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Santa Clara County Toy Ordinance

1) PROHIBITS toys or other giveaways with
2) Foods/Beverages EXCEEDING nutritional criteria (allows toys if they meet this criteria)
3) At restaurants IN unincorporated areas

Stated Intent of the Ordinance

 To improve the health of children and adolescents in the County by setting healthy nutritional standards.
 To support families seeking healthy eating choices for their children.

Nutritional Criteria: Limits

Food Item

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 calories</td>
<td>480 mg sodium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% total calories from fat</td>
<td>10% total calories from saturated fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5g trans fat</td>
<td>10% of calories from added sweeteners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meal

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600 calories</td>
<td>600 mg sodium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% total calories from fat</td>
<td>10% total calories from saturated fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5g trans fat</td>
<td>10% of calories from added sweeteners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beverage

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>125 calories</td>
<td>485 calories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% total calories from fat</td>
<td>10% of calories from added sweeteners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No added non-nutritive sweeteners</td>
<td>No caffeine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Restaurants Could Respond in a Number of Ways. For example,

- **TOYS:**
  - Get rid of toys
  - Toys only with meals meeting criteria
  - Offer toys freely

- **MENU ITEMS:**
  - Reformulate
  - Add healthful menu items
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Research Questions

How would restaurants respond to the legislation?

- Menu items
- Restaurant environment
Challenge 1: Tight timeline

Legislation in Effect: August 9, 2010

Legislation Passed: April/May, 2010

June/July 2010 (pre)
Aug/Sept 2010 (post 1)
Nov 2010 (post 2)
March 2011 (post 3)
June/July 2011 (post 4)

Challenge 2: Sample Size

- 4 Target locations: national/global fast food chains
- 4 Control locations: same-chain, nearby, similar demographics
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CMA

- Children’s Menu Assessment Tool (CMA)
  - Alterations
  - Direct Observation
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2005 Dietary Guidelines for Americans (4–8 y)</th>
<th>2010 IOM School Lunch Recommendations (Grades K–5)</th>
<th>USDA National School Lunch Program Standards (Grades K–6)</th>
<th>Toy Ordinance nutritional criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Max Food Energy (kcal)</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>550–650</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fat (as a percentage of total calories)</td>
<td>≤ 10%</td>
<td>≤ 10%</td>
<td>≤ 10%</td>
<td>≤ 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturated Fat (as a percentage of total calories)</td>
<td>&lt; 10%</td>
<td>&lt; 10%</td>
<td>&lt; 10%</td>
<td>&lt; 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans-fat</td>
<td>&lt;1% of energy intake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>&lt; 0.5 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>≤ 633 mg</td>
<td>≤ 640 mg</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>≤ 600 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Added Sweeteners</td>
<td>Less than half of discretionary calories</td>
<td>≤ 22% total sugars per portion packaged</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&lt;12% calories from added sweeteners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s name(s), sex, and date of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allergies to any of the following?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food: Beef, fish, eggs, milk, nuts,</td>
<td>Swedish, wheat,</td>
<td>Norwegian,</td>
<td>other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allergic symptoms observed in the child?</td>
<td>Swedish, wheat,</td>
<td>Norwegian,</td>
<td>other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the child have any special dietary</td>
<td>symptoms observed in the child?</td>
<td>symptoms observed in the child?</td>
<td>other?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restrictions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Appetizers on the children’s menu</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Minimum Spend Required to Entire Room</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Any special dietary restrictions for the children</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Special Instructions</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Allergies to any of the following are listed on the children’s menu.*
Also, added:

- Location of children’s menu: drive thru, menu board
- Presence/Absence of playground
- Pricing
- Signage descriptions (toy focused vs. food focused, location)
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Children’s Menu Assessment Score


WHAT IMPROVED AT AFFECTED RESTAURANTS?

- Nutritional Guidance
- Toy marketing and distribution
  - Removed toys
  - Separated sales
  - Removed toy signage/branding
- Promotion of healthy meals, beverages, side items
  - They identified and more vigorously promoted meals and items meeting nutrition criteria

Pre
Stayed the same at 4 months post?
- No restaurants reformulated
- No restaurants added more healthful menu options

Summary: 4 months post
- No menu additions/reformulations

- **Affected restaurants**
  - Identified/promoted meals meeting ordinance criteria, removed toy posters and signage, and de-linked toy sales with children’s meals.

- **Unaffected restaurants**
  - Minimal change
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Using the CMA tool

- Made sense of the data in a systematic way
- Allowed for an objective measure and for us to identify where changes took place
- Value of a visual
- Direct observation can augment

Thank you!

- **Co-Investigators**: Matt Buman, Kenya Eddings, Christopher Gardner, Eric Hekler, Lisa Henriksen, Abby King, Brian Saelens, Delia Smith West
- **In the field**: Katherine Dotter, Kirsten Rogers

Questions?