Dear Clearlake City Council Members,

Thank you for this opportunity to voice our concerns over commercial tobacco and other nicotine and vaping product use in city of Clearlake. The [***organization name***] supports the implementation of either a Tobacco Retail Licensing (TRL) mechanism or other ordinance(s) that address these concerns for the following reasons:

* Tobacco use is still the No.1 cause of preventable death and disease in California. Each year, nearly 34,000 California adults die from smoking and 20,300 kids become new daily smokers.[[1]](#endnote-1)
* Tobacco is the only legal consumer product that kills up to half of those who use it as intended by the manufacturer.[[2]](#endnote-2)
* California pays more than thirteen billion dollars ($13,000,000,000+) each year for the costs of smoking and *much of this cost is paid directly by the taxpayers*.[[3]](#endnote-3)
* Ninety percent (90%) of smokers today started before they were 18.[[4]](#endnote-4) The legal smoking age in the United States is now 21.
* In 2018, the U.S. Surgeon General declared the use of e-cigarettes an epidemic among youth.[[5]](#endnote-5)
* More kids than ever are using flavored electronic smoking devices and flavored tobacco products. In 2021, the California Healthy Kids survey showed **12% of Konocti Unified School District 7th graders, 22% of 9th graders and 36% of 11th graders had vaped**.[[6]](#endnote-6) A local TRL policy can disrupt this unhealthy trend by reducing the availability of these dangerous products and assuring that they don’t fall into the hands of kids.
* Higher density of tobacco retailers in a community is associated with increases of non-smokers starting to smoke.[[7]](#endnote-7) **The City of Clearlake has 2.25 tobacco retailers for every 2,500 residents**. Lake County has 2.75 and California’s average is 2 tobacco retailers per 2,500 residents.[[8]](#endnote-8)
* Exposure to retail tobacco marketing in stores increases tobacco experimentation and use by youth and is more powerful than peer pressure.[[9]](#endnote-9),[[10]](#endnote-10),[[11]](#endnote-11)
* Middle school youth exposed to tobacco products in a retail setting multiple times per week are twice as likely to start smoking.[[12]](#endnote-12)
* In 2020 in the **Konocti Unified School District, 32%, 65% and 69% of students in grade 7, 9, and 11, respectively, reported that e-cigarettes are fairly easy or very easy to obtain.**[[13]](#endnote-13)

We believe the increase in youth smoking is caused by the tobacco industry. Good education and family influences can help prevent youth uptake of smoking, but it hasn’t been enough. Additionally, given the number of youth that are using these products, current state licensing and enforcement of tobacco retailers is not effective in preventing their initiation. We must take local action to confront the tobacco industry and protect our children. A Tobacco Retail License (TRL) is one such mechanism that can help. We recommend that the following aspects of tobacco and nicotine products be addressed and included in a TRL, or similar ordinance:

* **Reduce tobacco and nicotine product retail density**. The City of Clearlake has 14 tobacco retailers, which equates to 2.25 per 2,500 residents. The California state average is 2 per 2,500.[[14]](#endnote-14) We recommend a cap of 1 per 2,500 residents.
* **Prohibit tobacco / vape / nicotine product retailers near schools & other youth-serving areas** such as parks & community centers.
* **Restrict pharmacies from selling tobacco / vape / nicotine products**. Pharmacies are designed to be retail centers for health. Tobacco and nicotine products are just the opposite.
* **Eliminate the sale of flavored tobacco / vape / nicotine products**. As of January 2021, over 60 communities in California have eliminated the sale of all flavored tobacco, including Mendocino County.[[15]](#endnote-15)
* **Restrict placement of tobacco / vape / nicotine product advertising, displays, and products within a certain distance of youth-oriented merchandise (candy, soda, snacks, etc.)** The City of San Diego has adopted restrictions that prohibit the placement of tobacco, vape and nicotine products and advertising within two (2) feet of candy, snack or non-alcoholic beverage displays inside stores.[[16]](#endnote-16) The city of Fort Bragg is considering a similar restriction.

Over 200 jurisdictions in California already have passed laws and ordinances requiring tobacco retailers to obtain licenses to sell tobacco products. Since local tobacco control projects can provide model policy language, offer free legal resources and technical assistance, and help draft retail licensing policy specific to the needs of local communities, we encourage you to reach out to them for support. You can contact the Health Education Coalition at <http://health.co.lake.ca.us/Community/Tobacco.htm> or contact NorCal 4 Health at (707) 530-5171 or [www.NorCal4Health.org](http://www.NorCal4Health.org).

No other legal product sold in America kills up to half of those that use it as intended. Please protect the health and safety of our children by supporting a strong tobacco retailer licensing or other ordinance.

Sincerely,

[Name]

[Your Position, Your Organization]
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