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Outcomes-Based Prevention

- Use of data to identify high levels of a substance-related consequence – AKA Outcome
- Our *outcome* is MVCs with drinking drivers within the 15-24 year age range
- All locations identified 18-24 year olds as target
- Change in level of outcome over time determines success of prevention activities
Distribution of MVCs & $$

- Baseline MVC rates were 3-year rates - 2006-2008*
- Funding considered two things
  - Jurisdiction rates higher than state rate
  - Proportion of crashes >1%
- 13 Jurisdictions funded
- 11 Jurisdictions implementing Phase II

*Data acquired from Virginia DMV
Virginia Updates Since 2008

- Number / rate of all MVCs downward trend
- Rate of alcohol-related MVCs down
  - Dropped one-third (33%) since 2004
  - From 19.2 to 12.9 alcohol-related MVCs per 10,000 persons 15 years of age and older
  - With BAC => 0.08
- Alcohol is consistently involved in 7-8% of all MVCs
- Any alcohol involved in >35% of fatal crashes
Eligible Jurisdictions

Motor Vehicle Crashes with Drinking Drivers 15–24, 2006–08: Rates and Proportions

Legend

- Rate > state rate
- Rate equal /less than state
- Proportion 1%+ (PROP_MVC)
  - < 1%
  - => 1%

Dark yellow jurisdictions have alcohol-related MVC rates greater than state AND proportion of crashes 1% or higher
Funded Jurisdictions

- 13 cities/counties funded to conduct local needs assessment - determine why so many MVCs
  - Albemarle
  - Arlington
  - Augusta
  - Campbell
  - Chesterfield
  - Fairfax County
  - Franklin County
  - Hanover
  - Lynchburg
  - Rockingham
  - Roanoke City
  - Roanoke County
  - Washington County
Funded Jurisdictions - Phase I

MVCs with Drinking Drivers 15 to 24, 2009–2010 with Funded Localities

Legend
- Alc-MVCs 2010-small
- Alc-MVCs 2009-small
Funded VA Counties (FUNDED)
- Yellow 1
- Gray 0
Strategic Prevention Framework

- Step 1: Assessment
- Step 2: Capacity
- Step 3: Planning
- Step 4: Implementation
- Step 5: Evaluation

- Sustainability and inclusion of cultural competency important throughout
Phase II

- 11 jurisdictions completed Steps 1-3
  - Assessment
  - Capacity
  - Planning
- Working on Steps 4 & 5
  - Implementation and
  - Evaluation
Assessment Identified Causes

Intervening Variables and Contributing Factors
IVs & CFs - Strategy Targets

Intervening Variables (IVs)
- Made up of specific Contributing Factors
- Community / population level – describe characteristics that influence alcohol-related outcomes
- Factors that influence the level of a behavior and then the outcome in populations
- Target of Environmental Strategies – most effective
IVs & CFs - Strategy Targets

- Risk and Protective Factors
  - Individual level IVs -- influencing individuals directly rather than indirectly thru environment
  - Individual-focused strategies work best in conjunction with Environmental Strategies
  - Once local assessment done - select the IVs to target and appropriate strategies
Jurisdiction Prevention

- All prevention activities *evidence-based* and approved by SPF-SIG Evidence-Based Workgroup (EBW)
- All jurisdictions *implementing environmental strategies*
- One jurisdiction has included an individually-focused strategy
  - High risk college students
  - Brief intervention
- Several strategies selected for ~3 prioritized factors (IVs)
Alcohol-Specific IVs

- Based on research – shown on Holder model
- Seven (7) key community IVs
  1. Retail Availability
  2. Social Availability
  3. Enforcement
  4. Community Norms
  5. Promotion
  6. Price
  7. Perceived Risk
Alcohol-Related Motor Vehicle Crash Model

Alcohol Sales and Service Regulations, Enforcement, and Sanctions

DUI Enforcement

Public Awareness of Drinking/Driving Enforcement

Community Norms—Drinking and Driving

Perceived Risk of DUI Arrest

Individual Factors

Drinking Context

Community Norms—Drinking

Social Availability

Retail Availability

Alcohol Serving and Sales Practices

Price

Drinking

Driving After Drinking

Alcohol-Related Motor Vehicle Crashes

Research Evidence

Strong Relationship

Moderate Relationship

Minor Relationship

Little Research Evidence but Logical Relationship

Harold Holder, Environmental Prevention: Achieving High Quality Implementation to Best Outcomes, SAMHSA, November 2011
Examples of Targeted EBS

Targeted Intervening Variable

- Restricting alcohol sales at public events

Availability
Virginia Examples - IV/CF Targets

- **Law enforcement**
  - Greater presence – check points and saturation patrols
  - Social media awareness

- **Retail availability**
  - Sales to intoxicated
  - App for taxi rides home / estimate BAC

- **Community norms**
  - Not okay to drink and drive / binge
  - All friends don’t
  - Targeted internet / social media messages
Trend in Alcohol-Related Crashes

Persons Killed in Crashes

Trend in Fatalities from Alcohol-Related Crashes, Virginia

Any BAC>0
Trend – 15 to 24 Year Olds

- Decreased even more since 2004
- 15-20 year olds – down 44% from 2004-2011
  - From 21.7 to 12.1 per 10,000 persons 15-20
- 15-20 year olds – rates similar to all drivers
- 21-24 year olds – down 36%
  - From 56.2 to 36.0 per 10,000 persons 21-24
- 21-24 year olds – rate remains 2-3 times then either 15-20 year olds or all drivers
Trend – 15 to 24 Year Olds

Trend in Rate/10,000 MVCs With Drinking Drivers 15-24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>15-20</th>
<th>21-24</th>
<th>15-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>34.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>32.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>33.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>31.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>26.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>22.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>21.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where Do Crashes Occur

- Baseline was 3 years – to get more stable rates
- Since then, looked at individual years and variations seen
- With some locations remaining high each year
Rate of Alcohol-Related Motor Vehicle Crashes With Drinking Drivers 15-24, 2006-2008

Alc-MVC 15-24 Rate/10,000:
- Less than 26.44
- 26.44 – 34.14
- 34.15 – 37.82
- 37.82 – 47.06
- 47.06 and Greater

State Rate = 34.1 / 10000 15-24
2009 Data

Rate of Alcohol-Related Motor Vehicle Crashes With Drinking Drivers 15-24, 2009

AlcMVCs 15-24 Rate/10,000
- Less than 14.64
- 14.64 - 26.34
- 26.35 - 30.86
- 30.86 - 40.46
- 40.46 and Greater

State Rate = 26.34/10,000 15-24
2010 Data

Rate of Alcohol-Related Motor Vehicle Crashes With Drinking Drivers 15-24, 2010

AICMVCs 15-24 Rate/10,000
- Less than 14.83
- 14.83 - 22.35
- 22.40 - 28.17
- 28.17 - 39.18
- 39.18 and Greater

State Rate = 22.35 / 10,000 15-24
2011 Data

Rate / 10,000 Alcohol Related MVCs with Drivers 15-24, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alc-MVC 15-24 Rate/10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 14.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.26 - 22.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.88 - 26.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.16 - 40.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.49 and Greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Rate = 22.87 / 10,000 15-24
2011 Data – 18-24 only

Rate / 10,000 Alcohol Related MVCs with Drivers 18-24, 2011

- Less than 19.26
- 19.26 - 29.66
- 29.66 - 37.75
- 37.75 - 59.81
- 59.81 and Greater

State Rate = 29.65 / 10,000 18-25
Statewide -- **Who is the Driver?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>2009 # MVCs</th>
<th>2010 # MVCs</th>
<th>2011 # MVCs</th>
<th>2009 Rate /10,000</th>
<th>2010 Rate /10,000</th>
<th>2011 Rate /10,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-17 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>40.85</td>
<td>35.16</td>
<td>30.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>11.87</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>23.90</td>
<td>20.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,452</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>59.63</td>
<td>51.25</td>
<td>52.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>17.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>1,686</td>
<td>1,648</td>
<td>41.06</td>
<td>36.21</td>
<td>36.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 15-24 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,202</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>37.90</td>
<td>32.08</td>
<td>31.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,962</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,456</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>22.32</td>
<td>21.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statewide -- **Who is the Driver?**

![Trend in MVCs With Drinking Drivers 15-24 Years, Rate/10,000, Virginia](image)

**Age and Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2009 Rate</th>
<th>2010 Rate</th>
<th>2011 Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-17 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-24 years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statewide -- Who’s At Risk?

- Overall, males ~ 3 times more likely to be the driver
  - 32 MVCs/10,000 males vs 11 MVCs/10,000 females
  - For 15-17 year group – 2 times more likely
- 21-24 year olds - highest rate
  - 52 MVCs/ 10,000 males 21-24 vs 18/ 10,000 females
  - 31 MVCs/ 10,000 males 18-20 vs 11/ 10,000 females
  - 4 MVCs/10,000 males 15-17 vs 2/ 10,000 females
When Do MVCs Occur?

MVCs by Month of Crash, 2011

- January: 8
- February: 6
- March: 7
- April: 8
- May: 9
- June: 8
- July: 9
- August: 7
- September: 9
- October: 8
- November: 7
- December: 9
When Do MVCs Occur?

MVCs by Time of Crash, 2011

- 8-12 am: 25%
- 0-4 am: 45%
- 4-8 am: 15%
- 8-12 pm: 5%
- 12-4 pm: 5%
- 4-8 pm: 10%
Statewide Updates in Usage

- Past month use of substances decreased overall from 2006-2010 in both 12-17 year olds and 18-25 year olds
- Exception --- alcohol use and binge drinking for 18-25 year olds
- Data – National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), 2004-2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia Drug Use - NSDUH</th>
<th>12-17</th>
<th>18-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past Month Marijuana Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change 2006-2010</strong></td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past Month Use of Illicit Drugs Other Than Marijuana</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change 2006-2010</strong></td>
<td>-19.7%</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Past month use of pain relievers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change 2006-2010</strong></td>
<td>-15.8%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illicit Drug Use 12-17

Trend in Past Month Illicit Drug Use, 12-17, Virginia

- Purple line: Marijuana
- Red line: Illicit Drugs Other Than Marijuana
- Blue line: Pain relievers

NSDUH, 2004-2011
Illicit Drug Use 18-25

Trend in Past Month Illicit Drug Use, 18-25, Virginia

- Marijuana
- Illicit Drugs Other Than Marijuana
- Pain relievers

NSDUH, 2004-2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Month Alcohol Use</th>
<th>12-17</th>
<th>18-25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change 2006-2010</td>
<td>-18.5%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past Month Binge Alcohol Use</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change 2006-2010</td>
<td>-21.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol dependence or abuse</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change 2006-2010</td>
<td>-12.6%</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Past Month Alcohol Use, 18-25

Trend in Past Month Alcohol Use, 18-25, Virginia

Percent

Use
Binge
Abuse/Dependence

NSDUH, 2004-2011
Specifics -- Fundees

- Change in rate over time
- Consider percent of change in funded localities versus unfunded localities statewide
- Goal - decrease of at least 10% from baseline
- Country-wide seeing decrease in rates
- Since all localities are decreasing – hope to see a 10% greater decrease in funded localities
Specifics -- Fundees

- Assessment activities began in 2012
- Interventions began early 2013
- Local data will be collected in late 2013
  - Change in usage-related behaviors
  - Awareness of prevention activities
- MVC data -- 2006-08 baseline thru 2013
Trend in MVC Rate/10,000, Funded Jurisdictions

- 2006-2008 Rate 15-24
- 2009 Rate 15-24
- 2010 Rate 15-24
- 2011 Rate 15-24

Virginia DMV
# Trend in Rates – Funded Localities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albemarle County</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>45.49</td>
<td>29.95</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>-21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta County</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>52.24</td>
<td>24.93</td>
<td>-53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbell County</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>30.86</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>24.37</td>
<td>-55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chesterfield County</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>26.89</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax County</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>23.40</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>-28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin County</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>31.35</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover County</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>44.30</td>
<td>30.55</td>
<td>32.90</td>
<td>-20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke City</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>49.45</td>
<td>27.66</td>
<td>28.49</td>
<td>-45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roanoke County</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>30.52</td>
<td>28.66</td>
<td>22.93</td>
<td>-44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>42.05</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>-60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>22.35</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>-32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18-24 Year Old Survey Data

- Survey data from 10 fundees merged
- 2,137 responses
- Responses per locality ranged from
  - 49 in Augusta County
  - 626 in Lynchburg City
- Merged data
  - **Cannot be generalized** to entire state
  - Suggests interesting findings
18-24 Year Old Survey Data

- Overall –
  - 59% (1,263) were 18-20
  - 41% (874) were 21-24
- Augusta and Chesterfield – more 21-24 year olds than 18-20 year olds
- 44% males, 56% females, 4% missing
- 77% white, 23% non-white
- 4% Hispanic, 8% missing
18-24 Year Old Survey Data

- 18-20 year olds
  - 42% lived w/parents, 32% dorm, 19% w/ friends
- 21-24 year olds
  - 35% in w/ friends, 28% w/ parents, 13% with SO
- 66% full-time college students
- 47% worked part-time / 20% worked full-time
18-24 Year Old Usage Data

- Virginia’s Young Adult Survey data – similar to NSDUH results for drinking and bingeing

![Bar Chart: Drinking in past month, VYAS and NSDUH, Virginia]

- VYAS-Yes
- NSDUH-Yes

Percent

Drink

Binge

61.3  66.6

43.2  44.6
18-24 Year Old Usage

- Most who drank alcohol did so on few days only
- More males than females
- ~5% males, 3% females drank most days
18-24 Year Old Usage

- Differed by age
- 51% 18-20 drank 1+ days
- 77% 21-24 drank 1+ days
18-24 Year Old Survey Data

- Those not in school were most likely to drink
- 21-24 – full time students similar
18-24 Year Old Binge Drinking

- 45% drank 5+ (males) / 4+ (females)
- 52% of males
- 36% of females
18-24 Year Old Binge Drinking

- 52% 21-24 year olds binge drank in past month
- 37% 18-24 year olds binge drank in past month
18-24 Year Old Drinking & Driving

- BAC $\geq 0.04$ – significant impairment
  - $\sim 4$ beers, 2 hours, 180 lbs
- Impairments may be present at very low levels - equivalent to 1 standard drink and BACs as low as 0.01 (Taylor et al., 2010).
- Fujita and Shibata (2006) found BAC = 0.05+ resulted in 4X the risk of fatality in traffic accidents
  

18-24 Year Old Drinking & Driving

- Only 18% said drove after drinking 2+ drinks
- Most few days only
- 26% males
- 13% females
18-24 Year Old Drinking & Driving

- More 21-24 year olds
- 24% 21-24 year olds
- 15% of 18-20 year olds
18-24: Rode With Drinking Driver

- Most claimed to not ride with someone who’d been drinking
- 21-24 year olds more likely to ride -- 30% versus 21% of 18-24
18-24: Rode With Drinking Driver

- Males more likely to ride with someone who was drinking
- 30% males
- 22% females
18-24 Year Old Risk Perceptions

- Survey asked – “risk” of binge drinking and drinking*.
- Driving after drinking 1-2 drinks – results differed by age group.
- Others similar.

*World Health Organization promotes this term globally.
18-24: Risk – Binge Drinking

Risk - 5 or more alcoholic drinks on one occasion

- Great Risk: 43.1%
- Moderate Risk: 35.5%
- Slight Risk: 17%
- No Risk: 3.6%
- Don’t Know or Can’t Say: 0.9%

No difference between age groups
18-24: Risk – Driving After Drinking

Risk - Drive after drinking 1-2 alcoholic drinks

- Great Risk: 25.3% (18-20), 18.1% (21-24)
- Moderate Risk: 45.7% (18-20), 41.1% (21-24)
- Slight Risk: 23.6% (18-20), 33.6% (21-24)
- No Risk: 4.7% (18-20), 6.7% (21-24)
18-24: Risk – Driving After Drinking

No difference between age groups
18-24: Perception of DUI Risk

- Only 13-24% thought it ‘Not very likely / Not at all likely’ that someone driving under the influence would be stopped or arrested
- 70% thought it ‘Very likely/Somewhat likely’ drunk adults would be served or sold alcohol
18-24 Year Old Attitudes

- 20% said ‘Somewhat acceptable’ to provide alcohol for people <21
  - 26% said ‘Somewhat unacceptable’
  - 44% said ‘Unacceptable’
- 52% said ‘Acceptable/Somewhat’ for 18-20 year olds to have 1-2 drinks
- 34% said ‘Acceptable/Somewhat’ for 18-20 year olds to get drunk
- 84% said ‘Unacceptable/Somewhat’ for 15-17 year olds to have 1-2 drinks
- 92% said ‘Unacceptable/Somewhat’ for 15-17 to get drunk
18-24: Top Reasons to Drink

- Of those who drank, the top reason was celebration (62%).
- 48% just like the taste.
18-24: Top Reasons to Drink by Age

- Older more apt to like taste and use alcohol for stress relief
- Younger use it to fit in and flirt

![Chart showing reasons to drink by age]
18-24: How Hard to Get Alcohol

- 57% said sort of / very easy to get alcohol if underage
18-24: Where Do They Get Alcohol

- 18-20 primarily got alcohol from friends (77%)
- 32% said from parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>18-20</th>
<th>21-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I bought it</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From friends</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents / over 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took from parent’s house</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took from store</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18-24: Where Do They Get Alcohol

- 29% of respondents said they were NOT asked to show an ID last time they bought alcohol
- 24% said they had provided alcohol to someone under 21
- 9% said they’d used a fake ID
18-24: Drinking Games

- Less than 50% localities included questions about drinking games
- Of those that did –
  - 97% respondents said somewhat / very popular
  - 92% said rapid consumption somewhat / very popular
  - 48% said drink specials influence the number they consume
  - 47% said drink specials influence where they go
18-24 Year Old Survey

- To be repeated late this year
- To include evaluation questions regarding environmental strategies
- Hope to see decreases in risky behaviors
Next Year – Complete Profile

- Usage alcohol and other drugs
- Substance-related harms
  - DUI / Drug-related arrests
  - Cirrhosis / Drug-related / overdose deaths
  - Alcohol / Illicit drug abuse/dependence
- Co-morbidity – mental health / SA
  - Need to explore data sources – nothing currently available statewide
- Returning military
  - Need to explore data sources