|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  1.2.10 Minimum Retail Price, Package, and Volume Size  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy setting a minimum retail sale price for tobacco products in conjunction with minimum package/volume size to reduce sales of low-cost tobacco and nicotine products |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

### Cost and availability of tobacco products

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County (2019) \* | California (2019) \* | Is Solano County doing better or worse than California? |
| Average price for the cheapest pack of cigarettes | $7.09 | $7.11 | Similar |
| % of stores selling Swisher Sweets cigarillo for less than $1.00 | 9.8% | 11.5% | Better |
| % of stores with a price promotion for any tobacco product | 56.1% | 37.2% | Worse |
| % of stores selling single little cigars/cigarillos | 41.5% | 46.3% | Better |
| % of stores selling little cigars/cigarillos in packs of 4 or fewer | 92.7% | 79.0% | Worse |

\* Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community Store Observation Survey.

### Adult tobacco purchase behaviors

**Disparities in the data**

* Men were more likely to buy cigarettes with a special price every time or sometimes (46%) compared to women (31%).
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/cgi0ydhagbm96btyng5k52en9rx7a97v) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California (2019) \*\* |
| % of adult smokers who buy cigarettes with a special price,  even if not usual brand… | |
| Every time | 12.3% |
| Sometimes | 29.7% |
| Very rarely | 29.5% |
| Never | 28.5% |
| % of adult smokers who took advantage of coupons or price promotions the last time they bought cigarettes | 38.7% |

\*\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for   
this question.

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, there is little community awareness about the sale or potential harms of selling small packs of low-cost tobacco products.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, community members have expressed indirect support for policies that set minimum pack sizes and pack prices through other tobacco policy efforts.

**Disparities in the data**

* In California, women were more likely to agree that tobacco products should not be sold at a deep discount (64%) than men (51%).
* In California, Asian residents were more likely to agree that tobacco products should not be sold at a deep discount (72%) or with price promotions (70%) than other race/ethnicity groups. Residents were multiracial or another race/ethnicity were least likely to agree (39%).
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/cgi0ydhagbm96btyng5k52en9rx7a97v) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County (2019) \*\*\* | California  (2019) † |
| % of adults who agree that tobacco products should not be allowed to be sold at a deep discount | 49.0% | 57.5% |
| % of adults who agree that price promotions for tobacco should be banned | NA | 55.2% |
| % of adults who agree that tobacco products like cigarillos or little cigars should be sold in packages of 10 instead of individually | 48.0% | 43.6% |
| % of adults who agree that tobacco products should have a minimum price | 47.0% | NA |

\*\*\* Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community Public Opinion Poll (n=367).  
† Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for this question.

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, finding an appropriate enforcement agency for a policy on minimum pack size/price/volume is challenging even when there is political will to pass the policy.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* January and February 2020: Three supportive articles on Benicia’s tobacco ordinance (Vallejo Times Herald).

## *Policy landscape*

* In December 2019, the Benicia City Council adopted a [tobacco ordinance](https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Benicia/html/Benicia09/Benicia0906.html) that enforced a minimum pack size for low-cost cigars, and enforced minimum pack prices. Benicia is the first—and only—city in Solano County to adopt this ordinance. Benicia was recognized by the American Lung Association as passing the most comprehensive tobacco policy in 2019.[[1]](#footnote-2) Benicia’s ordinance went into effect in 2020. Therefore, there is no data yet available on enforcement.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  2.2.9 Smoke-free Outdoor Non-recreational Public Areas  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy eliminating smoking on the premises of outdoor non-recreational public areas (e.g., walkways, streets, plazas, college/trade school campuses, shopping centers, transit stops, farmers’ markets, swap meets). |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

**Disparities in the data**

* Adults ages 45 to 64 were less likely to be exposed to e-cigarettes (43%) than younger adults. Residents who were multiracial or another race/ethnicity were more likely to be exposed to e-cigarettes (62%) than other race/ethnicity groups.
* Adults ages 25 to 44 were more likely to be exposed to marijuana smoke (63%) than those ages 45 to 65 (46%). Asian residents were less likely to be exposed to marijuana smoke (40%) than other race/ethnicity groups.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/lb6s84ij2uexk789cljz0qmkf2zg89ov) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) \* |
| % of adults exposed to secondhand tobacco smoke in California | 66.6% |
| % of adults exposed to secondhand smoke e-cigarette vapor in California | 50.4% |
| % of adults exposed to secondhand marijuana smoke in California | 54.7% |

\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data   
available for this question.

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, community awareness is high in Benicia due to the existing ordinance. Awareness is likely lower in other jurisdictions in the county, but some communities may believe that smoking in outdoor public spaces is a problem.

**Disparities in the data**

* Adults ages 18 to 24 are less likely to agree that secondhand smoke can cause lung cancer in non-smokers (77%) compared to other adults.
* Those who identify as multiracial or another race/ethnicity are less likely to agree that e-cigarettes and vaping products are harmful (70%) compared to other race/ethnicity groups.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/lb6s84ij2uexk789cljz0qmkf2zg89ov) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) \*\* |
| % of adults who agree that inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette can cause lung cancer in a nonsmoker | 87.1% |
| % of adults who agree that the vapor (aerosol) from e-cigarettes and vaping products is harmful | 83.0% |

\*\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data   
available for this question.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, communities in Vallejo, Benicia, and Dixon have all shown support for restricting smoking in outdoor public spaces.

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* Solano TPEP staff are not currently aware of support for this policy from decision makers in other jurisdictions in the county.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* January and February 2020: Three supportive articles on Benicia’s tobacco ordinance (Vallejo Times Herald).

## *Policy landscape*

* In 2017, Fairfield prohibited smoking within 25 feet of doorways and windows in downtown Fairfield (along Texas Street). The prohibition is limited to this area of Fairfield.
* Solano County has a policy prohibiting smoking in some outdoor service areas.
* Suisun City prohibits smoking at some outdoor public events.
* In the City of Vallejo, there are outdoor transit areas that are smoke-free and most jurisdictions with downtown areas are also smoke-free. There are also smoke-free campuses that include walkways and plazas.
* In December 2019, the Benicia City Council adopted a [tobacco ordinance](https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Benicia/html/Benicia09/Benicia0906.html) that included a ban on smoking in recreational areas, service areas, dining areas, outdoor places of employment, sidewalks in commercial zones, and public outdoor events. Benicia was recognized by the American Lung Association as passing the most comprehensive tobacco policy in 2019.[[2]](#footnote-3) Benicia’s ordinance went into effect in 2020. Therefore, there is no data yet available on enforcement.
* Rio Vista is working on a tobacco ordinance that would include a ban on menthol cigarettes, flavored tobacco, all e-cigarette products, and outdoor smoking. They are motivated by an interest in reducing youth tobacco use, as well as improving their American Lung Association grade.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  2.2.13 Smoke-free Multi-Unit Housing  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy prohibiting smoking in the individual units of multi-unit housing including balconies and patios. |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

### Secondhand smoke exposure

**Disparities in the data**

* In California, adults ages 45 to 64 were less likely to be exposed to e-cigarettes (43%) than younger adults. Residents who were multiracial or another race/ethnicity were more likely to be exposed to e-cigarettes (62%) than other race/ethnicity groups.
* In California, adults ages 25 to 44 were more likely to be exposed to marijuana smoke (63%) than those ages 45 to 65 (46%). Asian residents were less likely to be exposed to marijuana smoke (40%) than other race/ethnicity groups.
* According to the California Health Interview Survey (2015-2019), a higher proportion of Latino (42%), African American (48%), and American Indian/Alaska Native residents (56%) rent their homes in Solano County, compared to white (19%) Asian (21%), Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander (25%) and multiracial (34%) residents.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/t5ah9quqhl25lxgaba67cr0l1bl1wjly) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) \* |
| % of adults exposed to secondhand tobacco smoke in California | 66.6% |
| % of adults exposed to secondhand  e-cigarette vapor in California | 50.4% |
| % of adults exposed to secondhand marijuana smoke in California | 54.7% |

\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available   
for this question.

### Smoking among renters

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County (2018) \*\* | California (2018) \*\* | Is Solano County doing better or worse than California? |
| % of adults who rent that are current smokers | 24.4% | 14.3% | Worse |
| % of adults who rent that are past 30-day e-cigarette users | 7.8% | 7.0% | Worse |

\*\* California Health Interview Survey (CHIS). Data for Solano County are statistically unstable.

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* Solano County TPEP staff report that community members are generally aware that smoking in multi-unit housing is a problem.
* Solano TPEP funded a paid media campaign on smoke-free multi-unit housing in spring 2020, shortly after the COVID-19 stay-at-home orders were first implemented.
* After this paid media campaign, at least one resident wrote a letter to the Mayor of Vallejo expressing interest in a city-wide ban on smoking in multi-unit housing.
* According to Solano TPEP staff, several communities—including Vallejo and Vacaville—have identified smoking in multi-unit housing as an issue.

**Disparities in the data**

* Residents who were multiracial or identified as another race/ethnicity were less likely to agree that vapor from  
  e-cigarettes is harmful (70%) compared to other race/ethnicity groups.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/t5ah9quqhl25lxgaba67cr0l1bl1wjly) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) \*\*\* |
| % of adults who agree that inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette can cause lung cancer in a nonsmoker | 87.1% |
| % of adults who agree that the vapor (aerosol) from e-cigarettes and vaping products is harmful | 83.0% |

\*\*\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for this   
question.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

* At least 19 apartment complexes in Solano County have prohibited smoking policies.
* According to Solano TPEP staff, Vallejo has had several residents who have written letters to the mayor and city council asking for a ban on smoking in multi-unit housing.
* Solano TPEP staff also noted that Benicia residents were strong supporters of smoke-free multi-unit housing as part of Benicia’s larger tobacco ordinance.
* Solano TPEP staff also noted support in Fairfield.
* Community members may be more supportive of smoke-free multi-unit housing policies than most the average policymaker.

**Disparities in the data**

* Asian (74%) and Hispanic/Latino residents (63%) were more likely to support smoke-free multi-unit housing policies. Men (55%) and women (64%) were more likely to support these policies than trans men, trans women, or people who identify as non-binary.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/t5ah9quqhl25lxgaba67cr0l1bl1wjly) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) † |
| % of adults who agree that apartment complexes should require all rental units to be smoke-free, vape-free, and marijuana smoke-free† | 59.2% |
| % of adults who agree that outdoor common areas within apartment or condominium complexes should have designated areas for smoking† | 79.8% |

† Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for   
this question.

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

|  |
| --- |
| Key supports to adoption in Benicia |
| * + - Support from local tenant groups and other residents     - Support from school districts and youth advocates     - Education and organizing of tenants to pass policies     - Work with property owners and managers to enforce policies |
| Key barriers to adoption in Benicia |
| * + - Opposition from smokers, property owners, and residents who may see the policy as government overreach     - Opposition from businesses (including both local and national businesses) |

* The previous mayor in Vallejo was supportive of a multi-unit housing ordinance.
* Key informant interviews indicated that most decision makers are aware of policies that promote smoke-free multi-unit housing. Opinions on these policies were largely split: some believed that residents should be able to do what they want in their own home, and were not interested in government limiting actions in private homes. Others supported the policy because of the adverse effects of second-hand smoke on neighbors.
* During key informant interviews, Vallejo city councilmembers showed interest in a smoke-free multi-unit housing policy. However, they wanted to see more research before acting on any policy proposal.
* Key informant interviews were conducted with six Benicia city officials in 2019. While these interviews focused on strategies for Benicia’s tobacco ordinance, they also offered insights into key supports/barriers to this policy that could inform policy efforts in other jurisdictions.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* January and February 2020: Three supportive articles on Benicia’s tobacco ordinance, including one specifically on its smoke-free multi-unit housing provision (Vallejo Times Herald).

## *Policy landscape*

* In December 2019, the Benicia City Council adopted a [tobacco ordinance](https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Benicia/html/Benicia09/Benicia0906.html) that included a ban on smoking in multi-unit housing (including all living units and common areas). Benicia is the first—and only—city in Solano County to adopt this ordinance. Benicia was recognized by the American Lung Association as passing the most comprehensive tobacco policy in 2019.[[3]](#footnote-4) Benicia’s ordinance went into effect in 2020. Therefore, there is no data yet available on enforcement.
* As of February 2021, Solano TPEP staff are working with Bay Area Community Resources (BACR), a nonprofit serving the larger Bay Area, on a smoke-free multi-unit housing policy in Vallejo. Solano TPEP staff and BACR are coordinating on a strategy to engage city councilmembers at the appropriate time. This included a meeting with the Mayor of Vallejo, who was aware of previous efforts spearheaded by another organization (Fighting Back Partnership). The mayor and other city councilmembers recommended that Solano TPEP and BACR collect more public opinion data to demonstrate support for this policy. BACR is currently working administering a public opinion poll about this policy; data will be available in mid-2021.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  2.2.29 Eliminate Tobacco Product Sales to Address Tobacco Waste  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy that eliminates the sale and distribution of classes of tobacco products, or product packaging, that demonstrably contribute to tobacco product pollution, create single-use plastic waste, or create e-waste, including but not limited to: cigarette filters, cigarette pack waste, plastic cigar tips, cigar packaging sleeves, chew canisters, single use electronic cigarettes, and single use nicotine cartridges. |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) \* |
| % of adults who noticed tobacco product litter in public places… |  |
| Almost always | 37.9% |
| Sometimes | 32.4% |
| Every once in a while | 14.8% |
| Rarely | 7.6% |
| Never | 7.4% |

\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for this question.

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* According to Solano County TPEP staff, environmentalists will likely be aware of this issue. The general population is likely not aware, but may know that tobacco products are a common cause of litter.

**Disparities in the data**

* Adults ages 45 to 64 were less likely to think that cigarette filters are biodegradable (19%), compared to adults ages 18 to 24 (32%) and adults ages 25 to 44 (27%).
* Men (30%) were more likely than women (19%) to believe they were biodegradable.
* African American (35%), Hispanic/Latino (27%) and Asian residents (29%) were more likely than white (18%) and multiracial/other residents (20%) to believe they were biodegradable.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/w5wuuypmvpjbyip82isbcg868vsf9ka5) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California (2019) \*\* |
| % of adults who agree that cigarette butts  damage the environment | 90.2% |
| % of adults who agree that cigarette butts are poisonous to children, pets, and wildlife | 91.0% |
| % of adults who agree that cigarette filters are biodegradable | 24.1% |

\*\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available   
for this question.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

* No local data on this topic was collected during the last plan period   
  (2017-2021).

**Disparities in the data**

* Asian residents (73%) were more likely than other race/ethnicity groups to support a ban on the sale of filtered cigarettes. Residents who identified as multiracial or another race/ethnicity were least likely to support a ban (44%).
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/w5wuuypmvpjbyip82isbcg868vsf9ka5) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California (2019) \*\*\* |
| % of adults who would support a government policy to ban the sale of filtered cigarettes | 58.8% |
| % of adults who would support a government policy to ban the sale of single-use tobacco product | 69.3% |

\*\*\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data   
available for this question.

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* Overall, Solano County TPEP staff report there has been very little support for addressing this issue.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* There has been no unpaid media in the past year on this topic.

## *Policy landscape*

* Currently, there are no known jurisdictions with a policy that eliminates the sale and distribution of major waste-producing tobacco product classes.
* There are no active policy efforts to eliminate the sale and distribution of major waste-producing tobacco product sales.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  2.2.35 Smoke-free Outdoor Public Places  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a comprehensive policy eliminating smoking in outdoor recreational and non-recreational public places (including beaches, parks, sidewalks, dining, entryways, worksites, event sites, bike lanes/paths, alleys, parking structures) without designated smoking areas or distances. |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

### Secondhand smoke exposure

**Disparities in the data**

* Adults ages 45 to 64 were less likely to be exposed to e-cigarettes (43%) than younger adults. Residents who were multiracial or another race/ethnicity were more likely to be exposed to e-cigarettes (62%) than other race/ethnicity groups.
* Adults ages 25 to 44 were more likely to be exposed to marijuana smoke (63%) than those ages 45 to 65 (46%). Asian residents were less likely to be exposed to marijuana smoke (40%) than other race/ethnicity groups.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/3fc20dhkac8axdscr9zb993zfgk365se) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) \* |
| % of adults exposed to secondhand tobacco smoke in California | 66.6% |
| % of adults exposed to secondhand smoke e-cigarette vapor in California | 50.4% |
| % of adults exposed to secondhand marijuana smoke in California | 54.7% |

\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data   
available for this question.

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, awareness about smoke-free outdoor spaces is generally high due to tobacco use prevention efforts run by youth organizations such as the Solano County Youth Coalition and the Solano County Office of Education’s Friday Night Live program.
* According to Solano TPEP staff, awareness is high in Vallejo and Dixon. Awareness is also high in Benicia due to their existing ordinance. Awareness was initially lower in Rio Vista, and may have increased because of their efforts to promote smoke-free public places.
* Some community members may not know the extent of public places that can have a policy to eliminate smoking.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) \*\* |
| % of adults who agree that inhaling smoke from someone else's cigarette can cause lung cancer in a nonsmoker | 87.1% |
| % of adults who agree that the vapor (aerosol) from e-cigarettes and vaping products is harmful | 83.0% |

\*\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS).   
No local data available for this question.

**Disparities in the data**

* Adults ages 18 to 24 are less likely to agree that secondhand smoke can cause lung cancer in non-smokers (77%) compared to other adults.
* Those who identify as multiracial or another race/ethnicity are less likely to agree that e-cigarettes and vaping products are harmful (70%) compared to other race/ethnicity groups.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/3fc20dhkac8axdscr9zb993zfgk365se) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, community members in Dixon have shown support for smoke-free outdoor public spaces.

**Disparities in the data**

* In general, women were more likely than men to support smoking bans in all of these locations. Asian residents were also more likely than other race/ethnicity groups to support a ban in all of these locations. Residents who identify as multiracial or another race/ethnicity were less likely to support a ban.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/3fc20dhkac8axdscr9zb993zfgk365se) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) \*\*\* |
| % of adults who agree that smoking should not be allowed in outdoor dining areas at restaurants | 80.3% |
| % of adults who agree that smoking should not be allowed at public beaches | 71.7% |
| % of adults who agree that smoking should not be allowed in outdoor entertainment areas, such as amusement parks, zoos, and fairgrounds | 78.3% |
| % of adults who agree that smoking should not be allowed at public parks | 71.4% |
| % of adults who agree that people should be protected from breathing in secondhand marijuana smoke or vapor in any public places | 81.0% |

\*\*\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for   
this question.

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, policy makers and community members both tend to be slightly more receptive to policies related to smoke-free public spaces (as opposed to private spaces). Data on the impact of second-hand smoke tends to be an effective way to raise community awareness and support for policies that restrict smoking in public spaces.
* According to Solano TPEP staff, city councils in Benicia, Vallejo, Dixon, and Rio Vista have expressed support for bans on smoking in public places.
* In 2017, Fairfield prohibited smoking within 25 feet of doorways and windows in downtown Fairfield (along Texas Street). The prohibition is limited to this area of Fairfield. According to Solano TPEP staff, it is unclear whether there was political will to expand this ordinance beyond the downtown corridor.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* January and February 2020: Three supportive articles on Benicia’s tobacco ordinance (Vallejo Times Herald)

## *Policy landscape*

* In December 2019, the Benicia City Council adopted a [tobacco ordinance](https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Benicia/html/Benicia09/Benicia0906.html) that included a ban on smoking in recreational areas, service areas, dining areas, outdoor places of employment, sidewalks in commercial zones, and public outdoor events. Benicia was recognized by the American Lung Association as passing the most comprehensive tobacco policy in 2019.[[4]](#footnote-5) Benicia’s ordinance went into effect in 2020. Therefore, there is no data yet available on enforcement.
* Rio Vista is working on a tobacco ordinance that would include a ban on menthol cigarettes, flavored tobacco, all e-cigarette products, and outdoor smoking. They are motivated by an interest in reducing youth tobacco use, as well as improving their American Lung Association grade.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  3.2.1 Tobacco Retail Licensing  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy requiring retailers that sell, give, or furnish tobacco products to be licensed, designate a portion of the license fee for enforcement, prohibit police harassment of persons who purchase, use or possess tobacco, and exclude any provision that criminalizes a person for the purchase, use, or possession of tobacco products. |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

### Availability of tobacco products to young adults

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County  (2019) \* | California (2019) \* | Is Solano County doing better or worse than California? |
| % of stores selling tobacco to underage young adults | 21.6% | 17.9% | Worse |

\* Statewide Young Adult Tobacco Purchase Survey (YATPS)

### Student tobacco purchase behaviors

**Disparities in the data**

* Youth who identify as female were less likely to buy cigarettes (13%) and e-cigarettes (10%) than youth who identify as male or identify in another way. Tenth graders were less likely to buy e-cigarettes (8%) than twelfth graders (19%).
* Twelfth graders were more likely to say it is easy to obtain cigarettes (54%) than tenth graders (44%). Those who identify as a non-binary gender were also more likely to say cigarettes were easy to obtain (58%) compared to other youth.
* White students were more likely to say that it is easy to obtain e-cigarettes (65%) than other race/ethnicity groups. Twelfth graders (54%) and those who identify as a non-binary gender (65%) were also more likely to say e-cigarettes are easy to obtain.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/03i28kqz0csi0w9utf8taiodpwp153it) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2017-2018) \*\* |
| % of youth smokers that reported usually buying cigarettes from a store | 18.3% |
| % of youth e-cigarette users that reported usually buying e-cigarettes from a store | 14.3% |
| % of youth reporting that it is "somewhat easy" or "very easy" to obtain cigarettes | 48.7% |
| % of youth reporting that it is "somewhat easy" or "very easy" to obtain e-cigarettes | 58.2% |

\*\* Statewide California Student Tobacco Survey (CSTS). No local data available for this question.

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* Awareness is relatively low as many respondents to the Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community public opinion poll (conducted in Solano County in 2019) thought that a license was *already* required to sell tobacco.
* Staff also report that there is little awareness about what a tobacco retail policy would actually do.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, community groups in most jurisdictions (including priority populations such as youth and older adults) have expressed interest in tobacco retail licensing policies. Community members in Dixon showed considerable interest in February 2020.

**Disparities in the data**

* In California, women (84%) were more likely than men (75%) to agree that store owners should need a license to sell cigarettes.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/03i28kqz0csi0w9utf8taiodpwp153it) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County  (2019) \*\*\* | California  (2019) † |
| % of adults who agree that local communities should strongly enforce laws that prevent people from selling cigarettes to minors | NA | 90.2% |
| % of adults who agree that store owners should need a license to sell cigarettes (just like alcoholic beverages) | 82.0% | 79.7% |

\*\*\* Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community Public Opinion Poll (n=367).  
† Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for this question.

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, there is some political will among decision makers to pass a tobacco retail license policy for Solano County. However, identifying an enforcement agency for the policy has been challenging.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* January and February 2020: Three supportive articles on Benicia’s tobacco ordinance (Vallejo Times Herald)

## *Policy landscape*

* In December 2019, the Benicia City Council adopted a [tobacco ordinance](https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Benicia/html/Benicia09/Benicia0906.html) that requires tobacco retailers to obtain an annual license to sell tobacco. Benicia is the first—and only—city in Solano County to adopt this ordinance. Benicia was recognized by the American Lung Association as passing the most comprehensive tobacco policy in 2019.[[5]](#footnote-6) Benicia’s ordinance went into effect in 2020. Therefore, there is no data yet available on enforcement.
* In February 2020, Solano TPEP staff worked with youth in Dixon to propose a tobacco retail license policy.
* As of February 2021, Solano TPEP is working with LGBTQ Minus Tobacco in efforts to pass a tobacco retail license policy for Solano County. Though this policy would only affect retailers in unincorporated Solano County, Solano TPEP staff indicate that other cities/jurisdictions take notice when county leadership supports a policy. Solano TPEP is currently working to identify an appropriate monitoring/enforcement mechanism to include in a policy proposal.
* Solano TPEP and LGBTQ Minus Tobacco have considered Vallejo as the next jurisdiction for tobacco retail licensing.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  3.2.2 Tobacco Retail Density/Zoning  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy restricting the number, location, and/or density of tobacco retail outlets through use of any of the following means: conditional use permits, zoning, tobacco retail permits or licenses, or direct regulation. |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Total number of tobacco retailers (2018) | Tobacco retailers per 1,000 population  (2018) | % (N) of tobacco retailers within 1,000 feet of a school  (2018) |
| Solano County | **299** | **0.7** | **25% (75)** |
| Vallejo | 87 | 0.7 | 23% (20) |
| Vacaville | 67 | 0.7 | 30% (20) |
| Fairfield | 66 | 0.6 | 36% (24) |
| Dixon | 23 | 1.2 | 4% (1) |
| Benicia | 17 | 0.6 | 35% (6) |
| Suisun City | 16 | 0.5 | 19% (3) |
| Rio Vista | 8 | 1 | 0% (0) |

\* California Tobacco Health Assessment Tool

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* Awareness about the density of tobacco retailers is high in places where retailers are very visible, such as Vallejo. Awareness is also high in Benicia because of their existing tobacco control ordinance. Solano TPEP staff also report high awareness in Dixon. Awareness is lower in other areas of the county.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

* Five Dixon city officials interviewed in 2017-2018 indicated low community readiness for a tobacco retailer policy within the City of Dixon.

**Disparities in the data**

* In California, Asian residents were more likely than other race/ethnicity groups to agree that the number of tobacco stores should be reduced (74%) and that stores that sell tobacco should not be allowed near schools (86%).
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/r92rdqu9glp2e3x6dy24nrej3euxlybs) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County  (2019) \*\* | California  (2019) \*\*\* |
| % of adults who agree that the number of tobacco stores should be reduced | NA | 61.2% |
| % of adults who agree that stores that sell tobacco products should not be allowed near schools | 82.0% | 73.8% |

\*\* Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community Public Opinion Poll (n=367).  
\*\*\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS).

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* Key informant interviews were conducted with 5 Dixon city officials in 2017-2018.
  + All key informants considered it unlikely that the Dixon City Council would adopt a policy to cap the number of tobacco retailers in a geographic area or by population size. Key barriers to adoption included: pro-business policy objectives and smoking habits of current city councilmembers; the potential to displace existing retailers; prior failed efforts to pass ordinances to limit liquor retailers; more pressing health issues; and a need for more specificity in the proposed policy.
  + Three out of five thought a policy requiring a minimum distance between tobacco retailers had a moderate chance of adoption.
  + Two out of five thought a policy prohibiting retailers from locating within 1,000 feet of schools or youth-serving areas had a high chance of adoption. Respondents wanted more specificity about what qualified as a “youth-serving” area.
* While interviews focused on Dixon, they also offered insights into key supports/barriers to this policy that could inform policy efforts in other jurisdictions.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* January and February 2020: Three supportive articles on Benicia’s tobacco ordinance (Vallejo Times Herald).

## *Policy landscape*

* In December 2019, the Benicia City Council adopted a [tobacco ordinance](https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Benicia/html/Benicia09/Benicia0906.html) that limits the number of tobacco retailer licenses to one for every 1,750 Benicia residents. It also prohibits tobacco retailers from being within 1,000 feet of youth-populated areas, and prohibits retailers from being with 500 feet of each other. Existing retailers are not affected. Benicia is the first—and only—city in Solano County to adopt this ordinance. Benicia was recognized by the American Lung Association as passing the most comprehensive tobacco policy in 2019.[[6]](#footnote-7) Benicia’s ordinance went into effect in 2020. Therefore, there is no data yet available on enforcement.
* A density ordinance was proposed in Dixon but has not been successful.
* Solano TPEP staff have explored a tobacco retailer density policy ordinance in Dixon during the last four years. However, these efforts have been unsuccessful to date.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  3.2.4 Tobacco Industry Sampling and Coupons/  Discounts/Gifts  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy restricting the redemption of coupons, coupon offers, gift certificates, gift cards, rebate offers, loyalty and discount programs, buy-downs, multi-pack offers, and retail-value added promotions for free, low-cost, or reduced-cost tobacco products or other similar offers for tobacco and ESD products consistent with the First Amendment and federal law. |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

**Disparities in the data**

* Men were more likely to buy cigarettes with a special price every time or sometimes (46%) compared to women (31%).
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/yzyu43uq10dshiysc96r873qc0zxb3bk) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California (2019) \* |
| % of adult smokers who buy cigarettes with a special price, even if not usual brand… | |
| Every time | 12.3% |
| Sometimes | 29.7% |
| Very rarely | 29.5% |
| Never | 28.5% |
| % of adult smokers who took advantage of coupons or price promotions the last time they bought cigarettes \* | 38.7% |

\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for this question.

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* Solano County TPEP staff report that awareness of this issue is likely higher among current smokers. Awareness among the broader community may be more limited.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

**Disparities in the data**

* In California, women were more likely to agree that tobacco products should be sold at a deep discount (64%) compared to men (51%). Asian residents were also more likely to agree (72%) than other race/ethnicity groups.
* In California, Asian residents were more likely than other race/ethnicity groups to agree that price promotions should be banned (70%).
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/yzyu43uq10dshiysc96r873qc0zxb3bk) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County (2019) \*\* | California  (2019) \*\*\* |
| % of adults who agree that tobacco products should not be allowed to be sold at a deep discount | 49.0% | 57.5% |
| % of adults who agree that price promotions for tobacco should be banned | NA | 55.2% |

\*\* Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community Public Opinion Poll (n=367).  
\*\*\* Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS).

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* Solano County TPEP staff report community members have demonstrated no support for action. Some may be concerned that it is a First Amendment issue.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* January and February 2020: Three supportive articles on Benicia’s tobacco ordinance (Vallejo Times Herald).

## *Policy landscape*

* Solano County and Vallejo both have existing policies that prohibit the distribution of free tobacco product samples in designated places.
* In December 2019, the Benicia City Council adopted a [tobacco ordinance](https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Benicia/html/Benicia09/Benicia0906.html) that banned the use of discounts, coupons, and promotions. Benicia was recognized by the American Lung Association as passing the most comprehensive tobacco policy in 2019.[[7]](#footnote-8) Benicia’s ordinance went into effect in 2020. Therefore, there is no data yet available on enforcement.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  3.2.7 Tobacco-free Pharmacies and Health Care Providers  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy eliminating the sale and distribution of tobacco products from places where pharmacy and/or other health care services are provided by a licensed health care professional (e.g., hospital, vision screening, blood pressure screening). |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County  (2019) | California  (2019) | Is Solano County doing better or worse than California? |
| % of youth-accessible licensed tobacco retailers that have a pharmacy counter\* | 7.3% | 7.5% | Similar |
| % of retail pharmacies that sell tobacco\*\* | 35.0% | 30.0% | Worse |

\* Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community Survey

\*\* Statewide Tobacco Retail Licensing List and Retail Pharmacy Licensing List

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, smokers in the county are likely aware that certain national pharmacies (like CVS) ban tobacco products. Awareness among the broader community may be more limited.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

* One Dixon city official interviewed in 2017-2018 noted that community members protested CVS’ decision to stop selling tobacco products.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County  (2019) \*\*\* | California (2019) † |
| % of adults who agree that pharmacies should not sell tobacco products | 71.0% | 63.4% |

\*\*\* Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community Public Opinion Poll (n=367).  
† Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS).

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* Key informant interviews were conducted with five Dixon city officials in 2017-18. Four of these five believed that a policy prohibiting the sale of tobacco products in pharmacies or other types of retailers had a low chance of adoption. Barriers included: concerns about lawsuits from national pharmacies and retailers; concerns about government regulation of local businesses; lack of community support; and the smoking status of current councilmembers.
* According to Solano TPEP staff, public health leaders in the county would likely be supportive of a policy on this issue. Staff suggested that efforts within Solano County would need to focus on smaller, independent pharmacies rather than national pharmacy chains.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* January and February 2020: Three supportive articles on Benicia’s tobacco ordinance (Vallejo Times Herald)

## *Policy landscape*

* In December 2019, the Benicia City Council adopted a [tobacco ordinance](https://www.codepublishing.com/CA/Benicia/html/Benicia09/Benicia0906.html) that prohibited the sale of tobacco in pharmacies. Benicia is the first—and only—city in Solano County to adopt this ordinance. Benicia was recognized by the American Lung Association as passing the most comprehensive tobacco policy in 2019.[[8]](#footnote-9) Benicia’s ordinance went into effect in 2020. Therefore, there is no data yet available on enforcement or changes in tobacco sales at pharmacies.
* There are no active policy efforts to eliminate the sale and distribution of tobacco products at pharmacies or health care providers.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  3.2.9 Menthol and Other Flavored Tobacco Products  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy eliminating or restricting the sale and/or distribution of any mentholated cigarettes and other flavored tobacco products, and paraphernalia (e.g., smokeless tobacco products, dissolvable tobacco products, flavored premium cigars such as little cigars, cigarillos, hookah tobacco, e-cigarettes, e-hookah, wrappers). |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

### Flavored tobacco product use

**Disparities in the data**

* Use of menthol cigarettes among adults is highest for women (37%), African American/Black residents (68%), those who identify as bisexual (45%) and those who live in urban areas (32%).
* Use of flavored tobacco among adults is highest for those ages 18 to 25 (69%), those who identify as bisexual (36%), and those in urban areas (50%).
* Use of menthol cigarettes among youth is highest for those who identify as a non-binary (68%).
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/qli75e1ktwemkh2pix40t574zsxxji1v) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California |
| % of adult smokers who usually use menthol cigarettes\* | 30.2% |
| % of adult tobacco users who used flavored tobacco\* | 48.4% |
| % of youth smokers who used menthol cigarettes\*\* | 56.7% |
| % of youth tobacco users who used flavored tobacco\*\* | 86.4% |

\* California Health Interview Survey (CHIS) (2018). No local data is available for this question.

\*\* California Student Tobacco Survey (CSTS) (2017-2018). No local data is available for this question.

### Availability of flavored tobacco products

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County  (2019) \*\*\* | California  (2019) \*\*\* | Is Solano County doing better or worse than California? |
| % of stores selling menthol cigarettes | 100.0% | 88.3% | Worse |
| % of stores selling flavored non-cigarette products | 92.7% | 81.8% | Worse |

\*\*\* Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community Survey (2019).

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* CTCP has been running paid media campaigns around the tobacco industry’s efforts to target Black communities with menthol cigarettes (Solano TPEP plans to launch a local campaign on the same topic in the near future). This campaign may have raised general awareness about menthol and other flavored tobacco. At the same time, the tobacco industry’s efforts to put a referendum on the 2022 ballot about a statewide ban on flavored tobacco may have introduced misinformation about menthol and flavored tobacco products into the community.
* According to TPEP staff, awareness about flavored tobacco is high, and especially high in Vallejo, Dixon, and Benicia. Staff noted less awareness about menthol cigarettes and their harms, and that menthol and flavored tobacco are often thought of as separate issues.

**Disparities in the data**

* Adults ages 45 to 64 were more likely to believe than flavored products are designed to appeal to youth (84%).
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/qli75e1ktwemkh2pix40t574zsxxji1v) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) † |
| % of adults who believe flavored e-cigarettes and other flavored tobacco products are intentionally designed to appeal to youth | 78.5% |

† Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for this question.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

**Disparities in the data**

* In California, women were more likely to support a ban on flavored tobacco (66%) than men (53%). Residents who were multiracial or another race/ethnicity were less likely to support a ban (45%) than other race/ethnicity groups.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/qli75e1ktwemkh2pix40t574zsxxji1v) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County  (2019) †† | California  (2019) ‡ |
| % of adults who agree that flavored tobacco products like candy-flavored little cigars should not be allowed to be sold†† | 65.0% | 59.7% |
| % of adults who agree that the sale of menthol cigarettes should not be allowed†† | NA | 45.9% |

†† Healthy Stores for a Healthy Community Public Opinion Poll (n=367).  
‡ Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available for this question.

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* City councilmembers across Solano County understand that the sale of flavored tobacco products is a priority for youth, but many want more evidence on the impact of a ban on local businesses.
* According to Solano TPEP staff, policymakers may be less aware and/or inclined to take up local efforts while the statewide ban is being considered.
* Most councilmembers see menthol cigarettes and flavored tobacco as two separate issues.
* Key informant interviews were conducted with six Benicia city officials in 2019. While these interviews focused on strategies for Benicia’s tobacco ordinance, they also offered insights into key supports/barriers to this policy that could inform policy efforts in other jurisdictions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key supports to adoption | Key barriers to adoption |
| * + - Support from non-smokers and those who work with youth     - Support and active participation from parents and others interested in youth health, including sports teams and schools     - Media campaigns that use reliable data (particularly related to impact on youth)     - Messages that tackle the “freedom of choice” argument | * + - Opposition from smokers, retailers, and residents who see the policy as government overreach     - Opposition from the tobacco industry |

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* January and February 2020: Three supportive articles on Benicia’s tobacco ordinance (Vallejo Times Herald).
* January 2020: Two supportive commentary articles (Vallejo Times Herald, Daily Republic) on youth harms of flavored tobacco.
* February 2020: Two neutral articles on proposed bans on flavored tobacco sales (Daily Republic) and restrictions on flavored vaping (The Reporter); one supportive article on Solano County Board of Supervisors’ support for statewide ban (Daily Republic).
* July – October 2020: Four supportive articles on flavored tobacco bans, including the statewide ban, ban in Napa County, and ban in Hayward.
* July – October 2020: Two negative articles and commentaries on flavored tobacco bans (Daily Republic and The Reporter).
* July – October 2020: Three neutral articles on statewide flavored tobacco ban (Daily Republic and The Reporter).

## *Policy landscape*

* In December 2019, the Benicia City Council adopted a tobacco ordinance that banned the sale of all flavored tobacco products, including menthol cigarettes. Benicia is the first—and only—city in Solano County to adopt this ordinance. Benicia was recognized by the American Lung Association as passing the most comprehensive tobacco policy in 2019.[[9]](#footnote-10) Benicia’s ordinance went into effect in 2020. Therefore, there is no data yet available on enforcement.
* Solano TPEP staff met with the Mayor of Vallejo to discuss flavored tobacco.
* Rio Vista is working on a tobacco ordinance that would include a ban on menthol cigarettes, flavored tobacco, all e-cigarette products, and outdoor smoking. They are motivated by an interest in reducing youth tobacco use, as well as improving their American Lung Association grade.
* In August 2020, California passed a law prohibiting the sale of most flavored tobacco products. This law banned the sale of menthol cigarettes, all flavored e-cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, and cigars. The Solano County Board of Supervisors provided unanimous support for this law.[[10]](#footnote-11) It included exemptions for hookah, cigars, and pipe tobacco. However, the law has been suspended due to a lawsuit and referendum funded by the tobacco industry. The referendum will appear on the 2022 general election ballot, and the law will not be enforced until the results of the referendum are known.

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  3.2.17 No Sale of Tobacco Products  **Core Indicator Data Summary** |
| The number of jurisdictions with a policy prohibiting the sale and distribution of any tobacco products or emerging nicotine products not approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for cessation purposes. |

## *Scope of the problem: Do data show the existence of a public health problem?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Solano County | California | Is Solano County doing better or worse than California? |
| Adult Smoking Rate (2016-2018) \* | 14.1% | 11.1% | Worse |
| Youth Tobacco Use Rate (2017-2018) \*\* | 16.3% | 12.7% | Worse |
| Lung Cancer Incidence Rate (2013-2017) \*\*\* | 50.7 / 100,000 | 40.9 / 100,000 | Worse |
| Lung Cancer Mortality Rate (2013-2017) \*\*\* | 35.4 / 100,000 | 29.4 / 100,000 | Worse |

\* California Health Interview Survey (CHIS).   
\*\* California Student Tobacco Survey (CSTS).   
\*\*\* California Cancer Registry.

**Disparities in the data**

* In Solano County, adult smoking rates were highest among American Indian/Alaska Native (40%), multiracial (33%), and white (19%) residents.
* In Solano County, lung cancer incidence rates are highest among African American/Black (56/100,000) and white (58/100,000) residents. Lung cancer mortality rates are also highest among African American/Back (44/100,000) and white (41/100,000) residents.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/hxw64ocdy1kaj8rxzcn1gdiulqz58ltt) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

## *Community awareness: How aware is the community that a public health problem exists?*

* According to Solano TPEP staff, very few people think that a ban on tobacco products is a possibility in Solano County.

## *Community support: Have community members demonstrated support for action?*

* No local data on this topic was collected during the last plan period (2017-2021)

**Disparities in the data**

* Men are less likely (48%) than women (58%) to support a gradual ban on cigarettes.
* Residents who identify as white (32%) or multiracial/another race/ethnicity (24%) are less likely to support an immediate ban on the sale of cigarettes.
* Click [here](https://harderco.box.com/s/hxw64ocdy1kaj8rxzcn1gdiulqz58ltt) for more information on disparities for this indicator.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | California  (2019) |
| % of adults who agree that there should be a gradual ban on the sale of cigarettes | 52.8% |
| % of adults who agree that there should be an immediate ban on the sale of cigarettes | 37.3% |

† Statewide Online California Adult Tobacco Survey (CATS). No local data available   
for this question.

## *Decision maker support: Have decision makers/leaders demonstrated support for action?*

* Prohibitions on the sale of tobacco products have not been explicitly discussed with decision makers in interviews conducted during the last four years.
* According to Solano TPEP staff, political will to prohibit the sale of tobacco is likely low in Solano County because it may be seen as harming small businesses.
* While Solano TPEP staff noted that the Benicia ordinance came as a surprise, and there could be support from county leadership in the future for a full ban on tobacco, this is unlikely in the near future.

## *Earned media: Has there been unpaid media (positive or neutral) in the past year?*

* November 2020: Five supportive articles on continued tobacco and cigarette use, as well as tobacco-related health risks such as diabetes, high blood pressure, lung cancer (Daily Republic).

## *Policy landscape*

* Currently, there are no jurisdictions within Solano County that are considering a ban on the sale and distribution of tobacco products (including electronic smoking devices like e-cigarettes).

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  2.4 Youth Engagement in Tobacco Control  **Core Asset Data Summary** |
| The degree our program has participatory collaborative partnerships with diverse youth and youth serving organizations, and engages them to support tobacco control-related activities that focus on policy, systems, and environmental changes. |

## *Partnerships with diverse youth and youth-serving organizations*

* Solano TPEP staff have put significant effort into engaging youth in tobacco efforts in the county.
* Many local youth organizations have tackled tobacco projects during the last four years. Solano TPEP staff are currently working to release funding for youth organizations to create tobacco-focused projects for a youth summit in the spring.
* Staff are experienced and skilled at youth engagement.
* Schools and school districts have been particularly engaged in helping to find and invite youth to participate in tobacco efforts.
* Previous and current Tobacco Free Solano Coalition co-chairs have included staff from the Solano County Office of Education (including those involved with the Friday Night Live program).
* Participation in these youth opportunities has varied.
* Two recent articles (January 2020 and April 2020) described these youth advocacy efforts and their involvement in the Tobacco Free Solano Coalition.

## *Frequency of engagement in policy, community organizing, and health activities*

* Youth regularly participate in each of the Tobacco Free Solano Coalition’s quarterly meetings. They have also previously attended city council meetings.
* Most of Solano TPEP’s policy and community organizing activities have involved youth. Recently, youth have been involved in environmental change efforts in Vacaville, Benicia, Fairfield, Vallejo, and Dixon.
* Staff report a high number of engagements each year (at least five).

|  |
| --- |
| Solano County Tobacco Prevention and Education Program  2.5 Community Engagement in Tobacco Control  **Core Asset Data Summary** |
| The degree our program has collaborative partnerships with diverse organizations and individuals in addition to CTCP and TUPE-funded organizations, to engage them to support tobacco control-related activities that focus on policy, system, and environmental change such as community assessments, data collection, education of community members and decision makers, and media events. |

## *Partnerships with diverse organizations*

* Solano TPEP staff report that engagement of diverse organizations and individuals has improved over the last four years.
* Staff are experienced and skilled at community engagement.
* Staff cite opportunities to improve community engagement by continuing to recruit diverse membership and increase staff capacity to reach populations who speak languages other than English.

## *Frequency of engagement in policy, community organizing, and health activities*

* Community members regularly participate in the Tobacco Free Solano Coalition’s quarterly meetings.
* Most of Solano TPEP’s policy and community organizing activities have involved community members.
* Staff report approximately 3-4 engagements with members of diverse community organizations each year. Efforts to engage the community have increased, but are not as frequent as opportunities that engage youth community members.
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