ALCOHOL COMPLIANCE CHECKS:

An Environmental Strategy Conducted Statewide in South Carolina at the Local Level

Wednesday, August 16
9:45 am-11:15 am
1. The extent of the underage drinking issue in the nation as well as South Carolina
2. A review of the research and grey literature regarding alcohol compliance checks
3. Best practices concerning alcohol compliance checks
4. The process and outcome evaluation aspects of AET since 2007.

WHAT WE WILL DISCUSS TODAY
THE PICTURE OF UNDERAGE DRINKING
Leading Contributor to Death

- 4,300 people under age 21 die each year from alcohol-related injuries

![Pie chart showing:
- Motor Vehicle Crashes: 38%
- Homicides: 32%
- Suicide: 6%
- Other: 24%]
- Death
- Traffic Crashes
- Crime
- Secondhand Effects
- Academics
- Damaged Brain Development
- Economic Costs
- Not a complete list!

ALCOHOL-RELATED CONSEQUENCES
Youth who drink before the age of 15 are four times more likely to develop alcohol dependence and 2½ times more likely to become alcohol abusers than those who wait until age 21. 

The risk of becoming an alcoholic increases the younger a teen starts drinking.

- **Age 13**: 45% chance of alcohol-dependence
- **Age 17**: 26% chance of alcohol-dependence
- **Age 21**: 7% chance of alcohol-dependence
## Lifetime use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Been drunk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monitoring The Future Survey, 2015**
## 2015 S.C. YRBS VS. 2015 U.S. YRBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>South Carolina</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime Alcohol</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>0.00/difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge Drank</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>0.00/difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove after Drinking Alcohol</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>.04/difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rode with a driver who had been drinking alcohol</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>.31/no difference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Centers for Disease Control & Prevention. (2016). http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/data/yrbs/results.htm
2,128 for 5 years or almost 36 drivers per month
HARM ASSOCIATED WITH UNDERAGE DRINKING IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Underage drinking in South Carolina leads to substantial harm due to traffic crashes, violent crime, property crime, unintentional injury, and high-risk sex.

- During 2012, an estimated 43 traffic fatalities and 937 nonfatal traffic injuries were attributable to driving after underage drinking.
- In 2012, an estimated 21 homicides; 13,200 nonfatal violent crimes such as rape, robbery, and assault; 16,800 property crimes including burglary, larceny, and car theft; and 315,000 public order crimes including vandalism, disorderly conduct, loitering, and curfew violations were attributable to underage drinking.
- In 2011, an estimated 6 alcohol-involved fatal burns, drownings, and suicides were attributable to underage drinking.
- In 2013, an estimated 404 teen pregnancies and 12,852 teens having high-risk sex were attributable to underage drinking.
### Costs of Underage Drinking by Problem, South Carolina, 2013 $

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Total Costs (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth violence</td>
<td>$514.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth traffic crashes</td>
<td>$179.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-risk sex, Ages 14–20 years</td>
<td>$43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property and public order crime</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth injury</td>
<td>$53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poisonings and psychoses</td>
<td>$6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetal alcohol syndrome among mothers aged 15–20 years</td>
<td>$19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth alcohol treatment</td>
<td>$26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$927.1</strong> (e.g. $0.9 B)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ALCOHOL COMPLIANCE CHECKS

LITERATURE REVIEW

MDG
Main reason to increase MLDA in late 1980s was 1) prevalence of DUI among teenagers, and 2) resulting alcohol crashes (French & Maclean, 2006).

Other reasons to increase drinking age, such as prevention of delinquency and criminal activity using NESARC survey data (18 to 20 year olds).

Very little studies concerned issues of alcohol use, delinquency, and criminal activity.

Delinquency issues related to cutting class or missing school, engaging in some sort of risky or dangerous behavior, or bullying. Criminal activities were vandalizing property, stealing some item of value, and other illegal act.

It was assumed that heavy alcohol use related more to delinquency or criminal activity. This found to not necessarily to be the case. Authors found that less underage drinking has a positive effect on delinquency and criminal activity.

Even more community benefits to reducing underage access to alcohol.

Study focused on aspects of a best practices toolkit containing information & resources mailed to alcohol outlets (Wolff et al., 2011)

Purpose of toolkit was to reduce underage alcohol purchases (i.e. fake ID identification tools, policies, etc.)

Use of toolkit resulted in increase of signage quoting underage drinking laws & ID checking practices

Significant rise in managers offering underage drinking material to employees

Both practices have significance in prior studies

Authors recommended in person visits to alcohol outlets possibly conducted by community coalitions

Distribution by governmental bodies, such as licensing departments, was recommended, too.

Alcohol availability is considered a predictor of initial consumption (age of first use) and consumption patterns (30-day past use, binge drinking, etc.) in communities (Gosselt, Van Hoof, & De Long, 2012).

Enforcement combined with feedback and technical solutions appear to be key to compliance with underage drinking sale law. Providing information through training and public campaigns offer little effects.

Study focused on reasons that alcohol outlet personnel complied or did not comply with underage drinking law related to legal age to purchase.

Researchers (authors) learned that compliance with age limits for alcohol sale requires combination of awareness of age limits and a connection of possible violations to negative consequences.

Importance of environmental strategy of compliance enforcement is confirmed.

Through deterrence theory, perception of risk for underage drinking violations have been shown to have affect on alcohol use in communities (Lipperman-Kreda, Grube, & Paschall, 2010).

Very little is known about processes through which enforcement strategies affect underage drinking.

Study focused on development of a conceptual model that specified direct and indirect relationships between perception of enforcement, adult & youth personal beliefs, and community norms.

Analyzed existing survey data from 2007 Oregon Health Teens Survey.

Researchers found perceived alcohol availability, perceived drinking by peers and perceived local enforcement of underage drinking laws directly affected 30-day alcohol use.

Enforcing underage drinking laws and educating about underage drinking issues can affect community juvenile delinquency and criminal activity. Increased high visibility enforcement affects perception of consequences. Enforcement efforts combined with merchant education and visits by education staff (government entities, prevention staff, etc.) to alcohol outlets is important. Community perceptions about alcohol availability and peer consumption affects overall use of alcohol by youth.
BEST PRACTICES FOR ALCOHOL COMPLIANCE CHECKS
WHAT ARE COMPLIANCE CHECK INVESTIGATIONS?

Investigations that

- control youth access to alcohol from retail outlets
- are cost-effective
- work with underage buyers
- test retailers’ compliance with laws regarding the sale of alcohol to minors

PIRE, 1999
Selection of Volunteers

- Sources for Recruiting Underage Volunteers
  - Community and faith groups
  - School youth groups
  - Family members and friends of officers
  - Department employees who are under 21
  - Criminal justice programs in local colleges and high schools
  - Advertisements in college and community newspapers
  - Underage volunteers from tobacco compliance checks
SELECTING UNDERAGE VOLUNTEERS

It is strongly recommended that your underage volunteers not be working off any criminal charges or have any previous criminal history.

SLED will not be able to adopt the case for administrative penalties if you are using a UCI that is working off charges.

There are other requirements (SEE MEMORANDUM)

Use age-testing to make sure that volunteers look underage.

Retailers may suggest that the volunteer looked older than 21 and that’s why their employee didn’t ask for identification.
One method is to take your potential volunteer to a heavily traveled area such as a mall and ask 10 random people how old they think your volunteer looks.

- If most reasonable people think your volunteer looks 21 or older you should not use them.

Another method is to have an independent panel made up of responsible citizens assess the appearance of the underage volunteers before they are used in compliance checks.
SELECTING UNDERAGE VOLUNTEERS

- Select underage volunteers who match the community
- Select underage volunteers (some areas may not want to use 20 year olds)
- Select both male and female volunteers
- Instruct volunteers not to dress in ways that make them appear older
- Use volunteers in areas where they are not known
Train Volunteers to:

- Help them feel comfortable on how they are to act, what they are to say, what they are to purchase.
- Answer questions truthfully and provide photo identification when asked.
- Avoid situations that seem dangerous and not to buy if people in the outlet know them.
- Help them get over their fears or concerns.
- Give them some confidence that they can perform this role effectively.

KEY STEPS IN PREPARING FOR COMPLIANCE INVESTIGATIONS
Documentation of Volunteers. Collect the following information:

- Personal history form
- Photograph of volunteer
- Driving and criminal checks
- Injury waivers
- Parental permission form
- Agreement of Understanding
- Copy of Driver’s License
- Age Verification Form
- Record of compliance checks conducted
Compliance Program
Guidelines and Procedure Checklist

1. Parental consent
2. Photo before OPS
3. Carry only recorded state funds and drivers license/ID.
4. Cursory search of buyer before operation, no other money or alcohol
5. Casual clothes, no jewelry, no purse or bag, no tobacco use
6. No facial hair and no alcohol consumption
7. Buyer should say nothing to clerk for off-sale purchase
8. Buyer should only order to server for on-sale purchase
9. If sale occurs out of officer’s view, buyer will ID clerk
10. Buyer selects one pre-determined product
11. Buyer goes to least busiest register, placing on counter
Compliance Program
Guidelines and Procedure Checklist

12. If asked for age or date of birth, answer truthfully
13. If asked for ID, hand clerk DL or ID
14. Buyer will not encourage clerk to make sale if questioned
15. Buyer accepts receipt if offered, not ask for it
16. If buy occurs, officer takes possession of item and change
Compliance Program
Guidelines and Procedure Checklist

17. Officer(s) approach clerk, ID themselves, explain OP, retrieve bills used, return change, arrest or issue citation, write reports

18. Buyer write statement immediately after purchase while fresh, officer make notes of times, location, etc. during operation

19. Photo after OPS
- Investigate all retail outlets in the community
- Select locations at random
- Investigate all retailers in particular geographic areas (e.g., near a college campus)
- Select certain kinds of outlets (e.g., convenience stores)
- Select locations based on complaints or previous violations
- Timing and scheduling of investigations
- Number of volunteers and officers
ENFORCEMENT FOLLOW-THROUGH:

- Penalties on clerks
- Penalties on license holders
- Allow media to ride along
- Work with judicial partners
- Work with community leaders to create environmental change (including youth)
COMMUNITY FOLLOW-THROUGH:

- Publicize results (media plan)
- Educate retailers
- Educate the general public
- Review policies and advocate change as needed
SOUTH CAROLINA PROCESS & OUTCOME EVALUATION
### FY2008 - FY2016 ENFORCEMENT NUMBERS

*JULY 1, 2007 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2016 (STATE FISCAL YEARS RUN JULY 1 TO JUNE 30)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY2008-2016</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>FY2008-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compliance Checks</td>
<td>67,247</td>
<td>Compliance Check Sales</td>
<td>9,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety Checkpoints</td>
<td>7,043</td>
<td>Bar checks</td>
<td>2,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturation Patrols</td>
<td>2,489</td>
<td># of Parties Prevented</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Party Dispersals</td>
<td>1,303</td>
<td>Merchant Education</td>
<td>16,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Contacts</td>
<td>2,845</td>
<td>Shoulder Taps</td>
<td>304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Enforcement & Education numbers are collected monthly but FY 2017 numbers are not included in this count.**
ALCOHOL CRASHES 21+ UP 20% & <21 DOWN 27%

DUI Crashes for 21 & older & under 21 year olds
January 2007 to December 2015

State AET Begins
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>% decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>high school students reported ever drinking alcohol</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
<td>-18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported drinking alcohol before age 13</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>-16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported drinking alcohol in past 30 days</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>-34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reported binge drinking (5 or more drinks in 2 hour time period) in past 30 days</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>-50.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPLIANCE CHECK OPERATION RESULTS REPRESENT AN ALMOST 63% DECREASE IN THE BUY-RATE IN SC!

COMPLIANCE CHECKS
BUY RATE
Compliance Checks Conducted vs. Buy Rate
Jul. 2007 through Jun. 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Series2 243</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>1,349</td>
<td>5,261</td>
<td>7,121</td>
<td>6,438</td>
<td>6,108</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>7,830</td>
<td>9,043</td>
<td>8,499</td>
<td>8,176</td>
<td>6,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series1 22.8%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMPARISON OF UNDER 21 DUI CRASHES AND ALCOHOL COMPLIANCE CHECK BUY RATE
COMPARISON OF 21+ DUI CRASHES AND ALCOHOL COMPLIANCE CHECK BUY RATE
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cell: 803-727-3651
fax: 803-896-5557
mnienhius@daodas.sc.gov
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