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Wyoming Alcohol and Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks, 2017

# Summary

In August 2017 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 ninth consecutive year that WYSAC has handled this project.

Data entry began in October and concluded in December 2017. 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 1,292 alcohol and 856 tobacco sales compliance inspection forms were received by WYSAC and entered in the database. Of those, 1,230 (95.2%) alcohol and 827 (96.6%) 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 85.4% for alcohol sales and 91.9% for tobacco sales.

# Methodology

## 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]](#footnote-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 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 October 2016 through October 2017 and the tobacco checks from December 2016 through June 2017.

## Data Entry and Analyses

Unlike previous years when the completed inspection forms were hand-delivered to WYSAC from a designee of WASCOP, this year 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 October to December 2017.

Once data input was completed, the database was imported into SPSS 22.0 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 counted towards only the total number of checks and are excluded from all other calculations. Of the 1,292 alcohol forms submitted, 1,230 were categorized as valid, 62 as null, and 0 as incomplete. Of the 856 submitted tobacco forms, 827 were categorized as valid, 29 as null, and 0 as incomplete.

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.

A minor logical assumption was made concerning incomplete and inconsistent forms. For any compliance checks that resulted in no violation, the data regarding identification requested, checked, and checked against a calendar were assumed to be true. For a substantial number of cases these three variables were incomplete, however given the inspection result, these data were filled in as true.

# Results

## Compliance Checks Counts (2007 – 2017)

The total number of compliance checks forms submitted each year from 2007 to 2017 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 a large drop in the number of alcohol compliance checks submitted.

Figure 3.1. Total Number of Compliance Checks (2007–2017)

## Alcohol Sales Compliance Checks Results

In 2017, a total of 1,292 alcohol compliance check forms were submitted to WYSAC. After removing null attempts, 1,230 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 47 Wyoming cities, unincorporated communities (such as Hiland), and [census-designated place](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Census-designated_place)s (such as Alcova) submitted valid forms, which is 11 fewer than in 2016. Hyattville did not return any valid checks. The counties that did not return alcohol forms were: Crook, Hot Springs, Platte, Sublette, Washakie, and Weston. The number of checks returned varied greatly from one municipality to another; Cheyenne submitted the highest number of valid inspections (171), followed by Casper (108), and many small municipalities completed as few as one inspection.

Figure 3.2. Number of Regions Submitting Alcohol Sales Compliance Checks (2007–2017)

Following are the results from the alcohol compliance checks performed as part of the 2017 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 85.4%, less than a one percentage point drop from 2016[[2]](#footnote-2). 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, indicate that Johnson County had a perfect 100% alcohol compliance rate, followed by Goshen (91.7%) and Fremont (91.2%). Twelve counties had compliance rates between 89.9% and 80%: Campbell (89.8%), Carbon (88.9%), Sheridan (88.6%), Natrona (86.6%), Uinta (86.4%), Albany (85.3%), Park (85.2%), Big Horn (85.0%), Converse (84.8%), Laramie (83.6%), Niobrara (83.3%), and Lincoln (81.7%). The two least compliant counties were: Teton (77.4%) and Sweetwater (74.6%).

Table 3.2 displays the alcohol sales compliance rates and violations/infractions for municipalities listed alphabetically and Table 3.3 summarizes municipalities in groups of decreasing compliance. Twelve had a 100% compliance rate. Meanwhile, Lance Creek had a compliance rate of 0%. One municipality, Hyattville, returned only one alcohol compliance check but it was not valid. Many of these municipalities had very small sample sizes (5 or less) which are more likely to result in extreme rates (100% or 0%).

Table 3.1. Alcohol Sales Compliance Rates and Number of Violations by County (2017)\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Valid Alcohol Compliance Checks** | **No Infractions** | **Prohibited Sales Violation** | **Prohibited Sales Warning** | **Closed or Does Not Sell Alcohol** | **Compliance Rate** |
| **County** |
| Albany**9** | 68 | 58 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 85.3% |
| Big Horn**11** | 20 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 85.0% |
| Campbell**4** | 88 | 79 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 89.8% |
| Carbon**5** | 18 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 88.9% |
| Converse**12** | 46 | 39 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 84.8% |
| Fremont**3** | 91 | 83 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 91.2% |
| Goshen**2** | 60 | 55 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 91.7% |
| Johnson**1** | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 100.0% |
| Laramie**13** | 171 | 143 | 26 | 2 | 3 | 83.6% |
| Lincoln**15** | 60 | 49 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 81.7% |
| Natrona**7** | 134 | 116 | 18 | 0 | 11 | 86.6% |
| Niobrara**14** | 12 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 83.3% |
| Park**10** | 81 | 69 | 11 | 1 | 3 | 85.2% |
| Sheridan**6** | 105 | 93 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 88.6% |
| Sweetwater**17** | 118 | 88 | 30 | 0 | 1 | 74.6% |
| Teton**16** | 62 | 48 | 12 | 2 | 4 | 77.4% |
| Uinta**8** | 66 | 57 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 86.4% |
| **TOTAL** | **1230** | **1050** | **169** | **11** | **62** | **85.4%** |

*\* 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 Rates and Number of Violations by Municipality (2017)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Valid Alcohol Compliance Checks** | **No Infractions** | **Prohibited Sales Violation** | **Prohibited Sales Warning** | **Closed or Does Not Sell Alcohol** | **Compliance Rate** |
| **County** | **Municipality** |
| Lincoln | Afton | 24 | 21 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 87.5% |
| Natrona | Alcova | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Lincoln | Alpine | 9 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 88.9% |
| Fremont | Atlantic City | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Natrona | Bar Nunn | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 75.0% |
| Big Horn | Basin | 15 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 86.7% |
| Johnson | Buffalo | 30 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 100.0% |
| Big Horn | Burlington | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Natrona | Casper | 108 | 95 | 13 | 0 | 7 | 88.0% |
| Laramie | Cheyenne | 171 | 143 | 26 | 2 | 3 | 83.6% |
| Park | Cody | 53 | 48 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 90.6% |
| Lincoln | Diamondville | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 66.7% |
| Converse | Douglas | 40 | 34 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 85.0% |
| Fremont | Dubois | 13 | 12 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 92.3% |
| Natrona | Edgerton | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 80.0% |
| Lincoln | Etna | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 50.0% |
| Uinta | Evanston | 59 | 51 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 86.4% |
| Natrona | Evansville | 8 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 75.0% |
| Uinta | Fort Bridger | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 80.0% |
| Campbell | Gillette | 88 | 79 | 8 | 1 | 5 | 89.8% |
| Converse | Glenrock | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 83.3% |
| Sweetwater | Green River | 26 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 92.3% |
| Natrona | Hiland | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Fremont | Hudson | 4 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 75.0% |
| Big Horn | Hyattville | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | N/A |
| Teton | Jackson | 62 | 48 | 12 | 2 | 4 | 77.4% |
| Fremont | Jeffery City | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Lincoln | Kemmerer | 16 | 12 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 75.0% |
| Fremont | Kinnear | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Niobrara | Lance Creek | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0.0% |
| Fremont | Lander | 26 | 22 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 84.6% |
| Albany | Laramie | 68 | 58 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 85.3% |
| Big Horn | Lovell | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Niobrara | Lusk | 11 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 90.9% |
| Big Horn | Manderson | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Natrona | Midwest | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 50.0% |
| Fremont | Pavillion | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Park | Powell | 28 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 75.0% |
| Carbon | Rawlins | 18 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 88.9% |
| Fremont | Riverton | 26 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 92.3% |
| Sweetwater | Rock Springs | 93 | 65 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 69.9% |
| Big Horn | Shell | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 50.0% |
| Sheridan | Sheridan | 105 | 93 | 12 | 0 | 6 | 88.6% |
| Fremont | Shoshoni | 9 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Lincoln | Thayne | 6 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 83.3% |
| Goshen | Torrington | 60 | 55 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 91.7% |
| Uinta | Urie | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
|  | **TOTAL** | **1230** | **1050** | **169** | **11** | **62** | **85.4%** |

Table 3.3. Summary of Alcohol Sales Compliance Rates by Municipality (2017)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **100%** | **99.9% - 90.0%** | | **89.9% - 80.0%** | | **79.9% - 70.0%** | | **69.9% - 60.0%** | | **59.9% - 0.0%** | |
| Alcova | Dubois | 92.3% | Gillette | 89.8% | Jackson | 77.4% | Rock Springs | 69.9% | Etna | 50.0% |
| Atlantic City | Green River | 92.3% | Alpine | 88.9% | Bar Nunn | 75.0% | Diamondville | 66.7% | Midwest | 50.0% |
| Buffalo | Riverton | 92.3% | Rawlins | 88.9% | Evansville | 75.0% |  |  | Shell | 50.0% |
| Burlington | Torrington | 91.7% | Sheridan | 88.6% | Hudson | 75.0% |  |  | Lance Creek | 0.0% |
| Hiland | Lusk | 90.9% | Casper | 88.0% | Kemmerer | 75.0% |  |  |  |  |
| Jeffery City | Cody | 90.6% | Afton | 87.5% | Powell | 75.0% |  |  |  |  |
| Kinnear |  |  | Basin | 86.7% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lovell |  |  | Evanston | 86.4% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manderson |  |  | Laramie | 85.3% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pavillion |  |  | Douglas | 85.0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shoshoni |  |  | Lander | 84.6% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urie |  |  | Cheyenne | 83.6% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Glenrock | 83.3% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Thayne | 83.3% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Edgerton | 80.0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Fort Bridger | 80.0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks Results

In total, 856 tobacco sales compliance checks were submitted to WYSAC and entered into a database. After removal of null attempts, 827 checks were included in the calculations and analysis.

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 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 17 Wyoming counties, the same number as in 2016. However, ten more municipalities submitted in 2017 (47) compared to 2016 (40). Historically there have been substantially fewer municipalities receiving tobacco sales compliance checks than alcohol sales compliance checks. The counties that did not return valid tobacco forms were: Crook, Hot Springs, Platte, Sublette, Washakie, and Weston.

Figure 3.3. Number of Regions Submitting Tobacco Sales Compliance Checks (2007–2017)

Following are the results from the tobacco compliance checks performed in 2017. 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 91.9%, remaining essentially flat as compared to 91.3% in 2016[[3]](#footnote-3). 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 two counties, Converse and Niobrara had a perfect tobacco sales compliance rate of 100%. The next eight counties with the highest compliance rates were Teton (97.3%), Johnson (97.0%), Campbell (96.4%), Sheridan (95.2%), Park (94.7%), Uinta (94.0%), Fremont (93.9%), and Natrona (93.9%). The six counties that demonstrated compliance rates between 89.9% and 80.0% are Laramie (89.8%), Lincoln (89.8%), Sweetwater (89.7%), Albany (87.1%), Carbon (86.7%), and Goshen (85.0%). Big Horn County had the lowest compliance rate with 76.2%.

Table 3.5 displays the compliance rates and infractions for all 47 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 compliancy. Twenty-three municipalities had perfect compliance rates. Three municipalities, Basin, Burns, and Greybull, had rates of 50%, the lowest of all municipalities. 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%).

Table 3.4. Tobacco Sales Compliance Rate and Number of Violations by County (2017)\*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Valid Tobacco Compliance Checks** | **No Infractions** | **Prohibited Sales Violation** | **Prohibited Sales Warning** | **Closed or Does Not Sell Tobacco** | **Compliance Rate** |
| **County** |
| **Albany 14** | 62 | 54 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 87.1% |
| **Big Horn 17** | 21 | 16 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 76.2% |
| **Campbell 5** | 28 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 96.4% |
| **Carbon 15** | 30 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 86.7% |
| **Converse 1** | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| **Fremont 9** | 82 | 77 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 93.9% |
| **Goshen 16** | 20 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 85.0% |
| **Johnson 4** | 33 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 97.0% |
| **Laramie 11** | 128 | 115 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 89.8% |
| **Lincoln 12** | 49 | 44 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 89.8% |
| **Natrona 10** | 114 | 107 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 93.9% |
| **Niobrara 1** | 11 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| **Park 7** | 38 | 36 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 94.7% |
| **Sheridan 6** | 42 | 40 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 95.2% |
| **Sweetwater 13** | 68 | 61 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 89.7% |
| **Teton 3** | 37 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 97.3% |
| **Uinta 8** | 50 | 47 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 94.0% |
| **TOTAL** | **827** | **760** | **55** | **12** | **29** | **91.9%** |

*\* 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 (2017)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Valid Tobacco Compliance Checks** | **No Infractions** | **Prohibited Sales Violation** | **Prohibited Sales Warning** | **Closed or Does Not Sell Tobacco** | **Compliance Rate** |
| **County** | **Municipality** |
| Lincoln | **Afton** | 12 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 83.3% |
| Laramie | **Albin** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Natrona | **Alcova** | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 100.0% |
| Lincoln | **Alpine** | 12 | 11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 91.7% |
| Big Horn | **Basin** | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 50.0% |
| Johnson | **Buffalo** | 33 | 32 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 97.0% |
| Big Horn | **Burlington** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Laramie | **Burns** | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 50.0% |
| Big Horn | **Byron** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Natrona | **Casper** | 101 | 96 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 95.0% |
| Laramie | **Cheyenne** | 124 | 112 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 90.3% |
| Park | **Cody** | 24 | 23 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 95.8% |
| Lincoln | **Cokeville** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Big Horn | **Cowley** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Fremont | **Crowheart** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Lincoln | **Diamondville** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Converse | **Douglas** | 14 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Fremont | **Dubois** | 10 | 9 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 90.0% |
| Lincoln | **Etna** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Uinta | **Evanston** | 46 | 43 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 93.5% |
| Natrona | **Evansville** | 6 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 66.7% |
| Uinta | **Fort Bridger** | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Campbell | **Gillette** | 28 | 27 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 96.4% |
| Sweetwater | **Green River** | 13 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Big Horn | **Greybull** | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 50.0% |
| Natrona | **Hiland** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Teton | **Jackson** | 37 | 36 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 97.3% |
| Lincoln | **Kemmerer** | 10 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 80.0% |
| Fremont | **Kinnear** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Lincoln | **LaBarge** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Fremont | **Lander** | 27 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 96.3% |
| Albany | **Laramie** | 62 | 54 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 87.1% |
| Big Horn | **Lovell** | 9 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 88.9% |
| Niobrara | **Lusk** | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Uinta | **Lyman** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Niobrara | **Manville** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Natrona | **Midwest** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Fremont | **Pavillion** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Laramie | **Pine Bluffs** | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Park | **Powell** | 14 | 13 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 92.9% |
| Carbon | **Rawlins** | 30 | 26 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 86.7% |
| Fremont | **Riverton** | 39 | 36 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 92.3% |
| Sweetwater | **Rock Springs** | 55 | 48 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 87.3% |
| Sheridan | **Sheridan** | 42 | 40 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 95.2% |
| Fremont | **Shoshoni** | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Lincoln | **Thayne** | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100.0% |
| Goshen | **Torrington** | 20 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 85.0% |
|  | **TOTAL** | **827** | **760** | **55** | **12** | **29** | **91.9%** |

Table 3.6. Summary of Tobacco Sales Compliance Rates by Municipality (2017)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | | | | | | | |
| **100%** | **99.9% - 90.0%** | | **89.9% - 80.0%** | | **79.9% - 70.0%** | | **69.9% - 60.0%** | | **59.9% - 0.0%** | |
| Albin | Jackson | 97.3% | Lovell | 88.9% |  |  | Evansville | 66.7% | Basin | 50.0% |
| Alcova | Buffalo | 97.0% | Rock Springs | 87.3% |  |  |  |  | Burns | 50.0% |
| Burlington | Gillette | 96.4% | Laramie | 87.1% |  |  |  |  | Greybull | 50.0% |
| Byron | Lander | 96.3% | Rawlins | 86.7% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cokeville | Cody | 95.8% | Torrington | 85.0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cowley | Sheridan | 95.2% | Afton | 83.3% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crowheart | Casper | 95.0% | Kemmerer | 80.0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diamondville | Evanston | 93.5% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Douglas | Powell | 92.9% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Etna | Riverton | 92.3% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fort Bridger | Alpine | 91.7% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Green River | Cheyenne | 90.3% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hiland | Dubois | 90.0% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kinnear |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LaBarge |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lusk |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lyman |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Manville |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Midwest |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pavillion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pine Bluffs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shoshoni |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Thayne |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
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