DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Division of Measurement Standards 8500 Fruitridge Road Sacramento, CA 95826 Phone: (916) 229-3000

Fax: (916) 229-3006

September 23, 2004

A.G. KAWAMURA, Secretary



DMS NOTICE QC - 04 - 5

Discard: Retain

TO WEIGHTS AND MEASURES OFFICIALS

SUBJECT: Statewide Price Verification Survey

The 2004 statewide price verification survey was completed in June. While this was a follow up to prior surveys allowing us to evaluate changes in compliance conditions that have occurred over previous years, we also expanded this survey to include additional categories and looked at manual entry sales as well as automated scanner transactions. In an effort to balance the selection process, location selection was based on state tax records not county weights and measures records as was done with prior surveys. With many smaller businesses and apparel stores added to the selection pool, selection sizes included purchases of 5, 10, or 30 items per location. These efforts required resources from most counties and we appreciate the continued interest and hard work by each of the many California weights and measures officials involved.

In the following tables the shaded areas present additional categories not used in earlier surveys.

Survey results indicate that of 8377 **items** purchased, 2.94% were overcharged and 1.47% were undercharged (see Table 1). An aggregate algebraic overcharge amounted to 0.22% of the dollars spent (see Table 2). Of the 772 stores inspected, 562 (76.42 %) had no overcharges. Table three was replaced since it does not relate to past surveys. Sample sizes of 5 and 10 items can never go into "Level 1" when there are violations. Based only on percent of **total** correct price criteria, 70 stores (9.07%) had algebraic overcharges of less than 2% of the correct price (Level 1). 38 stores (4.92%) had overcharges that ranged between 2% and 4% of the correct amount (Level 2). 48 stores (6.22%) had algebraic overcharges equal to or more than 4% of the correct amount (Level 3). The highest percent of algebraic overcharge for a location was 27.09 % more than the correct total price.

Table 3 outlines survey results by manual entry, scanner, and price look-up codes.

Please review the attached report and contact Ken Lake, Program Supervisor, Measurement Compliance, at (916) 229-3047 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Mike Cleary Director

Attachments

DIVISION OF MEASUREMENT STANDARDS

STATEWIDE PRICE VERIFICATION SURVEY

A statewide survey of pricing accuracy at retail stores was conducted throughout the state during May and June of 2004.

Scope of Survey

Establishments surveyed included both food and nonfood retail stores to evaluate accuracy in determining the proper sales price.

Sample Selection

Over seven hundred fifty (750) establishments were selected at random from a statewide population of approximately 350,000 qualifying retail establishments. Items were randomly selected from each establishment based on the following criteria:

- a. If there are less than 400 lots on sale.

 Sample size = 5 items
- b. If there are more than 400 lots on sale **and** there are
 - (1) 10 or fewer shopping carts. Sample size = 10 items
 - (2) More than 10 shopping carts. Sample size = 30 items

Inspection Procedure

Approximately half of the items selected were sale items, price reduced or "special buys"; including manufacturers' reduced price items, in-store specials or markdowns. After selecting the sample, the items were run through the check stand and the prices charged for the items were compared with the advertised, quoted, posted or marked prices. If the price charged for an item was more than the lowest of the advertised, quoted, posted or marked price, it was determined that an overcharge existed. If the price charged was less than the lowest of the advertised, quoted, posted or marked price, it was determined that an undercharge existed. If the price charged equaled the lowest of the advertised, quoted, posted or marked price, it was determined that no error existed.

Survey Results

The following tables summarize the survey results in comparison to the 2000 and 2002 surveys. These results may be useful for county weights and measures officials in determining which areas of the marketplace to focus enforcement activity.

TABLE 1

TABLE 1							
Type of Store		Year	Number of Items	Overcharge	%	Undercharge	%
			Inspected	Number of Items		Number of Items	
Specialty Food and Tobacco							
	Liquor	2004	255	18	7.06	7	2.75
Eatin	g Establishments	2004	208	2	0.96	4	1.92
Ap	oparel and Shoes	2004	498	6	1.20	6	1.20
	Art, Gift, Novelty	2004	191	3	1.57	3	1.57
	Entertainment	2004	409	7	1.71	17	4.16
Furni	shings/Appliance	2004	611	13	2.13	13	2.13
	Sporting Goods						
	Grocery	2004 2002 2000	2408 4050 5607	83 106 99	3.45 2.62 1.77	20 30 59	0.83 0.74 1.05
		2004 2002 2000	360 1469 1256	19 41 24	5.28 2.79 1.91	10 22 39	2.78 1.50 3.11
	Building	2004 2002 2000	295 630 899	8 23 40	2.71 3.65 4.45	9 8 36	3.05 1.27 4.00
	Variety	2004 2002 2000	921 1383 899	19 30 10	2.06 2.17 1.11	16 30 34	1.74 2.17 3.78
	Drug	2004 2002 2000	1035 2041 2339	18 45 31	1.74 2.20 1.33	7 22 48	0.68 1.08 2.05
	Misc	2004 2002 2000	506 5190 3684	22 107 90	4.35 2.06 2.44	7 103 126	1.38 1.98 3.42
	Nonfoods Total	2004 2002 2000	5021 10713 9077	124 246 195	2.47 2.30 2.15	89 185 283	1.77 1.73 3.12
	Foods Total	2004	3356	122	3.64	34	1.01
	Grand Total	2004 2002 2000	8377 14763 14684	246 352 294	2.94 2.38 2.00	123 215 342	1.47 1.46 2.33

TABLE 2 Algebraic Result of All Errors

Туре	Year	Sales	Amount Overcharge	% Over
Specialty Food & Tobacco	2004	\$1,995.50	\$6.75	0.34
Liquor	2004	\$636.31	-\$0.86	-0.14
Eating/Drinking Establishments	2004	\$668.43	-\$1.25	-0.19
Apparel & Shoes	2004	\$9,707.47	-\$6.98	-0.07
Art, Gift, & Novelty Stores	2004	\$2,919.02	\$4.28	0.15
Entertainment	2004	\$3,705.69	\$4.56	0.12
Furnishings & Appliance Stores	2004	\$12,544.61	-\$2.92	-0.02
Sporting Goods	2004	\$3,246.86	\$50.73	1.56
Grocery	2004	\$8,042.65	71.71	0.89
	2002	\$16,531.03	\$81.35	0.49
	2000	\$18,844.18	\$35.72	0.19
Auto	2004	\$3,325.31	\$23.62	0.71
	2002	\$11,927.08	\$118.48	0.99
	2000	\$9,660.29	-\$54.36	-0.56
Building	2004	\$2,489.56	-\$10.57	-0.42
	2002	\$7,943.98	\$24.61	0.31
	2000	\$10,637.71	-\$22.98	-0.22
Variety	2004	\$10,214.08	-\$20.81	-0.20
	2002	\$13,433.31	\$38.12	0.28
	2000	\$11,524.10	-\$35.67	-0.31
Drug	2004	\$5,505.30	\$24.28	0.44
	2002	\$12,440.30	\$48.94	0.39
	2000	\$11,743.70	-\$11.19	-0.10
Miscellaneous	2004	\$3,342.01	\$10.37	0.31
	2002	\$79,952.99	-\$273.21	-0.34
	2000	\$56,218.33	-\$632.15	-1.12
Total for Food Groups	2004	\$11,324.89	\$76.35	0.67
	2002	\$16,531.03	\$81.35	0.49
	2000	\$18,844.18	\$35.72	0.19
Total for Non-Food	2004	\$56,999.91	\$76.56	0.13
	2002	\$125,697.66	-\$43.06	-0.03
	2000	\$99,784.13	-\$756.35	-0.76
Grand Total	2004	\$68,342.80	\$152.91	0.22
	2002	\$142,228.69	\$38.29	0.03
	2000	\$118,628.31	-\$720.63	-0.61

TABLE 3
Comparison by Pricing Methods for 2004 Data

Pricing System Used	Number of Items	Over Charges Number of Items	%	Under Charges Number of Items	%
Manual Entry Food Establishments NonFood Establishments Total	909	27	2.97	18	1.98
	1162	27	2.32	22	1.89
	2071	54	2.61	40	1.93
PLU or SKU Food Establishments NonFood Establishments Total	280 432 712	10 15 25	3.57 3.47 3.51	2 13 15	0.71 3.01 2.11
Scanner Food Establishments NonFood Establishments Total	2167	85	3.92	14	0.65
	3427	82	2.39	54	1.58
	5594	167	2.99	68	1.22