

# UC Merced

## Public Health Capstone Projects

### Title

Survey evidence on behavior of smokers and vapers to the introduction of a retail flavor ban on the retail outlets in California

### Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5q01x53m>

### Author

Fabian, Rudiel

### Publication Date

2022-05-24

Peer reviewed

# **Survey evidence on behavior of smokers and vapers to the introduction of a retail flavor ban on the retail outlets in California**

Rudiel Fabian

Paul Brown, PhD

Mariaelena Gonzalez, PhD

Marisela Yopez, BA

Anna Song, PhD

Linda Cameron, PhD

April 2022

Nicotine and Cannabis Policy Center  
University of California, Merced

**Disclosures:** The authors report no conflicts of interest.

**Acknowledgements:** Funding was provided by the University of California, Merced and the California Tobacco Related Disease Research Program (<https://www.trdrp.org/>).

**Corresponding author:**

Rudiel Fabian

[rfabian2@ucmerced.edu](mailto:rfabian2@ucmerced.edu)

**Abstract**

**Purpose:** The popularity of flavored nicotine products in California has surged in the last few years. Flavored products play an important role in the initiation and use of tobacco products. The California Department of Public Health has recommended that counties and cities consider banning flavored vaping products in retail outlets. This study assessed the purchasing patterns of smokers and vapers, change of vacation plans if a ban was in place in the county they planned to visit, and support of regulations that restrict or ban the sale of flavored products in retail outlets.

**Methods:** Using Qualtrics and in-person surveys, a sample of vapers and smokers (N= 773) in urban and rural areas were surveyed about their vaping and smoking status. Descriptive statistics and chi-square tests were applied in the analysis.

**Findings:** Results indicate that across all three regions, vapers and smokers are more likely to purchase their products from local shops. Neither vapers nor smokers are likely to change their vacation plans should a ban exist in the county they planned to visit. Furthermore, support for flavor bans exists across all regions, with stronger support among nonsmokers.

**Conclusions:** The findings suggest that counties that depend on tourism will not have a dramatic impact on their local economy if they ban the sale of flavored products as most current users prefer to bring their own products, and vacation destinations are not likely to change due to a ban. A comprehensive flavored ban will significantly reduce the use of flavored nicotine products.

**Keywords:** vaping, smoking, flavored, nicotine, ban

## Introduction

The use of flavored nicotine electronic cigarettes (vaping) in the United States has surged rapidly in the recent years, especially among adolescents.<sup>1,2</sup> When initially introduced to the U.S market in 2007, vaping was touted as an effective tool for smoking cessation for active smokers seeking to quit traditional cigarettes.<sup>3</sup> However, the popularity of vaping grew among non-smokers due in part to the unique flavors, marketing, lower perceived risk, and appealing shape of the vaporizer pens.<sup>4,5</sup> Vaping has now drawn national attention due its addictiveness and potential serious health consequences to respiratory disease, including the weakening of the immune system and contribution to chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).<sup>1,6</sup>

In response to the increase in the popularity of vaping, public health departments and many schools have implemented policies aimed at curbing the use and adoption of vaping, particularly among youths. In California (as in other states), the California Department of Public Health has recommended that counties introduce a ban on the sale of flavored vaping products in retail stores.<sup>7</sup> As of June 2021, nearly 109 California cities and counties combined have restricted or prohibited the sale of flavored tobacco products, although some of these restrictions have future implementations dates and/or are the subject of litigation.<sup>8</sup> The regulations differ across jurisdictions, with some only applying to retailers in unincorporated areas of a county, others exempting stores that receive a certain portion of their revenue from tobacco sales or liquor stores, or flavor restrictions to only e-cigarettes and not menthol flavor, smokeless tobacco, hookah, or other products.<sup>8</sup>

In general, the communities that have implemented such bans/restrictions tend to be more urbanized, such as in the regions of Los Angeles and the Bay Area.<sup>8</sup> Other areas, such as the San Joaquin Valley and its neighboring mountains areas, have yet to implement restrictions. This

might be due in part to their being higher number of smokers and vapers in these regions than in other area of the state,<sup>9</sup> but other concerns have been raised as well, including the potential impact on tourism resulting from smokers and vapers who either choose not to visit areas that ban flavored products or purchase their products beforehand rather than at the retail outlet, the violation of the freedom of use of these products, particularly among adults who have been using them for a long time, and the role that vaping plays in harm reduction for cigarette smokers.

There is conflicting evidence about the impact of a ban on flavored products on retail outlets. For instance, previous research suggests that the implementation of a flavor ban leads to a decrease in flavor usage by youths, but an increase in the use of other tobacco products, mainly cigarette use. This suggests that the impact of a ban on retail outlets might be minimal due to shifts in usage. On the other hand, an analysis conducted by the State of California projected lost revenue of \$292 million (\$237 million would be from excise tax and \$54.5 million in sales tax revenue) if a flavor ban were implemented.<sup>10</sup> Their projections were based on the estimated number of current users who would switch to online purchasing or obtaining products from out-of-town retailers. This would suggest that while the impact on smoking behavior might not be significant, there would be a large loss in revenue to local retailers. The concern is even greater in rural communities that rely on tourism, this has retailers and county officials concern that a flavored sales ban will not only harm sales but also on tourists not wanting to visit their communities where a ban may be in place.

Direct evidence of the impact on flavored bans on retail outlets is difficult to obtain due to the fact that retail outlets are not required to provide detailed information about their sales of vaping and nicotine products. However, an alternative approach is to examine the behavior of smokers and vapers, particularly about their current purchasing patterns, how these patterns

might change if a flavored ban was introduced, and the extent to which a flavored ban might change their travel or vacation plans. This evidence, when coupled with information about the public's support for flavored bans, particularly in rural areas, would provide information to county officials on the likely impact and support of flavored bans in their counties.

The purpose of this study is to report the results from a survey investigating the likely impact of a flavor ban on purchasing behavior of smokers and vapers, and the support that exists for these bans. Responses were compared across participants in three regions of California: The Bay Area, urban areas of Central California, and rural areas of the San Joaquin Valley and mountain communities. The study specifically addresses three questions: 1) What are the purchasing patterns of smokers and vapers in these regions, 2) would vapers or smokers change their vacation plans if there was a ban in the county they planned to visit, and 3) what is the support for regulations that restrict or ban the sale of flavored products by retail outlets? The implication of these results for understanding the likely impact of flavored bans on retail outlets is discussed.

## **Methods**

**Data sources:** Data were collected before the COVID pandemic (late 2019 and early 2020) and using two methodologies. First, data collection in the community was conducted in coordination with a group of *Promotores de Salud* (Hispanic community health workers) from the local community. *Promotores de Salud* is a highly experienced group in conducting surveys and were approached by our team to help administer surveys in “hard to reach” communities such as rural, heavily Latino regions in California. In partnership with a group of bilingual, trained research assistants, data was collected from a variety of sites in the community, including ethnic group festivals (e.g., indigenous events), community events (e.g., farmer's markets, community fairs),

and in-person surveys. In-person surveys were translated to Spanish for participants. At the end of the survey, participants were given a \$20 gift card as an incentive. The second method involved an online survey organized Qualtrics. The survey targeted urban and rural areas throughout the state of California (identified and screened by the zip code of the respondent). An Institutional Review Board approved this study.

***Measures:***

*Smoking status:* As per previous studies, smokers were identified as having smoked any product (cigarette, cigar, cigarillos, or hookah) more than 100 times in their lifetime and in the last 30 days, and vapers as people who had vaped more than 100 times in their lifetime and in the last 30 days.<sup>11,12,13</sup> Most ‘vapers’ also reported meeting the criteria for being a smoker as well, suggesting that they should be viewed as ‘dual users.’ Based on these responses, participants were categorized into one of three categories: Smoker (does not vape), vaper (vaper only or dual user), and non-smoker.

*Region:* Participants were categorized as living in one of three regions based on their zip code: Bay Area, Urban Central California (Fresno and Sacramento), and Rural San Joaquin Valley.

*Demographics:* All participants were asked their age, gender, race/ethnicity, self-reported political views (liberal to conservative), and education level.

*Purchasing behavior at home and on-vacation:* Vapers and smokers were asked about the places where they would purchase items at their homes and how this would change if they were to vacation in a county that had a ban. They were also asked how they would change their behavior if a total ban on flavored vaping or tobacco products was introduced across the state of California.

*Attitudes about bans on smoking and vaping:* All participants were asked to indicate on a 1 to 5 scale (1 being ‘not at all’) the degree to which they would support a number of different bans, ranging from the *sale of all vaping and smoking products* to *banning advertisements of vaping products in smoke shops, convenience stores, markets, or liquor stores* (see table 4). Because this was not a representative sample, the averages for each region were weighted using census data for the average age, gender, ethnicity, and education in the region, and the California Health Information Survey (CHIS) to assess the prevalence of smoking and vaping.

*Analysis:* Chi-square tests were used to test differences in the outcome variables among regions by smoking and vaping status. All analyses were performed in STATA 15.

## **Results**

*Demographics of sample:* As shown in Table 1, among the 773 participants who completed the survey, 56% were female (n=433), the average age was 44.4 years, 70% were non-smokers, 13% were categorized as vapers, and 17% categorized as smokers. Of the females, 76% were nonsmokers (n=330), 9% were vapers (n=39), and 15% were smokers (n=64). Of the males in the sample, 62% were nonsmokers (n=206), 19% were vapers (n=62), and 20% were smokers (n=67). As participants were categorized by region, the majority reported being from the mountains and rural communities in the San Joaquin Valley (55%), with 25% coming from the Bay Area and 20% from urban areas of Central California.

Table 2 reports the behaviors of vapers. Overall, 19% of the respondents reported not using cigarettes at all, but the remainder reported either dual use (34%) or that they are using vaping to stop (13%) or reduce (34%) smoking. The majority of vapers reported buying their products from a local shop (60%), though the numbers were greater for people living in rural



areas (70%) than in urban Central California or the Bay Areas (50% and 48%), where online purchasing was more common than in the rural areas. In response to questions about their behavior should they go on vacation, the most likely scenario reported by vapers in all regions is that they would bring their own products with them (mean = 2.33 out of 4), and that they would be unlikely to choose another place to vacation should a flavor ban be in effect (mean = 1.32 out of 4). This same pattern of responses held if there was a total ban of vaping in their prospective vacation spot, and if California were to ban all flavored products, 26% reported they would switch to non-flavored products, 26% that they would switch to cigarettes, and 19% said that they would switch to another flavored product.

A similar pattern of results was found for smokers (Table 3). The majority of smokers reported buying their products from a local shop (53%), though the numbers were greater for people living in rural areas (58%) than in urban Central California or the Bay Areas (52% and 46%), where online purchasing was more common than in the rural areas. In response to questions about their behavior should they go on vacation, the most likely scenario reported by smokers in all regions is that they would bring their own products with them (mean = 2.55 out of 4), and that they would be unlikely to choose another place to vacation should a flavor ban be in effect (mean = 1.09 out of 4). This same pattern of responses held if there was a total ban of smoking products in their prospective vacation spot, and if California were to ban all flavored tobacco products, 30% reported they would switch to non-flavored products, 20% that they would switch to vaping, and 1% said that they would switch to another tobacco product, and 16% said they would quit smoking.

Finally, participants were asked the views regarding a number of policy options currently being considered by some counties in California. As shown in Tables 4a, 4b, and 4c, support for

the ban of all vaping products was fairly similar across the regions, with between 50% (urban Central California and Bay Area) to 56% (Rural SJV) of the nonsmokers favoring a ban of all and flavored vaping products (the numbers were lower for vapers and smokers). The support among non-smokers increased when the target of the ban was people under the age of 21, including 66% support in rural areas and 73% support in urban Central California and the Bay Area. Support fell to between 40% (urban Central California) and 48% (rural areas) for the proposal to ban the sale of vaping products to cigarette smokers who want to quit smoking.

## **Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to examine the potential impact of a ban on flavored vaping products in California. The study focused on three regions – the greater Bay Area, urban areas of Central California, and rural areas of the San Joaquin Valley and mountain communities. The results indicate that, across all regions, smokers and vapers are more likely to get products from local shops or markets as opposed to on-line, although the use of online delivery was greater for people in the Bay Area and urban areas of Central California than in the rural areas of the San Joaquin Valley and mountain communities. Furthermore, neither smokers nor vapers reported being likely to change their vacation plans should a ban be introduced into a county they were thinking of visiting and reported being more likely to bring products from home or use non-flavored products.

The finding that smokers and vapers were not likely to change their vacation plans might seem unsurprising in one sense, vacations plans consideration of a number of factors of which availability of flavored vaping products is likely to be far down the list. But it is a consideration for counties that depend on tourism, where even small decreases in visitors can have a disproportionate impact on the local economy. And as pointed out by the California Office of

Finance when considering the potential impact of a flavored products ban,<sup>10</sup> the availability of online purchasing might exacerbate the impacts without having the benefits from reduction in use. The results here suggest that such dramatic impacts are unlikely.

The results also report the support for various proposals to ban vaping and/or flavored products. The results suggest that, not surprisingly, support for bans are greater among nonsmokers than for vapers or smokers, though support does increase for all groups when examining support for bans for 21 and younger buyers. This is consistent with previous studies that have found support for bans is higher among never tobacco users than current users.<sup>15,16</sup> There are some regional differences, but actually more support in rural areas than in the urban Central California or the Bay areas for bans. While not greater than 50%, there is still substantial support for banning sale of vaping products even for the use in smoking cessation. This suggests that the nonsmoking public is not convinced of the benefits of vaping for smoking cessation.

Overall, this study contributes to the body of knowledge as to what would be expected from a local flavored ban, from consumers and the local economy perspective. On one side, the implementation of a comprehensive flavored ban will significantly reduce the use of flavored nicotine products among adults, and it would have a major impact in stopping the rising trend of its use among youth. As discussed previously in this paper, rural regions are left behind on this matter as they tend to have the highest number of smokers and vapers as compared to other regions. If a ban is implemented, this would help increase the opt-out option among its users, even though some of them would look for other alternatives for replacement. From a local economic perspective, the implications on retailers would not be much since tourism destinations are not likely to change due to a ban. This is what policymakers are concern about, however, findings in economic research indicate that a flavored ban would have a narrow impact because

the majority of tobacco sellers do not specialize in the sale of tobacco products. Other reasons as to why this is, first, most retailers selling flavored tobacco products do not rely on these products as their only or primary source of revenue. Second, consumers are likely to spend money originally intended for a banned tobacco product on other purchases, including tobacco products and other goods and services. Third, labor and other resources not used in the supply and sale of a banned product tend to be redirected to other uses.<sup>17</sup>

Despite the rigorous effort in carefully examining the behavior of vapers and smokers, there are some limitations in this paper. First, the sample of vaping/smoking status by region was relatively small. Second, we did not have another large urban region such as Los Angeles to compare participants with. Further research is clearly needed, and these limitations should be taken into consideration when addressing vaper/smoker's behavior.

## References

1. Miech R, Johnston L, O'Malley PM, Bachman JG, Patrick ME. Trends in Adolescent Vaping, 2017–2019. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(15):1490-1491. doi:10.1056/NEJMc1910739
2. Hamberger ES, Halpern-Felsher B. Vaping in adolescents: epidemiology and respiratory harm. *Current Opinion in Pediatrics*. 2020;32(3):378-383. doi:10.1097/MOP.0000000000000896
3. Trtchounian A, Williams M, Talbot P. Conventional and electronic cigarettes (E-cigarettes) have different smoking characteristics. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2010;12(9):905-912. doi:10.1093/ntr/ntq114
4. Trucco EM, Fallah-Sohy N, Hartmann SA, Cristello JV. Electronic cigarette use among youth: understanding unique risks in a vulnerable population. *Curr Addict Rep*. 2020;7(4):497-508. doi:10.1007/s40429-020-00340-w
5. Keamy-Minor E, McQuoid J, Ling PM. Young adult perceptions of JUUL and other pod electronic cigarette devices in California: a qualitative study. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(4):e026306. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026306
6. Mishra A, Chaturvedi P, Datta S, Sinukumar S, Joshi P, Garg A. Harmful effects of nicotine. *Indian Journal of Medical and Paediatric Oncology*. 2015;36(01):24-31. doi:10.4103/0971-5851.151771
7. California Tobacco Control Branch. California Department of Public Health. <https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/CTCB/Pages/CaliforniaTobaccoControlBranch.aspx>. Accessed June 7, 2021.
8. Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids. <https://www.tobaccofreekids.org/>. Accessed July 10, 2021.
9. Liu L, Edland S, Myers MG, Hofstetter CR, Al-Delaimy WK. Smoking prevalence in urban and rural populations: findings from California between 2001 and 2012. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*. 2016;42(2):152-161. doi:10.3109/00952990.2015.1125494
10. SB 38 (Hill) - Flavored tobacco products (2019). SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS. [https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201920200SB793](https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml?bill_id=201920200SB793). Accessed July 10, 2021.

11. Syamlal G, Mazurek JM, Hendricks SA, Jamal A. Cigarette smoking trends among US working adult by industry and occupation: findings from the 2004–2012 National Health Interview Survey. *Nicotine & Tobacco Research*. 2014; 17(5), 599-606.
12. Syamlal G, Mazurek JM, Dube SR. Gender differences in smoking among u. S. Working adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2014;47(4):467-475.  
doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2014.06.013
13. Braak D, Cummings K, Nahhas G, et al. Where do vapers buy their vaping supplies? Findings from the international tobacco control (Itc) 4 country smoking and vaping survey. *IJERPH*. 2019;16(3):338. doi:10.3390/ijerph16030338
14. Rogers T, Brown EM, Mccrae TM, et al. Compliance with a sales policy on flavored non-cigarette tobacco products. *tob regul sci*. 2017;3(2):84-93.  
doi:10.18001/TRS.3.2(Suppl1).9
15. Agaku IT, Odani S, Armour BS, King BA. Adults' favorability toward prohibiting flavors in all tobacco products in the United States. *Preventive Medicine*. 2019;129:105862. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.105862
16. Soule EK, Chaiton M, Zhang B, et al. Menthol cigarette smoker reactions to an implemented menthol cigarette ban. *tobacco reg sci*. 2019;5(1):50-64.  
doi:10.18001/TRS.5.1.5
17. Institute for Global Tobacco Control. State of the Evidence: Flavored Tobacco Product Bans or Restrictions.  
<https://www.globaltobaccocontrol.org/resources/flavorreportssummary>. Accessed July 15, 2020.

**Table 1**  
**Demographics by group (%)**

	<b>Total (N=773)</b>	<b>Non-smokers (N=541)</b>	<b>Vapers (N=101)</b>	<b>Smokers (N=131)</b>
Sex/Gender				
Male	43%	38%	61%	51%
Female	56%	61%	39%	49%
Race/Ethnicity				
White	48%	46%	57%	53%
Hispanic	31%	35%	25%	16%
Black	7%	4%	7%	16%
Asian	8%	9%	6%	9%
Other	6%	6%	5%	6%
Education				
<4-year degree	66%	65%	57%	74%
≥4-year degree	34%	35%	43%	26%
Conservatism				
Extremely	16%	17%	10%	16%
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Age (in years)	44.44(16.68)	45.95(17.56)	37.10(12.61)	44.11(14.23)
Regions				
Urban Bay Area	25%	23%	27%	29%
Rural San Joaquin Valley	55%	60%	46%	46%
Urban Central California	20%	17%	27%	25%

Table 2

<b>Restrictions on vaping products: Vapers Purchasing and Travel Behavior</b>					
<b>Means, Percentages and Chi Square by Region</b>					
	<b>All</b>	<b>Bay Area</b>	<b>Rural San Joaquin Valley</b>	<b>Urban Central California</b>	<b>Pearson's Chi2</b>
<b>n</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>27</b>	
<b><i>Vaping Behavior</i></b>					11.64
Vape only (don't smoke cigarettes)	19%	0%	29%	23%	
Vape and smoke cigarettes	34%	37%	31%	35%	
Vape only, used to smoke cigarettes	13%	22%	7%	15%	
Vape to reduce cigarettes use	34%	41%	33%	27%	
<b><i>Vaping purchasing behavior- Home</i></b>					7.81
Local shop	60%	48%	71%	50%	
Market or convenience store	14%	19%	13%	11%	
Online	22%	26%	16%	31%	
Someone in the community	4%	7%	0%	8%	
<b><i>Vaping purchasing behavior- Vacation Plans</i></b>	<b>Mean Likelihood (0=not at all; 1=a little; 2=somewhat; 3=very; 4=extremely)</b>				
Bring enough vaping products from home with you	2.33	2.88	2.02	2.30	11.35
Buy vaping products at the vacation spot from a <u>smoke shop</u>	1.91	2.33	1.78	1.73	11.34



Buy vaping products at the vacation spot from a <u>market or liquor store</u>	1.84	2.44	1.67	1.53	13.41
Buy vaping products at the vacation spot from <u>someone in the community</u>	1.45	2.44	1.00	1.23	28.08**
<b><i>Vaping purchasing behavior- Flavor ban at vacation spot</i></b>	<b>Mean Likelihood (0=not at all; 1=a little; 2=somewhat; 3=very; 4=extremely)</b>				
Choose another place to vacation	1.32	2.40	0.82	1.07	28.71**
Vacation at that spot but bring your own flavored vaping products	2.31	2.48	2.21	2.30	2.36
Vacation at that spot but use <u>non-flavored</u> vaping products	1.74	2.51	1.34	1.65	15.65*
Vacation at that spot but use <u>another nicotine product (e.g. cigarettes)</u>	1.90	2.18	1.82	1.76	6.21
Vacation there but buy vaping products from <u>someone in the community</u>	1.39	2.40	1.02	1.00	24.78**
<b><i>Vaping purchasing behavior- Total ban at vacation spot</i></b>	<b>Mean Likelihood (0=not at all; 1=a little; 2=somewhat; 3=very; 4=extremely)</b>				
Choose another place to vacation	1.31	2.14	0.86	1.23	20.65**
Vacation at that spot but bring your own vaping products	2.39	2.25	2.32	2.65	13.63
Vacation at that spot but use <u>another nicotine product (e.g. cigarettes)</u>	1.95	2.33	1.84	1.76	9.03

Vacation there but buy vaping products from <u>someone in the community</u>	1.38	2.29	1.00	1.11	22.01**
<b><i>Behavior if California banned all flavor vaping products</i></b>					11.55
Switch to non-flavored vaping products	26%	37%	27%	12%	
Switch to cigarettes	26%	19%	29%	27%	
Switch to another tobacco product	19%	22%	20%	15%	
Quit vaping	11%	4%	13%	15%	
Don't know	18%	18%	11%	31%	
*p<.05					
**p<.01					

**Table 3**  
**Restrictions on smoking products: Smokers and Vapers Purchasing and Travel Behavior**  
**Means, Percentages and Chi Square by Region**

	All	Bay Area	Rural San Joaquin Valley	Urban Central California	Pearson's Chi2
<b>n</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>60</b>	
<b><i>Smoking purchasing behavior-Home</i></b>					3.13
Local smoke shop	53%	46%	58%	52%	
Market or convenience store	35%	38%	32%	35%	
Online	8%	10%	7%	9%	
Someone in the community	4%	6%	3%	4%	
<b><i>Smoking purchasing behavior-Vacation plans</i></b>	<b>Mean Likelihood (0=not at all; 1=a little; 2=somewhat; 3=very; 4=extremely)</b>				
Bring enough cigarettes, cigars, or cigarillos from home with you for the trip	2.55	2.53	2.54	2.61	4.42
Buy cigarettes, cigars, or cigarillos in the vacation spot from a <u>smoke shop</u>	2.18	2.38	1.95	2.44	13.09
Buy cigarettes, cigars, or cigarillos in the vacation spot from a <u>market or liquor store</u>	2.21	2.36	2.01	2.40	5.51
Buy cigarettes, cigars, or cigarillos in the vacation spot from <u>someone in the community</u>	1.39	1.96	1.01	1.46	22.32**

<i><b>Smoking purchasing behavior-Flavor ban at vacation spot</b></i>	<b>Mean Likelihood (0=not at all; 1=a little; 2=somewhat; 3=very; 4=extremely)</b>				
Choose another place to vacation	1.09	1.77	0.65	1.15	28.18**
Vacation at that spot but bring your own flavored cigarettes, cigars, or cigarillos	2.00	2.10	1.88	2.23	12.57
Vacation at that spot but use <u>non-flavored</u> cigarettes, cigars, or cigarillos	1.83	2.11	1.60	2.00	11.99
Vacation at that spot but use <u>another nicotine product (e.g. e-cigs or other vaping products)</u>	1.63	2.00	1.38	1.69	14.55
Vacation there but buy cigarettes, cigars, or cigarillos from <u>someone in the community</u>	1.24	1.77	0.93	1.23	27.22**

<b><i>Smoking purchasing behavior-Total ban at vacation spot</i></b>	<b>Mean Likelihood (0=not at all; 1=a little; 2=somewhat; 3=very; 4=extremely)</b>				
Choose another place to vacation	1.24	1.74	0.86	1.42	24.31**
Vacation at that spot but bring your own cigarettes, cigars, or cigarillos	2.39	2.20	2.44	2.59	12.80
Vacation there but buy cigarettes, cigars, or cigarillos from <u>someone in the community</u>	1.41	1.87	1.12	1.46	19.46*
<b><i>Behavior if California banned all flavored tobacco products</i></b>					7.58
Switch to non-flavored tobacco products	30%	34%	31%	23%	
Switch to e-cigs	20%	21%	20%	21%	
Switch to another tobacco product	1%	1%	1%	1%	
Quit smoking	16%	13%	13%	25%	
Don't know	33%	31%	35%	30%	

\*p&lt;.05

\*\*p&lt;.01

**Table 4A**  
**Support for banning vaping and smoking products in**  
**Rural SJV by group (%)**

	Rural San Joaquin Valley								
	Non-smoker			Smoker			Vaper		
	No	Yes	Don't Know	No	Yes	Don't Know	No	Yes	Don't Know
Sale of all vaping products?	25%	56%	19%	43%	42%	15%	57%	28%	15%
Sale of <u>flavored</u> vaping products other than those with mint or menthol flavors?	24%	57%	19%	43%	40%	17%	55%	30%	15%
Sale of mint or menthol flavored vaping products?	25%	56%	19%	45%	40%	15%	60%	30%	10%
Sale of <u>flavored tobacco</u> products other than those that are mint or menthol flavored?	24%	58%	18%	58%	28%	14%	55%	28%	17%
Sale of mint or menthol flavored tobacco products?	25%	55%	20%	57%	28%	15%	55%	28%	17%
Sale of all vaping products to people under the age of 21?	23%	66%	11%	22%	67%	11%	34%	51%	15%
Sale of <u>flavored</u> vaping products to people under 21?	22%	66%	12%	20%	67%	13%	28%	55%	17%
Sale of <u>flavored tobacco</u> products to <u>people under 21?</u>	25%	65%	10%	20%	68%	12%	34%	53%	13%
Advertisement of vaping products in convenient stores, markets, or liquor stores?	28%	57%	15%	50%	40%	10%	53%	30%	17%
Advertisement of vaping products in smoke shops?	32%	53%	15%	48%	40%	12%	57%	28%	15%
Sale of vaping products to people who want to use them to quit smoking cigarettes?	28%	48%	24%	46%	37%	17%	52%	33%	15%

**Table 4B**  
**Support for banning vaping and smoking products in**  
**Urban Central CA by group (%)**

	Urban Central California								
	Non-smoker			Smoker			Vaper		
	No	Yes	Don't Know	No	Yes	Don't Know	No	Yes	Don't Know
Sale of all vaping products?	26%	50%	24%	36%	43%	21%	59%	30%	11%
Sale of <u>flavored</u> vaping products other than those with mint or menthol flavors?	23%	55%	22%	48%	37%	15%	59%	30%	11%
Sale of mint or menthol flavored vaping products?	29%	51%	20%	49%	33%	18%	59%	30%	11%
Sale of <u>flavored tobacco</u> products other than those that are mint or menthol flavored?	29%	51%	20%	46%	36%	18%	56%	33%	11%
Sale of mint or menthol flavored tobacco products?	34%	49%	17%	61%	24%	15%	59%	30%	11%
Sale of all vaping products to people under the age of 21?	16%	73%	11%	21%	58%	21%	44%	45%	11%
Sale of <u>flavored</u> vaping products to people under 21?	17%	72%	11%	24%	58%	18%	33%	56%	11%
Sale of <u>flavored tobacco</u> products to <u>people under 21?</u>	22%	69%	9%	27%	58%	15%	41%	52%	7%
Advertisement of vaping products in convenient stores, markets, or liquor stores?	28%	58%	14%	45%	30%	25%	41%	44%	15%
Advertisement of vaping products in smoke shops?	32%	54%	14%	43%	36%	21%	44%	37%	19%
Sale of vaping products to people who want to use them to quit smoking cigarettes?	35%	40%	25%	40%	33%	27%	59%	30%	11%

**Table 4C**  
**Support for banning vaping and smoking products in**  
**Urban Bay Area by group (%)**

	Urban Bay Area								
	Non-smoker			Smoker			Vaper		
	No	Yes	Don't Know	No	Yes	Don't Know	No	Yes	Don't Know
Sale of all vaping products?	27%	50%	23%	49%	41%	10%	59%	33%	8%
Sale of <u>flavored</u> vaping products other than those with mint or menthol flavors?	23%	55%	22%	41%	49%	10%	59%	37%	4%
Sale of mint or menthol flavored vaping products?	27%	49%	24%	54%	38%	8%	63%	26%	11%
Sale of <u>flavored tobacco</u> products other than those that are mint or menthol flavored?	27%	52%	21%	43%	51%	6%	63%	33%	4%
Sale of mint or menthol flavored tobacco products?	29%	50%	21%	56%	41%	3%	52%	33%	15%
Sale of all vaping products to people under the age of 21?	12%	73%	15%	49%	49%	2%	37%	48%	15%
Sale of <u>flavored</u> vaping products to people under 21?	12%	74%	14%	41%	57%	2%	41%	44%	15%
Sale of <u>flavored tobacco</u> products to <u>people under 21?</u>	12%	74%	14%	41%	57%	2%	37%	52%	11%
Advertisement of vaping products in convenient stores, markets, or liquor stores?	25%	55%	20%	57%	35%	8%	44%	52%	4%
Advertisement of vaping products in smoke shops?	33%	50%	17%	54%	38%	8%	56%	33%	11%
Sale of vaping products to people who want to use them to quit smoking cigarettes?	37%	43%	20%	54%	33%	13%	52%	41%	7%