodology	4
2.1.	Compliance Checks	4
2.2.	Data Entry and Analyses	5
3.	Results	6
3.1.	Compliance Checks Counts (2007 – 2019)	6
3.2.	Alcohol Sales Compliance Checks Results	7
3.3.	Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks Results	13

List of Tables

Table 3.1.	Alcohol Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by County (2019)*	9
Table 3.2.	Alcohol Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by Municipality- 2019 (A-H)	10
Table 3.2.	Alcohol Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by Municipality- 2019 (J-U)	11
Table 3.3.	Summary of Alcohol Sales Compliance Rates by Municipality (2019)	12
Table 3.4.	Tobacco Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by County (2019)*	15
Table 3.5.	Tobacco Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by Municipality- 2019 (A-K)	16
Table 3.5.	Tobacco Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by Municipality- 2019 (L-Y)	17
Table 3.6.	Summary of Tobacco Sales Compliance Rates by Municipality (2019)	18

List of Figures

Figure 3-1:	Total Number of Compliance Checks (2007–2019)	6
Figure 3-2:	Number of Regions Submitting Alcohol Sales Compliance Checks (2007– 2019)	7
Figure 3-3:	Number of Regions Submitting Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks (2007– 2019)	13

Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks, 2019

1. Summary

In August 2019 the Wyoming Association of Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police (WASCOP) engaged the Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center (WYSAC) to complete data entry, analysis, and reporting for the annual alcohol and tobacco sales compliance inspection checks performed by Wyoming police officers. This marks the eleventh consecutive year that WYSAC has handled this project.

Data entry began in August and concluded in October 2019. After all inspection forms were entered into a database, the data were cleaned and then analyzed. The results are summarized in tables found in Section 3 of this report. A total of 1,337 alcohol and 878 tobacco sales compliance inspection forms were received by WYSAC and entered in the database. Of those, 1222 (91.4%) alcohol and 840 (95.7%) tobacco forms were determined to be valid and subsequently included in the analyses.

The analyses show that, for all businesses where valid checks were completed, the overall compliance rate was 87.4% for alcohol sales and 89.3% for tobacco sales.

2. Methodology

2.1. Compliance Checks

Police officers, in conjunction with an underage youth buyer, attempted alcohol and tobacco purchases statewide. Checks are most often conducted at brick and mortar stores. Occasionally in the past, vendors at special events (such as the Cheyenne Frontier Days) have also been checked. Aside from the type of item purchased, the protocol for completing these checks is the same for both alcohol and tobacco sales. It involves criminal compliance checks, which are “used to educate, encourage compliance, and penalize non-compliance. These operations consist of prosecuting individuals for age-of-sale law violations through the court system.”¹

Prior to any compliance check purchase attempt, the youth buyer is:

- Photographed,
- Searched for additional cash or alternative identification,
- Taught the state or local statute explaining the law regarding underage purchasing, and
- Instructed to stay in line of sight of accompanying officers

The item to be purchased (i.e., bottle of Bud Light, pack of Marlboro Blues) is established beforehand. During buy attempts it is preferable for two officers to accompany the youth buyer, though this is not always a viable option due to small precincts and other engagements of officers. Buyers carry their

¹ Nelson-Bragg, T. (2011). *State of Wyoming Compliance Check Manual*. Published by the Wyoming Department of Health, Behavioral Health Division and Wyoming Association of Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police.

own personal identification, often a Wyoming driver's license, and are instructed to present it to any requesting clerks. If a purchase attempt is successful the clerk is issued a citation, or, less often, they are issued a warning.

The alcohol compliance checks included in this year's analysis were completed from August 2018 through June 2019 and the tobacco checks from December 2018 through June 2019.

2.2. Data Entry and Analyses

WYSAC was instructed to download electronic scans of the compliance check forms from WASCOP's website. Forms were manually entered by trained WYSAC staff into two custom-built Microsoft Access Databases; one each for alcohol and tobacco checks. All officers who did not properly finish their inspection forms were contacted by telephone for clarification in an attempt to fill missing data, a process which ran from September to October 2019.

Once data input was completed, the database was imported into SPSS for processing, where cross-tabulations and frequency tables were generated. Finally, the databases were converted into Microsoft Excel files for electronic delivery to WASCOP.

Inspection forms indicating only a warning was issued were considered a violation of compliance for data analysis purposes, though no citations were issued. Inspection forms which indicated an unsuccessful attempt (i.e. business closed, no longer selling alcohol/tobacco) were considered a null attempt and not included in the total valid compliance check count or data analysis. In a few cases, blank or extremely incomplete compliance check forms were submitted. These forms were not counted toward the total. Of the 1,337 alcohol forms submitted, 1,222 were categorized as valid, 113 as null, and 2 as incomplete. Of the 878 submitted tobacco forms, 840 were categorized as valid and 38 as null.


Compliance rates are calculated by dividing the number of non-infractions reported by the number of valid compliance checks performed. This rate is considered valid since all compliance forms included in the calculations had a *resolution*, thus leaving no missing data associated with them.

3. Results

3.1. Compliance Checks Counts (2007 – 2019)

The total number of compliance checks forms submitted each year from 2007 to 2019 is shown below in Figure 3-1. These totals include forms that were not used in the calculation of compliance rates, such as for businesses that were closed. Each year the number of completed forms for compliance with alcohol sales submitted to WYSAC for data entry and analysis has been substantially higher than those for tobacco sales. This year saw an increase in the number of both alcohol and tobacco compliance checks submitted as compared to 2018.

Figure 3-1: Total Number of Compliance Checks (2007–2019)




3.2. Alcohol Sales Compliance Checks Results

In 2019, a total of 1,337 alcohol compliance check forms were submitted to WYSAC. After removing null attempts, 1,222 forms were determined to be valid checks and included in the calculations of compliance rates.

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 valid compliance checks performed. Each qualifying establishment received one of three values: no violation/no infraction, violation/citation, or warning.

As shown in Figure 3-2 below, valid alcohol forms were returned for 17 of 23 Wyoming counties. A total of 59 Wyoming cities, unincorporated communities (such as Hiland), and census-designated places (such as Alcova) submitted valid forms, which is 16 more than in 2018. The number of checks returned varied greatly from one municipality to another; Cheyenne submitted the highest number of valid inspections (182), followed by Casper (151), and many small municipalities completed as few as one inspection. (See Table 3.2)

Figure 3-2: Number of Regions Submitting Alcohol Sales Compliance Checks (2007–2019)



Following are the results from the alcohol compliance checks performed as part of the 2019 statewide compliance checks report. Compliance rates are presented first by county (Table 3.1), then by municipality (Table 3.2). In the county table, the name of each location is followed by a superscripted number which represents its relative ranking, with the highest compliance rate given a rank of one.

Overall alcohol sales compliance for all reporting counties and cities was 87.4%, which is slightly worse than 2018² when the overall alcohol compliance was 88.9%. It should be noted that different municipalities have submitted checks each year, so this comparison should not be considered representative of the "statewide compliance rate" but rather a comparison of the overall compliance rates for those municipalities that submitted forms.

Results by county, presented in Table 3.1 displays the alcohol sales compliance rates and violations/infractions for counties listed alphabetically. It indicate that Johnson County had the highest alcohol compliance rate at 100%, followed by Sublette (96.2%) and Freemont (96.1%).

Table 3.2 displays the alcohol sales compliance rates and violations/infractions for municipalities listed alphabetically.

Table 3.3 summarizes municipalities in groups of decreasing compliance. Sixteen municipalities had a 100% compliance rate. Many of these municipalities had very small sample sizes (5 or less) which are more likely to result in extreme rates (100% or 0%).

² WYSAC (2018) *Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Compliance Checks, 2018*, by Dorssom, M. (WYSAC Technical Report No. SRC-1808). Laramie, WY: Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center, University of Wyoming.

Table 3.1. Alcohol Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by County (2019)*

County	Valid Tobacco Compliance Checks	No Infractions	Prohibited Sales Violation	Prohibited Sales Warning	Closed or Does Not Sell Tobacco	Compliance Rate
Albany ¹³	101	84	15	2	7	83.2%
Campbell ⁴	46	44	2	0	7	95.7%
Carbon ¹⁵	9	7	2	0	1	77.8%
Converse ⁸	73	66	7	0	8	90.4%
Fremont ³	76	73	3	0	16	96.1%
Goshen ⁵	39	37	2	0	0	94.9%
Johnson ¹	15	15	0	0	1	100.0%
Laramie ¹¹	183	160	20	3	0	87.4%
Lincoln ⁷	55	51	1	3	0	92.7%
Natrona ¹²	179	152	26	1	18	84.9%
Niobrara ¹⁴	15	12	3	0	0	80.0%
Park ⁶	70	66	4	0	0	94.3%
Sheridan ¹⁰	89	79	10	0	8	88.8%
Sublette ²	26	25	1	0	0	96.2%
Sweetwater ¹⁶	114	88	26	0	0	77.2%
Teton ¹⁷	61	45	15	1	6	73.8%
Uinta ⁹	71	64	7	0	0	90.1%
Total	1222	1068	144	10	72	87.4%

* The name of each location is followed by a superscripted number which represents its relative ranking, with the highest compliance rate given a rank of one.

Table 3.2. Alcohol Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by Municipality-2019 (A-H)

City	County	Valid Tobacco Compliance Checks	No Infractions	Prohibited Sales Violation	Prohibited Sales Warning	Closed or Does Not Sell Tobacco	Compliance Rate
Afton	Lincoln	18	18	0	0	0	100.0%
Alcova	Natrona	4	2	2	0	0	50.0%
Alpine	Lincoln	16	14	1	1	0	87.5%
Atlantic City	Fremont	5	5	0	0	1	100.0%
Bar Nunn	Natrona	4	4	0	0	0	100.0%
Bear River	Uinta	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Big Piney	Sublette	2	1	1	0	0	50.0%
Bill	Converse	3	3	0	0	0	100.0%
Boulder	Sublette	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Buffalo	Johnson	15	15	0	0	1	100.0%
Burns	Laramie	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Casper	Natrona	151	129	21	1	16	85.4%
Cheyenne	Laramie	182	159	21	3	0	87.4%
Cody	Park	56	52	4	0	0	92.9%
Cokeville	Lincoln	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Daniel	Sublette	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Douglas	Converse	63	59	4	0	3	93.7%
Dubois	Fremont	6	6	0	0	6	100.0%
Edgerton	Natrona	3	2	1	0	1	66.7%
Etna	Lincoln	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Evanston	Uinta	62	55	7	0	0	88.7%
Evansville	Natrona	13	11	2	0	1	84.6%
Fort Bridger	Uinta	3	3	0	0	0	100.0%
Fort Laramie	Goshen	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Gillette	Campbell	46	44	2	0	7	95.7%
Glenrock	Converse	6	3	3	0	2	50.0%
Green River	Sweetwater	22	22	0	0	0	100.0%
Hawk Springs	Goshen	1	0	1	0	0	0.0%
Hiland	Natrona	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Hudson	Fremont	2	2	0	0	2	100.0%

Table continued on next page.

Table 3.2. Alcohol Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by Municipality-2019 (J-U)

City	County	Valid Tobacco Compliance Checks	No Infractions	Prohibited Sales Violation	Prohibited Sales Warning	Closed or Does Not Sell Tobacco	Compliance Rate
Jackson	Teton	61	45	15	1	6	73.8%
Jeffery City	Fremont	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Kemmerer	Lincoln	16	15	0	1	0	93.8%
Kinnear	Fremont	3	3	0	0	2	100.0%
La Grange	Goshen	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Lance	Niobrara	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Lander	Fremont	27	25	2	0	0	92.6%
Laramie	Albany	101	84	15	2	7	83.2%
Lingle	Goshen	4	4	0	0	0	100.0%
Lost Springs	Converse	0	0	0	0	2	N/A
Lusk	Niobrara	13	11	2	0	0	84.6%
Lysite	Fremont	0	0	0	0	2	N/A
Manville	Niobrara	1	0	1	0	0	0.0%
Marbleton	Sublette	3	3	0	0	0	100.0%
Midwest	Natrona	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Mountain View	Uinta	3	3	0	0	0	100.0%
Pavillion	Fremont	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Pinedale	Sublette	18	18	0	0	0	100.0%
Powder River	Natrona	0	0	0	0	0	N/A
Powell	Park	14	14	0	0	0	100.0%
Rawlins	Carbon	9	7	2	0	1	77.8%
Riverton	Fremont	27	26	1	0	1	96.3%
Rock Springs	Sweetwater	92	66	26	0	0	71.7%
Rolling Hills	Converse	1	1	0	0	1	100.0%
Sheridan	Sheridan	89	79	10	0	8	88.8%
Shoshoni	Fremont	2	2	0	0	2	100.0%
Thayne	Lincoln	2	1	0	1	0	50.0%
Torrington	Goshen	31	30	1	0	0	96.8%
Urie	Uinta	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Total		1222	1068	144	10	72	87.4%

Table 3.3. Summary of Alcohol Sales Compliance Rates by Municipality (2019)

100%	99.9% - 90.0%	89.9% - 80.0%	79.9% - 70.0%	69.9% - 60.0%	59.9% - 0.0%
Afton	Torrington 96.8%	Sheridan 88.8%	Rawlins 77.8%	Edgerton 66.7%	Alcova 50.0%
Atlantic City	Riverton 96.3%	Evanston 88.7%	Jackson 73.8%		Big Piney 50.0%
Bar Nunn	Gillette 95.7%	Alpine 87.5%	Rock Springs 71.7%		Glenrock 50.0%
Bear River	Kemmerer 93.8%	Cheyenne 87.4%			Thayne 50.0%
Bill	Douglas 93.7%	Casper 85.4%			Hawk Springs 0.0%
Boulder	Cody 92.9%	Evansville 84.6%			Manville 0.0%
Buffalo	Lander 92.6%	Lusk 84.6%			
Burns		Laramie 83.2%			
Cokeville					
Daniel					
Dubois					
Etna					
Fort Bridger					
Fort Laramie					
Green River					
Hiland					
Hudson					
Jeffery City					
Kinnear					
La Grange					
Lance					
Lingle					
Marbleton					
Midwest					
Mountain View					
Pavillion					
Pinedale					
Powell					
Rolling Hills					
Shoshoni					
Urie					


3.3. Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks Results

In total, 878 tobacco sales compliance checks were submitted to WYSAC and entered into a database. After removal of null attempts, 840 checks were included in the calculations and analysis.

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 or no longer sells tobacco were considered a null attempt and not included in the total compliance check counts or calculations. Compliance rates were calculated by dividing the number of non-infractions reported by the number of compliance checks performed.

As shown below in Figure 3.3, valid tobacco sales compliance checks forms were returned for 16 Wyoming counties, one less than in 2018. However, 14 more municipalities submitted in compliance checks in 2019 (50) compared to 2018 (36). Historically there have been substantially fewer municipalities receiving tobacco sales compliance checks than alcohol sales compliance checks.

Figure 3-3: Number of Regions Submitting Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks (2007–2019)



Following are the results from the tobacco compliance checks performed in 2019. Compliance rates are presented first by county (Table 3.4), then by municipality (Table 3.5). In the county table, the name of each location is followed by a superscripted number which represents its relative ranking, with the highest compliance rate given a rank of one.

Overall tobacco sales compliance for all reporting counties and cities was 89.3%, down from 2018³, when the compliance rate was 94.5%. It should be noted that different municipalities have submitted checks each year, so this comparison should not be considered representative of the "statewide compliance rate" but rather a comparison of the overall compliance rates for those municipalities that submitted forms.

Results by county, presented in Table 3.4, indicate that no county had a perfect tobacco sales compliance rate although the vast majority had compliance rates above 80%. Goshen County had the lowest compliance rate of 76.3%.

Table 3.5 displays the compliance rates and infractions for all 50 municipalities that returned tobacco sales compliance checks, listed in alphabetical order.

Table 3.6 presents the tobacco sales compliance rates for all municipalities organized into groups of decreasing compliance. Twenty-two municipalities had perfect compliance rates. It should be noted that for many of these municipalities the sample sizes were very small (5 or less) which is more likely to result in extreme rates (100% or 0%).

³ WYSAC (2018) *Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Compliance Checks, 2018*, by Dorssom, M. (WYSAC Technical Report No. SRC-1808). Laramie, WY: Wyoming Survey & Analysis Center, University of Wyoming.

Table 3.4. Tobacco Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by County (2019)*

County	Valid Tobacco Compliance Checks	No Infractions	Prohibited Sales Violation	Prohibited Sales Warning	Closed or Does Not Sell Tobacco	Compliance Rate
Albany ²	63	61	2	0	1	96.8%
Campbell ⁵	29	26	3	0	0	89.7%
Converse ¹⁵	22	17	3	2	3	77.3%
Fremont ¹	66	64	2	0	0	97.0%
Goshen ¹⁶	38	29	9	0	1	76.3%
Johnson ⁹	29	25	4	0	8	86.2%
Laramie ³	154	143	11	0	1	92.9%
Lincoln ¹⁰	52	44	1	7	3	84.6%
Natrona ⁴	100	92	8	0	0	92.0%
Niobrara ¹³	12	10	2	0	0	83.3%
Park ¹²	31	26	5	0	0	83.9%
Sheridan ¹¹	45	38	7	0	2	84.4%
Sublette ⁶	59	53	4	2	10	89.8%
Sweetwater ⁷	57	51	6	0	1	89.5%
Teton ¹⁴	30	25	4	1	0	83.3%
Uinta ⁸	53	46	6	1	0	86.8%
Total	840	750	77	13	30	89.3%

* The name of each location is followed by a superscripted number which represents its relative ranking, with the highest compliance rate given a rank of one.

Table 3.5. Tobacco Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by Municipality-2019 (A-K)

City	County	Valid Tobacco Compliance Checks	No Infractions	Prohibited Sales Violation	Prohibited Sales Warning	Closed or Does Not Sell Tobacco	Compliance Rate
Afton	Lincoln	28	23	0	5	1	82.1%
Alcova	Natrona	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Alpine	Lincoln	9	7	0	2	1	77.8%
Big Piney	Sublette	6	6	0	0	1	100.0%
Bill	Converse	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Bondurant	Sublette	0	0	0	0	2	n/a
Boulder	Sublette	3	3	0	0	0	100.0%
Buffalo	Johnson	29	25	4	0	8	86.2%
Casper	Natrona	96	88	8	0	0	91.7%
Cheyenne	Laramie	154	143	11	0	1	92.9%
Cody	Park	26	22	4	0	0	84.6%
Crowheart	Fremont	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Daniel	Sublette	6	6	0	0	0	100.0%
Douglas	Converse	18	15	2	1	1	83.3%
Dubois	Fremont	6	6	0	0	0	100.0%
Etna	Lincoln	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Evanston	Uinta	49	44	5	0	0	89.8%
Fort Bridger	Uinta	3	2	0	1	0	66.7%
Ft Laramie	Goshen	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Gillette	Campbell	29	26	3	0	0	89.7%
Glenrock	Converse	0	0	0	0	1	n/a
Green River	Sweetwater	8	8	0	0	0	100.0%
Hawk Springs	Goshen	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Hiland	Natrona	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Jackson	Teton	30	25	4	1	0	83.3%
Kemmerer	Lincoln	8	7	1	0	0	87.5%
Kinnear	Fremont	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%

Table continued on next page.

Table 3.5. Tobacco Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by Municipality-2019 (L-Y)

City	County	Valid Tobacco Compliance Checks	No Infractions	Prohibited Sales Violation	Prohibited Sales Warning	Closed or Does Not Sell Tobacco	Compliance Rate
La Grange	Goshen	4	4	0	0	0	100.0%
Lander	Fremont	27	25	2	0	0	92.6%
Laramie	Albany	63	61	2	0	1	96.8%
Lingle	Goshen	4	4	0	0	0	100.0%
Lost Springs	Converse	0	0	0	0	1	n/a
Lusk	Niobrara	10	8	2	0	0	80.0%
Lyman	Uinta	1	0	1	0	0	0.0%
Manville	Niobrara	2	2	0	0	0	100.0%
Marbleton	Sublette	12	11	1	0	0	91.7%
Maverik	Fremont	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Midwest	Natrona	1	1	0	0	0	100.0%
Pavillion	Fremont	4	4	0	0	0	100.0%
Pinedale	Sublette	29	25	3	1	7	86.2%
Powell	Park	5	4	1	0	0	80.0%
Riverton	Fremont	18	18	0	0	0	100.0%
Rock Springs	Sweetwater	50	44	6	0	1	88.0%
Rolling Hills	Converse	2	0	1	1	0	0.0%
Sand Draw	Sublette	2	1	0	1	0	50.0%
Sheridan	Sheridan	45	38	7	0	2	84.4%
Shoshoni	Fremont	7	7	0	0	0	100.0%
Thayne	Lincoln	6	6	0	0	1	100.0%
Torrington	Goshen	27	18	9	0	1	66.7%
Yoder	Goshen	0	0	0	0	0	n/a
Total		840	750	77	13	30	89.3%

of Tobacco Sales Compliance Rates by Municipality (2019)

90.0% - 90.0%		89.9% - 80.0%		79.9% - 70.0%		69.9% - 60.0%		59.9% - 0.0%	
e	96.8%	Evanston	89.8%	Alpine	77.8%	Fort Bridger	66.7%	Sand Draw	50.0%
hne	92.9%	Gillette	89.7%			Torrington	66.7%	Lyman	0.0%
	92.6%	Rock Springs	88.0%					Rolling Hills	0.0%
	91.7%	Kemmerer	87.5%						
eton	91.7%	Buffalo	86.2%						
		Pinedale	86.2%						
		Cody	84.6%						
		Sheridan	84.4%						
		Douglas	83.3%						
		Jackson	83.3%						
		Afton	82.1%						
		Lusk	80.0%						
		Powell	80.0%						