THE CONSUMPTION AND CONSEQUENCES OF ALCOHOL in Monroe County, IN A Local EPIDEMIOLOGICAL PROFILE

Developed by the Monroe County Asset Building Coalition Through its Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant “Project 1825” Jan. 2008
Generated for Monroe County community leaders and state policy-makers by the Asset Building Coalition in partnership with the Monroe County Commissioners, this epidemiological profile presents data and analysis to support the development of a framework for advancing the mission of the Asset Building Coalition and the Indiana Substance Abuse Prevention System.

This document and the efforts described herein were funded through a Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant (SPF SIG) from the Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), and the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP).
The mission of the Asset Building Coalition is to improve the quality of life for the entire community, and to sustain a recognized coalition that promotes asset-building and life skills!

To accomplish this mission, the coalition pledges:

- To collaborate with community partners with similar missions and to mobilize community resources to implement the Coalition’s responsibilities.

- To establish a quality, science-based alcohol, tobacco and other drug abuse prevention initiative that supports and complements other initiatives in Monroe County.

The focus of the ABC:

- Promoting Developmental Assets
- Increasing Protective factors
- Reducing Risk Factors

The ABC sets Community prevention priorities and is an 501 (c)(3) corporation. The ABC serves as the prevention arm of the Bloomington CARES Board (our Local Coordinating Council – LCC) established in 1983.
Alcohol, specifically underage and binge drinking is the priority under which our community received funding by the Indiana Strategic Prevention Framework from the Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), and the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP):

As established in the State Epidemiological Profile (SEOW), Monroe County ranks 19th out of the 92 Indiana counties in terms of proxy indicators for alcohol. These indicators present a safety hazard to all residents of Monroe County. Below is a summary list of county level consequences of alcohol use and abuse highlighted in this profile.

- Number of arrests for illegal possession/consumption of alcohol.
- Number of arrests for public intoxication.
- Number of arrests for driving while under the influence.
- Number and rate of alcohol related fatal auto accidents.
- Number and rate of alcohol-related crashes.
- Number of Bloomington Hospital Admits with alcohol as primary and secondary diagnosis.
- Number of people with sexually transmitted diseases.
The Indiana Strategic Prevention Framework Process

The Indiana Strategic Prevention Framework (see graphic below) is a process guide for prevention professionals and community stakeholders to follow when planning and implementing prevention initiatives for their community. It is a five step process that encompasses the best practices of prevention and is designed to bring community stakeholders together in collaboration through various workgroups. Key ideas include a lifespan focus, community-level change, data driven decision making, and the implementation and evaluation of evidence-based programs.

In Monroe County, the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) is being employed to address underage and binge drinking. This epi profile is part of the first step - assessment.

The Five Steps:

1. **Assessment**
   Profile population needs, resources, and readiness to address the problems and gaps in service delivery.

2. **Capacity**
   Mobilize and/or build capacity to address needs.

3. **Planning**
   Develop a comprehensive strategic plan.

4. **Implementation**
   Implement evidence-based prevention strategies and infrastructure development activities.

5. **Evaluation**
   Monitor process, evaluate effectiveness, sustain effective programs/activities, and improve or replace those that fail.

*The concurrent goals of Cultural Competency & Sustainability are integral to each part of the framework as a community moves through the process.*
Monroe County Workgroups have been established for each phase of the framework –

The Local Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup (LEOW), is part of the assessment phase. The Monroe County LEOW members are volunteers from stakeholder agencies with a public health and safety orientation who have contributed local data for this epi profile and aided in the analysis of any data compiled.
LEOW Mission

*We are a multi agency network whose common aim is the assessment of alcohol abuse patterns, trends, and emerging problems within Monroe County.*

*Workgroup data sharing and analysis will provide the foundation of information for public health response. Our ultimate goal is the reduction of alcohol abuse and its related consequences.*
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Methods

LEOW members represent local agencies where data about the patterns of use and negative consequences of alcohol are maintained. Members meet regularly one time per month to provide, review, compare, and draw inferences from data. When expedient, LEOW members meet individually with the LEOW Chairperson and/or SPF SIG staff toward data collection or comparative analysis.

Primary Objectives

- Determine who are exhibiting the most significant negative consequences.
- Identify demographic characteristics (e.g. age, ethnicity, race, gender, education level, socio-economic status, sexual orientation, individuals within the criminal justice system.)
- Identify when, where, and under what conditions groups are using/abusing.
- Identify environmental variables encouraging or discouraging use/abuse. What attitudes, beliefs, knowledge and behaviors in each domain are encouraging or discouraging uses? (e.g. individual, peer, family, community)
- Identify alcohol abuse patterns in defined geographic areas.
- Identify changes in alcohol abuse patterns over defined time periods to establish trends.
- Detect emerging substances of abuse.
- Promote or further develop cross agency partnerships toward strengthening community prevention capacities and sustainability.
- Disseminate Epidemiological Report to members and appropriate community agencies for the development of policies, practices, prevention strategies, and research studies.
Local/Regional Data Sources

Bloomington Hospital Emergency Department
South Central Community Action Program
City of Bloomington Housing Authority
Monroe County Public Health Department
Monroe County Youth Services Bureau
Monroe County Probation Department
Monroe County Sheriff’s Office
Bloomington Police Department
Ellettsville Police Department
Indiana State Excise Police
Indiana University Police
Monroe County Youth Services Bureau
Indiana Department of Education
Indiana State Department of Health
Monroe County Community School Corporation
Richland Bean Blossom School Corporation
The Indiana Youth Tobacco Survey (IYTS)
Indiana University
Ivy Technical Community College
Indiana Prevention Resource Center
Search Institute of Minnesota
Indiana Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking Core Survey

National Data Sources

Centers for Disease Control & Prevention
Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration -
Alcohol & Drug Treatment Episodes and Admissions Data System (TEDS)

Federal Bureau of Investigation
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
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Executive Summary
Epidemiological Profile

THE CONSUMPTION AND CONSEQUENCES OF ALCOHOL in Monroe County, IN

This summary represents a preliminary step in developing a comprehensive look at the impact of alcohol on our community and is intended to help generate dialog on ways to address alcohol-related problems in Monroe County. The Asset Building Coalition and the County Commissioners hope that it will serve as a springboard for building consensus about ways to improve the health and wellness of our citizens. Listed below are key archival statistics and community conditions related to alcohol use and abuse identified and analyzed in the epidemiological profile.

Monroe County ranks 19th out of 92 Indiana counties in terms of proxy indicators for alcohol. Each indicator (e.g. OWI arrest data) presents a safety hazard to ALL residents of Monroe County.

OWI has been the number one offense in Monroe County for 17 years.

2007: The most prevalent adult offense type in Monroe County (per Probation Dept.) was substance-related, accounting for 57% of all offenses committed by adult offenders:

- 45% of offenders had prior convictions
- 34% were assessed as alcohol and/or drug dependant
- 29% were IU students

2007: State Excise Police issued more summonses in Monroe County than in any other county in Indiana.

2007: State Excise Police charged 45 county adults with furnishing alcohol to a minor. (This statistic is from a single agency indicating a county condition endangering our youth.)

2006-2007: The 18-25 yr. old demographic is responsible for 83% of all substance related offenses scripted by Bloomington Police Department and Indiana University Police Department.

- 97% of the illegal consumption arrests
- 63% of the OWI arrests
- 67% of the public intoxication arrests

2007: Monroe County Pre-Trial Diversion citations for minor alcohol offenses including illegal consumption/possession and public intoxication totaled 1,642.
40% of Crash Fatalities in Monroe County were Alcohol Related.

Economic Deprivation

- 14% of all Monroe County residents live in poverty
- 22.5% of students in Monroe County receive free lunch
- Graduation rates for Monroe County average only 80%
- 30% of single mothers and 26% of single fathers have children living below the poverty level
- 33% of Monroe County residents 18 and over have no health insurance

Social & Retail Availability of Alcohol

- Monroe County high school youth report that alcohol is easy to obtain socially
- The Indiana State Excise Police report that in 2007 Monroe County retail alcohol outlets had a 27% non-compliance rate with alcohol codes
- In Monroe County, there are 2.07 alcohol sales outlets for every 1,000 persons compared to state rates of 1.74
- The state of Indiana tax on alcohol has not been raised since 1981

Community Health Consequences

- From Jan. to Sept. 2007: 645 Emergency Room visits and admits of 18-25 yr. olds with alcohol as the primary or secondary diagnosis/2006 year total was 712
- In 2006 Monroe County reported 427 cases of Chlamydia and 416 cases of Gonorrhea among 15-24 yr. olds (The effects of alcohol abuse include sexual health because it increases the likelihood of having unplanned and/or unprotected sex)
- 18-24 yr. olds and 35-44 yr. olds have the highest numbers for being in treatment for alcohol addiction in Monroe County
- From 2001-2006 alcohol caused an average of 20% of county deaths

County Youth Consumption Indicators/Risk Factors/Protective Factors

- Teens that start drinking at age 13 have a 43% chance of becoming an alcoholic compared to 10% if drinking doesn’t begin until after 21 years of age.
- MCCSC students who self report being involved in school sports showed higher rates of alcohol use than the general population. 40.4% reported alcohol use within past 30 days.
- 85% of junior high students live in homes that either have only one parent or where both parents work
- 75% of junior high students report spending time at home without adult supervision
- 15.2% of MCCSC 8th graders reported first use of alcohol at ages 12-13
- 29.9% of MCCSC 10th graders reported first use of alcohol at ages 14-15
- 39.8% of MCCSC 11th graders believe there is no risk of harm due to occasional alcohol consumption and 43.1% believe there to be only slight risk.
- According to the IPRC survey of MCCSC students, as students grow older, the perception of peer approval of weekly binge drinking also grows
College Student Consumption
From the 2006 Core Survey of 14 Indiana campuses (sponsored by the IN Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking):

- The binge drinking rate for Indiana is 45%
- 35% of students had trouble with police
- 25% reported personal problems including depression
- 24% reported driving while under the influence
- 18% reported academic failure
- 36% said they did something they regretted…like having a sexual encounter
- More than 55% said alcohol facilitates sexual opportunity
- 10% reported being taken advantage of sexually
Introduction to Monroe County
Monroe County, population 123,629, is located approximately sixty miles south of Indianapolis in south central Indiana. The county incorporates three towns – Bloomington, Ellettsville and Stinesville.

The cultural and economic polarity evident in the county is related to the costs and benefits of having a large university thriving in the midst of an otherwise rural community.

Bloomington is the county seat of Monroe County and is home to Big Ten Indiana University as well as Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana. It has been named a “Tree City, USA” for more than 20 years. The city was the site of the Academy Award-winning movie *Breaking Away*, featuring Indiana University's annual bicycle race “Little 500”. The Tibetan spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, has family here and is a frequent visitor. The singer-songwriter John Mellencamp and his family reside in the county near scenic Lake Monroe.

*The cosmopolitan atmosphere of Bloomington aside, Monroe County resembles other Midwestern manufacturing economies, and is culturally similar to other southern Indiana communities*

County quarries have provided the finest grade of limestone for buildings and monuments throughout the nation including our nation’s capitol. Limestone construction is abundant here.
According to 2004 Census figures: 92.3% of Monroe County Citizens identified themselves as white, 3.5% black, 3.9% Asian, 1.9% Hispanic, and 1.2% consider themselves some other race.

County School Districts:

Two school districts serve the population in the county – The Monroe County Community School Corporation (MCCSC), and the Richland Bean Blossom School Corporation (RBB). In addition to these two public school corporations, several private schools offer the community options for Kindergarten through high school education.

According to the State Department of Education, the number of students receiving free & reduced lunches and/or textbooks in Monroe County in 2006 was 24.1%.
INTRODUCTION TO MONROE COUNTY

Richland-Bean Blossom School Corporation

The RBB school corporation is located in northwestern Monroe County and provides public schooling for the Richland and Bean Blossom townships, which includes the towns of Ellettsville and Stinesville. The RBB school corporation includes: 1 high school, 2 middle schools, and 3 elementary schools. In 2006-2007, 20% of all students received free lunches. Minority student enrollment was 4.9%, and special education enrollment was 19.6%.

Attendance Rate ’06-’07: 95.2%
Graduation Rate ’06-’07: 84.7%

Data Source: Indiana Accountability System for Academic Progress ©2007 Indiana Department of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>State Total (Public)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1,046,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monroe County Community School Corporation

The MCCSC schools cover all of Monroe County not served by the RBB. Most MCCSC schools are located in and around Bloomington. The MCCSC includes two regular high schools, one alternative high school, the “New Tech” high school which will open academic year 2008-2009, three middle schools and fifteen elementary schools. In the 2007-2008 academic year, 25% of all students received free lunch. 16.5% of all students enrolled were minority students, and 16.5% were in special education. Figures available for vocational students reflect enrollment data for the 2005-2006 academic year – 3.4%.

Attendance Rate ’06-’07: 95.2%
Graduation Rate ’06-’07: 86.3%

Data Source: Indiana Accountability System for Academic Progress ©2007 Indiana Department of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>State Total (Public)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>1,046,612</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intra and Inter-mobility, expulsion, and drop out rates for the two county school systems are cited under the County Conditions – Risk Factors section of this profile.
Post Secondary Educational Opportunities:

Ivy Tech Community College of Indiana is a state-wide accredited community college. In total, it serves more than 111,000 students per year. It has 23 campuses throughout the state and an average class size of 22. The Bloomington Ivy Tech branch reached record spring 2008 enrollment with more than 5,000 students registered for classes. Many students of Indiana University complete a portion of their education through Ivy Tech.

Indiana University Bloomington is a comprehensive research university serving and/or employing national as well as international students, faculty and staff. IU offers more than 130 undergraduate majors and more than 320 other degree programs. Graduate programs offered are vast and include M.A. and M.S. degrees as well as doctorate (PH.D) degrees. Enrollment for the 2007-2008 academic year totaled 38,000.
Logic Model – County Conditions
Logic Model

A logic model was employed for assessing underage and binge drinking in Monroe County. This causal model represents county conditions and variables affecting youth consumption, and the related outcomes - “Underage Drinking” and “Alcohol-Related Problems” present in the county.

The model is an ongoing exercise of research and understanding; a work in progress that will be reconsidered annually.

Risk factors, motives and antecedents for youth, as well as county conditions, will be highlighted in this model, based upon research by the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (PIRE), the Search Institute of Minnesota, and the expertise of Monroe County LEOW prevention professionals.

The conditions – or mediating and moderating variables identified in Monroe County:

- Retail Availability of Alcohol
- Social Availability of Alcohol
- Underage Drinking Laws
- Visible Law Enforcement
- Price of Alcohol
- Alcohol Promotion
- Drinking Context
- Drinking Beliefs
- Family, School and Peer Influence
- Community Norms About Alcohol

The model employs the Prevention Risk Factors/Protective Factors Theory. Key ideas:

- *To prevent a problem, first identify the factors that increase the risk of the problem developing.*
- *Find ways to reduce the risk.*
- *Identify those protective factors that buffer individuals from risk factors in their environments, and find ways to increase the protection.*

See Model page 25
Alcohol Logic Model

Risk Factors for Youth:
- Economic Deprivation
- Neighborhood Disorganization
- Physiological/genetic Factors
- Poor & Inconsistent Family Mgmt.
- Family Conflict
- Early & Persistent Problem Behavior
- Academic Failure
- Low Degree of Commitment to School
- Peer Rejection in Elementary
- Early Onset of Alcohol/Drug Use

Protective Factors for Youth:
- Structured Time in Activities
- Strong Commitment to School/Community
- Strong Parental Bonding/External Support
- Belief in Expectations, Values of Society

Conditions: Mediating/Moderating variables

- Underage Drinking Laws
- Community Norms About Youth Drinking
- Drinking Beliefs
- Family, School, and Peer Influence
- Alcohol Promotions
- Social Availability of Alcohol
- Drinking Context
- Retail Availability of Alcohol
- Price of Alcohol
- Visible Enforcement of Alcohol Laws

Outcomes

- Underage Drinking

Alcohol-Related Community Problems
- Arrests for OWI, Illegal Consumption, Public Intox., vehicle collisions
- Impaired school performance indicators
- Health Consequences including E.R. visits, risk of alcohol dependence, compromised adolescent brain development, risky sexual behaviors leading to STDs
MONROE COUNTY LOGIC MODEL

Factors & conditions for which there is county level quantitative data will be addressed.

In those instances where there is no hard data, LEOW members and prevention professionals (SIG staff), have added research and/or ideas relative to the topic and county. Data on adults and/or how variables such as poverty or low wages affect families will be included in order to frame our community more fully.

RISK FACTORS

Risk Factor – Economic Deprivation:

Per the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the unemployment rate for Monroe County in 2006 was 4.3%. Over the past decade, Monroe County has lost 5,000 high paying manufacturing jobs due to layoffs at local factories. These jobs have largely been replaced with low-wage retail and service positions. Average wages in Monroe County consistently rank below state averages. In January of 2008, General Electric announced 900 layoffs for the following year.

14% of all Monroe County residents live in poverty. This is higher than the national percentage. Indiana ranks 31 out of the 51 states for persons living in poverty.

Poverty & Race: 31% of people in county living in poverty are black, 17% are white, and 30% are Hispanic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% Youth Living in Poverty</th>
<th>US Census Bureau, 2004 est., 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Persons %</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-17 yrs.</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-17 Yrs.</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank for All Persons</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank for Ages 0-17</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank for Ages 5-17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.4% of county children aged 0-17 live in poverty. 13.6% of children aged 5 to 17 live in poverty. This is an increase of over 4% from year 2000.
Monroe County ranks 30th out of 92 counties in the state of Indiana for all families with children in poverty. Indiana ranks 35th in the nation for all families with children living in poverty.

30% of Monroe County single mothers have children living below the poverty level. 26% of Monroe County single fathers have children living below the poverty level. 8% of all county families live below the poverty level. IPRC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families Below Poverty Level</th>
<th>Monroe</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Families Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Families w/ Own Children Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Married Couples w/ Own Children Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Single Fathers w/ Own Children Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Single Mothers w/ Own Children Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Single Parents w/ Own Children &lt; 18 Below Poverty</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

33% of Monroe County residents 18 and over have no health insurance. Out of 97,202 residents aged 18-25, 32,202 had no health insurance. The state rate for this demographic is 27.9%. The national rate is 33.1%. The state of Indiana ranks 37th out of 51 states for persons aged 18-25 with no health insurance. IPRC

2.9% of county residents are adults with less than a 9th grade education and no high school diploma. The state rate is 5%, and the national rate is 5.8%. 6.9% of county residents have a 9th through 12th grade education but no high school diploma. The state rate for this is 9.7%, and the national rate is 8.9%. IPRC
Supplemental Data Sources Reflecting County Poverty:

The South Central Community Action Program, one of the multiple agencies in the county that provide services to households experiencing economic hardship, reports that in 2006 it served 22,897 residents by providing energy assistance, Section 8 housing, weatherization support, owner occupied rehab services, and Head Start.

- Children aged 0-17 accounted for 8,433 of the clients.
- Young adults aged 18-23 comprised 1,373 of the clients.
- Through its Family Development Program from September to December 2007, SCCAP aided 16 households including 15 adult females, 5 adult males, and 27 children under the age of 18.

The City of Bloomington Housing Authority reports that it presently has 90 heads of household and/or household members aged 18-25 in public housing and 226 heads of household and/or household members aged 18-25 in Section 8.

The Food Stamp Program provides assistance to over 112,000 county community members per month. (see table below for 2005 figures)

Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) is also available in Monroe County and serves approximately 1,200 persons per month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Stamp Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population in 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamp Recipients per month 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate per 1000 persons in 2005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TANF Statistics 2004 (FSSA) Temporary Assistance to Needy Families |
|------------------------|----------|----------|
| Population | 123639 | 6,230,346 |
| Average Monthly Cases | 423 | 54,330 |
| Average Monthly Persons | 1166 | 155,549 |
| Rate of TANF per 1,000 persons | 9.4 | 25.0 |
| Rank for Rate per 1000 persons | 67 |
RISK FACTORS

Risk Factor - Neighborhood Disorganization:

Economic deprivation and family conflict often result in relocation. Any relocation, including successive relocations can result in neighborhood disorganization and low bonding to neighborhood. Given the poverty rate of 15.4% of children aged 0-17 in the county, it is safe to conclude that a high percentage of these youth may be experiencing low bonding with their respective neighborhoods. This is important because it decreases the chances for bonding and sustaining relationships with positive non-parent adults. Search Institute

Further, it is possible that a family is rooted in a given home or apartment, experiences ever changing neighbors. This rotation of neighbors could be due to economic factors, or university affiliation.

2006-2007 Intra Mobility Rates for County School Corporations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Corporation</th>
<th>Mobility Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCCSC</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Risk Factor – Physiological/Genetic Factors:

60% of alcohol addiction is genetically predisposed. Environmental factors make up the other 40%. Youth may be unaware of their personal genetic predispositions, and therefore at higher risk.


Risk Factor – Poor Family Management Practices/Family Conflict:

- 85% of junior high school students live in homes that either have only one parent or where both parents work, resulting in a disproportionate number of 'latchkey kids' who are unsupervised during late afternoon. 2002 Profile of Our Youth – Search Institute
- 75% of 7th and 8th graders reported spending time at home without adult supervision during the school year. IPRC – Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Use survey of MCCSC students 2006
- The divorce rate in Monroe County in 2006 was 4.3%, with 9.4 % of the population divorced. IPRC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Monroe</th>
<th>Indiana</th>
<th>U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divorced (Percent)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6
Risk Factor - Early and Persistent Problem Behavior:

Youth experiencing difficulties such as academic failure and peer rejection in elementary school, are at higher risk for alcohol abuse in their middle and high school years. Search Institute. Additionally, youth may enter into the court system for criminal behaviors.

### Estimated Arrests of Persons under age 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance Abuse Only</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Index</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving under influence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor laws</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse violations</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

### Estimated Arrests of Persons under age 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal &amp; Property Crime Arrests</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Index</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stolen property</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny Theft</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
RISK FACTORS

Risk Factor – Academic Failure:

Academic failure in elementary school is an early predictor of substance use in middle school. Search Institute In 2007, 4 county elementary schools had average ISTEP scores lower than the state average. These lower test scores were accompanied by lower population stability rates for each individual school (Stability rates indicate student movement into and out of enrollment in a school), as well as higher percentages for free and reduced lunch/textbook participants. Youth attending these elementary schools may be experiencing several risk factors: low bonding to school, economic deprivation, and academic failure.

Risk Factor – Low Degree of Commitment to School:

Low commitment to school has been linked to substance use. Search Institute The table below lists raw numbers for drop outs, suspensions and expulsions. The county had 1,139 total suspensions in academic year 2005-2006. Of those, 77 were ‘out of school’ and 43 were related to alcohol, other drugs or weapons.

Number of home-schooled students 2005-2006: MCCSC = 372 RBB = 93

Discovery: The drop out numbers may not truly reflect the drop out rate for the county. Students and parents have become aware that they can report as ‘home-schooled’ instead of dropping out. The percent of MCCSC home-schooled students was .66 in 1995-1996. By academic year 2005-2006, this figure rose to 3.37%.

Number of Drop Outs, Expulsions & Suspensions for County Students Grades 9-12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCCSC NORTH</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCSC SOUTH</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCSC AURORA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBB EHS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1139</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 Source: Indiana State Department of Education
RISK FACTORS

Risk Factor – Peer Rejection in Elementary School:

Peer rejection in elementary school places students at higher risk for substance use in middle school. Search Institute

Risk Factor – Early Onset of Drug Abuse:

New research alerts us to the fact that the developing adolescent brain is more prone to addiction than the adult brain. Teens who start drinking at age 13 have a 43% chance of becoming an alcoholic. A person who starts drinking at 21 has only a 10% chance.
Source: http://learn.genetics.utah.edu/units/addiction/factors/

15.2% of MCCSC 8th graders reported first use of alcohol at ages 12-13.
29.9% of MCCSC 10th grade students reported first use of alcohol at ages 14-15.
IPRC Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Use survey of MCCSC students 2006

PROTECTIVE FACTORS

Protective Factor- Strong Parental Bonding:

When a young person and his or her parents communicate positively, and the young person is willing to seek parent(s’) advice and council, it is part of their external support system and a protective factor. Children with strong parental bonds are at lower risk for substance use and abuse. Search Institute

In 2002, 30% of Monroe County 6th – 12th grade students reported having “positive family communication”. 2002 Profile of Our Youth – Search Institute

Protective Factor- Strong Commitment to School:

When youth feel that school is an encouraging environment, are bonded to their school, engaged in learning and motivated to do well, they are at lower risk. Search Institute

MCCSC attendance rate: 95.2 % RBB attendance rate: 95.7%
2002 Profile of Our Youth 6-12th grade – Search Institute: 51% of students reported caring about their school, 57% reported being engaged in learning, and 62% reported being motivated to do well in school.
PROTECTIVE FACTORS

Strong External Support System:

When youth experience strong support from parents, extended family, friends, neighbors, and non-parental adults they are at lower risk for substance abuse. Search Institute 2002 Profile of Our Youth 6-12th grade – Search Institute: 49% of students reported receiving support from three or more non-parent adults.

Protective Factor – Structured Time in Activities:

Youth involved in structured or supervised activities – in particular during the critical hours from three to five p.m. are at lower risk for substance use. Additionally, there is evidence to support youth being involved in church activities in terms of reducing risk. Search Institute 2002 Profile of Our Youth 6-12th grade – Search Institute: 52% of youth reported spending 2 or fewer hours per week out with friends with “nothing special to do”, 62% reported spending 3 or more hours per week involved in sports, clubs and other community activities, 24% reported spending 3 or more hours in creative activities, and 55% reported spending one or more hours in religious activities.

Protective Factor – Belief in Generalized Expectation/Norms/Values of Society:

A norm is the perceived social standard for acceptable behavior. Norms influence the impact of family, peer, and education on alcohol and other substance use and impact the effectiveness of law enforcement.
Mediating/Moderating variables - Social Availability of Alcohol:

During the 2007 Youth Network – Youth Summit, county high school students reported that alcohol was very easily obtained socially. A peer-lead group of students openly shared that alcohol could be readily obtained from the following sources: parents, parents of other students, siblings, older co-workers, and strangers about to enter alcohol retail outlets. In the case of the strangers, students explained that some minors approach strangers in the parking lots of alcohol selling establishments and ask them to purchase alcohol for them. (The Youth Summit is an annual county event that brings approximately 120 students together with local policy makers to discuss and find solutions to community problems.)

*Social availability of alcohol has been defined as ‘availability within small social or family groups’* (Smart, 1980, p. 124, cited in Abbey, Scott, and Smith, 1993, p. 490) *It may also be thought of as availability through any non-retail source.*

‘Social Hosting’ is a social availability issue in our county. House Bill 1118 has passed in the state senate and includes higher penalties for persons who provide alcohol to others who are underage. The new law goes into effect July 1, 2008.

2007: State of Indiana Excise Police charged 45 adults with furnishing alcoholic beverages to a minor.

Mediating/Moderating variables - Retail Availability of Alcohol:

Monroe County currently has 251 retail outlets for alcohol. Thefts of alcohol from retail outlets and sales to underage persons are retail availability issues. The Indiana State Excise Police report that Monroe County retail alcohol outlets have a non-compliance with alcohol codes rate of 27% in 2007. 

Over ¼ of all outlets checked were found in non compliance. 
Rate for restaurants: 33% Rate for Grocery/Pharmacy: 17% 
County Rate: 27%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol Sales Outlets Per Capita, (IN ATC, 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monroe Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (2006 est.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Outlets (March 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlets Per Capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlets Per 1,000 Persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10
COUNTY CONDITIONS

251 Alcohol Outlets in Monroe County
COUNTY CONDITIONS

Alcohol Outlets 1, 2, 3 and 5 miles around Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
COUNTY CONDITIONS

Mediating/Moderating variables – Drinking Context:

Drinking contexts can vary by age and refer to locations where consumption takes place as well as the presence of others during consumption. For youth, contexts in Monroe County include retail alcohol outlets (by way of outlets in non-compliance with alcohol laws, or use of falsified identification by youth), private homes, or public locations away from home such as cars.

2007: Indiana State Excise Police

- 319 tickets were issued in Monroe County for possession of false identification.
- 905 minors were charged with illegal possession, consumption or transportation of alcoholic beverages.
- 45 minors were charged with being in a tavern or liquor store.

Drinking context plays a great role in blood alcohol concentration levels. Youth are often under time constraints when consuming alcohol and may therefore drink quickly. Participation in drinking games could also greatly affect amounts of alcohol consumed.

Mediating/Moderating variables – Drinking Beliefs:

Drinking beliefs have to do with anticipated outcomes of drinking. The 2006 IPRC survey of MCCSC high school students measured youth perceived risk of harm due to occasional alcohol consumption. Of the 11th graders, 39.8% found no risk, 43.1% believed there was a slight risk. Of the 12th graders, 37.1%, found no risk, and 43% believed there was a slight risk.

| PERCEIVED RISK OF HARM FROM OCCASIONAL ALCOHOL CONSUMPTION MCCSC 2006 IPRC SURVEY |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| GRADE  | NO RISK | SLIGHT RISK |
| 6TH    | 23.6%   | 44.0%       |
| 7TH    | 22.7%   | 39.7%       |
| 8TH    | 29.8%   | 36.4%       |
| 9TH    | 35.5%   | 38.4%       |
| 10TH   | 34.1%   | 38.7%       |
| 11TH   | 39.8%   | 43.1%       |
| 12TH   | 37.1%   | 43.0%       |

Table 11

The “Slight Risk” perception had the highest rankings across all grades.
As students grow older, the perception of peer approval of binge drinking also grows.

Mediating/Moderating variables – Community Norms about Youth Drinking:

County norms about youth drinking run the gamut from - believing that youth drinking is highly risky and should never occur, to allowing youth drinking and accepting it as a right of passage. All law enforcement agencies of the county arrest for furnishing alcohol to minors. 2007 IN State Excise Police - 45 adults were charged with furnishing alcohol to a minor.

Mediating/Moderating variables – Family, School & Peer Influence:

As youth progress from middle through high school, perceptions of peer approval gain from the lower to higher grades. From 6th grade to 12th grade, the perception of peer approval rose 30%. The perception of strong peer disapproval regarding occasional drinking drops from 41% in 6th grade, to 9.3% in 11th grade.
Mediating/Moderating variables – Underage Drinking Laws:

Alcohol use by youth is lessened when the intensity of enforcement of drinking laws - and the visibility of enforcement of those laws is constant, consistent, and strong.

Mediating/Moderating variables – Visibility of Enforcement:

Enforcement visibility is the means by which enforcement has a deterrent effect. Deterrence occurs when information about enforcement (conveyed through its visibility) convinces the intended target that violating the law or policy will result in an unacceptable likelihood of detection and sanction. Source: Holder

*Enforcement can be marketed through various media to heighten the perception of active enforcement.*

Mediating/Moderating variables - Price of Alcohol:

The price of alcohol has a direct effect on consumption by youth and adults. Prices for alcohol products may vary between types of outlets, taxation or other regulations. The state of Indiana tax on alcohol has not been raised since 1981. The tax for beer is 12.5 cents. *In 2006 the average annual dollars spent on alcohol per household in Monroe County was $533.* (IPRC)

Mediating/Moderating variables – Alcohol Promotion:

Alcohol promotions by way of advertisements on radio, television and in print contribute to the framing of youth perceptions of alcohol consumption. PIRE

---

### Table 13 continued

**Perceived Peer Approval of Occasional Drinking Mccsc 2006 IPRC Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Perceived Approval</th>
<th>Perceived Strong Disapproval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Consequences of Alcohol Abuse

- Serious Personal Problems such as Depression
- Developing an Addiction to Alcohol
- Academic Failure
- Loss of Time from Work or School
- Impaired School or Work Performance
- Having a Hangover
- Doing Something That is Later Regretted
- Risky Sexual Behavior
- Driving While Under the Influence
- Public Misconduct such as fighting or vandalism
- Violence
- Sexual Assault
Logic Model – Outcomes

Law Enforcement Consequences

Law Enforcement Agencies & Data Sources for Arrest Data of Monroe County:
- FBI Uniform Crime Report
- Bloomington Police Department
- Monroe County Sheriff’s Office
- Indiana University Police Department
- Ellettsville Police Department
- Indiana State Excise Police
- Monroe County Pre-Trial Diversion Program – Alcohol Education School

Data collection and analysis was performed for all listed agencies.

Data and statistics from the Monroe County Pre-Trial Diversion Program, as well as the Indiana Excise Police, were analyzed in conjunction with the normal arrest data in order to frame the analysis of the alcohol related consequences in the county population more fully. Both entities specialize in substance-related consequences, yet operate differently from the other agencies.

Bloomington Police Department and Indiana University Police Department data provided the foundation for quantitative analysis. These two agencies have the highest arrest rates for the county and offer comparable and parallel statistics.
ARREST DATA

The FBI Uniform Crime Report provides county data on arrests made by all county law enforcement agencies.

*This is the most up-to-date FBI data as of Feb. 2008.*

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FBI Uniform Crime Report DATA</th>
<th>Arrests, Monroe County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Law Violations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arrests</td>
<td>1525 884 1143 1439 1345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Arrests</td>
<td>1401 773 1057 1350 1259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests</td>
<td>124 111 86 89 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness Arrests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arrests</td>
<td>687 424 504 564 517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Arrests</td>
<td>682 416 501 563 514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests</td>
<td>5 8 3 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUI Arrests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Arrests</td>
<td>734 607 602 623 602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Arrests</td>
<td>724 605 593 618 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests</td>
<td>10 2 9 5 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alcohol-related Arrest Rates per 1,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total (UCR)</td>
<td>121,242 122,121 121,949 123,735 121,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults (US Census 2000 projections)</td>
<td>98,899 98,899 99,135 98,887 98,982 99472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juveniles (computed)</td>
<td>22,343 23,222 22,814 24,848 22,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liquor Law Violations</th>
<th>2001 2002 2003 2004 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Arrests</td>
<td>12.58 7.24 9.37 11.63 11.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Arrests</td>
<td>14.17 7.82 10.66 13.65 12.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Arrests</td>
<td>5.55 4.78 3.77 3.58 3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drunkenness Arrests</th>
<th>2001 2002 2003 2004 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Arrests</td>
<td>5.67 3.47 4.13 4.56 4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Arrests</td>
<td>6.90 4.21 5.05 5.69 5.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DUI Arrests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In the sections to follow, BPD and IU PD data are featured, as these agencies have the highest arrest rates for Monroe County and offer comprehensive arrest data for analysis.

- Arrest Data from Sept. 2006 through August 2007 has been analyzed.
ARREST DATA

Bloomington PD and IU PD Arrests Analysis

Alcohol Arrests by Age & Offense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Illegal Consumption</th>
<th>OWI</th>
<th>Public Intox</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 to 17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 25</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 +</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

Discovery: The 18-25 yr. old demographic is responsible for 83% of all substance related offenses scripted by Bloomington Police Department and Indiana University Police Department.

18-25 Demographic Arrest Statistics:

- 97% of the illegal consumption arrests
- 63% of the OWI arrests
- 67% of the public intoxication arrests

Other Statistics of Interest:

- 16-17 yr. olds comprised 3% of illegal consumption arrests
- 37% of OWI offenders were 26 years of age and older
- 33% of public intoxication offenders were 26 years of age and older.
Illegal Possession/Consumption Offense by Age

BPD & IU PD

Chart 1

**Discovery:** It is highly probable that the spike at age 19 in illegal consumption/possession arrests is due to this age group transitioning into college, or at least graduating high school and perhaps experiencing an increase in social alcohol availability.
Chart 2

**Discovery:** There is a spike in OWI arrests among 21 to 23 yr. olds. The newly gained right to legally frequent alcohol establishments may explain this spike. It is possible that these young adults are unaccustomed to responsible decision-making in terms of legal alcohol consumption and driving.
Public Intoxication Offense by Age BPD & IU PD

Age Profile of Public Intoxication Arrests (BPD and IUPD, Sept 2005 - Aug 2007)

Chart 3

**Discovery:** There is a spike in public intoxication arrests among 21 to 23 yr. olds which parallels the spike in drunk driving arrests. The new found freedom to consume alcohol legally may affect the arrest numbers:

- 21 and 23 yr. olds are sometimes unfamiliar with public intoxication codes. They may choose to become legally intoxicated and then upon trying to make their way without driving themselves, find that being intoxicated in public is a punishable offense. This may include being a passenger in a vehicle with a sober driver, or simply walking in public and drawing attention to themselves in some manner.
- Facing college graduation and all of the preparations and expectations for this and for a life beyond college places this age group at higher risk for substance use and abuse. They not only endure the stress of this transition, but may also see this transition as a cause to over celebrate.
- Many young adults face alienation when experiencing the final steps into adulthood if they don’t have the social networking or support that college life or a full-time career may offer. A majority of adults in this age range are expected to be fully self-sufficient regardless of whether they are developmentally prepared for this.
ARREST DATA

18-25 yr. olds: Race and Alcohol Offenses/Raw Numbers BPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Illegal Consumption</th>
<th>OWI</th>
<th>Public Intox.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkn/Oth</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discovery: Whites have the highest percentage for all three offenses.
- Illegal Consumption/Possession = 92%
- Operating While Intoxicated = 69%
- Public Intoxication = 72%

Table 16

18-25 yr. olds: Race and Alcohol Offenses/Percentages BPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Illegal Consumption</th>
<th>OWI</th>
<th>Public Intox.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkn/Oth</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17
ARREST DATA

18-25 yr. olds – Gender & Alcohol Offenses/Raw Numbers BPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Illegal Consumption</th>
<th>OWI</th>
<th>Public Intox.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18

18-25 yr. olds – Gender & Alcohol Offenses/Percentages BPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Illegal Consumption</th>
<th>OWI</th>
<th>Public Intox.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

Discovery: White Males Aged 18-25 constitute the majority of arrestees.

Statistics for Males:

- Illegal Possession/Consumption of Alcohol - 74%
- Driving While Under the Influence - 76%
- Public Intoxication - 89%

Statistics for White Males:

- Illegal Possession/Consumption of Alcohol - 66%
- Driving While Under the Influence - 45%
- Public Intoxication – 55%
Alcohol Arrests and IU Undergrad Presence

Alcohol Possession & Consumption Arrests and IU Undergrad Presence Days Present by Month of Year for 2006

Chart 4

Discovery: There are peaks in arrests coinciding with undergrad presence and campus events. This chart indicates higher arrest numbers during months of the year when undergraduate activities occur such as Fall semester move-in and Little 500 in Spring.
ARREST DATA

Alcohol Crimes by Day of Week & Time of Day

**Discovery:** Thursday through Sunday are peak days for arrests of 18-25 yr. olds. Peak hours of OWI, Illegal consumption/possession, and public intoxication are 12 am, 3 am and 4 am.
“Excise Police issued more summonses in Monroe County, than in any other county in Indiana in 2007”.
(Quote and statistics from News Release January 2008 by Officer Travis Thickstun)

Total excise violations 2007: 1,629
Total excise violations 2006: 880

- 905 minors were charged with illegal possession, consumption or transportation of alcoholic beverages.
- 287 additional charges were filed for a variety of other offenses.
- 319 tickets were issued for possession of false identification.
- 45 adults were charged with furnishing alcoholic beverages to a minor.
- 45 minors were charged with being in a tavern or liquor store.
- 15 people were arrested for public intoxication.
- 13 people were arrested on drug-related charges.
- 319 tickets were issued for possession of false identification.
- 45 adults were charged with furnishing alcoholic beverages to a minor.
- 45 minors were charged with being in a tavern or liquor store.
- 15 people were arrested for public intoxication.
- 13 people were arrested on drug-related charges.

“The increase in arrests and ticket numbers are primarily the result of two factors: a renewed focus by the department on and near Indiana University and a cooperative relationship with several alcoholic beverage establishments in Bloomington.”
– Officer Travis Thickstun
Pre Trial Diversion Program:

The Pre-Trial Diversion Program (PDP) is designed to keep offenders out of court and thereby keep convictions off of their records. Offenses eligible for PDP include: alcohol violations such as public intoxication, illegal consumption/possession, check deception and driving while having a suspended license. Once an offender is approved for PDP, he or she must sign an agreement to commit no further criminal offenses within one year, to comply with all program terms and to pay various fees. Once all terms of the program have been successfully completed, and no further criminal offenses have been committed within that year, the offender’s charge will be dismissed.

Terms of the Program for Alcohol Related Violations:

A. Attend an alcohol education class
B. Complete road crew if applicable
C. Pay fees

Discovery: It is estimated by the Monroe County Coordinator of the Alcohol Education School that 98% of the PDP offenders enrolled are in the 18-25 yr. old demographic.

Citations for minor alcohol-related offenses: illegal consumption/public intoxication:

2006 – 1,222
2007 – 1,642
The most prevalent adult offense type in Monroe County in 2007 was substance-related, accounting for 57% of all offenses committed by adult offenders.

Operating While Intoxicated was the number one offense, as it has been for the past 17 years, accounting for 35% of all adult probationer offenses committed.

Of the more than 10,032 drug screens administered by county probation in 2007 to monitor compliance, 1,763 showed positive for continued substance use.

Probation: Adults & Juveniles

### 2006 Monroe County Offense Statistics for Adults & Juveniles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adult</th>
<th>Juvenile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug Related</td>
<td>724 (52%)</td>
<td>60 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>245 (18%)</td>
<td>58 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery/Violent</td>
<td>147 (11%)</td>
<td>32 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>265 (19%)</td>
<td>46 (15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Status</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>122 (38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1,381</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 Data provided by Monroe County Probation

**Juvenile**

Among Monroe County Juveniles in 2006, substance-related offenses accounted for 60 of the substance-related offense referrals resulting in supervision. Illegal Consumption continued to be the most common substance-related offense for which a juvenile received supervision services; representing 26 of the 60 substance-related supervisions in 2006.

Monroe County Juvenile Detention Statistics

- In 2006, 110 local juvenile offenders (79 male and 31 female) were held in secure detention facilities throughout Indiana. (Presently, Monroe County does not have a juvenile detention facility.)
- The 110 individual youthful offenders detained in 2006 were admitted to various facilities 182 separate times throughout 2006.
- Of these admissions, 3011 days were billed to Monroe County, for a cost of over $339,499.
## Substance Abuse Offenses
### Probation Demographics & Levels of Dysfunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-Under</td>
<td>20 (3%)</td>
<td>11 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>117 (15%)</td>
<td>130 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>391 (49%)</td>
<td>309 (48%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>140 (18%)</td>
<td>86 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>83 (10%)</td>
<td>59 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>40 (5%)</td>
<td>34 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-Over</td>
<td>5 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>11 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>614 (77%)</td>
<td>486 (76%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>182 (23%)</td>
<td>154 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Charge</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DWI</td>
<td>602 (76%)</td>
<td>476 (74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>132 (17%)</td>
<td>89 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Criminal</td>
<td>3 (&lt;1%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Alcohol</td>
<td>59 (7%)</td>
<td>73 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males comprised 76% of offenders in 2006.

Drunk driving was No. 1 Offense.

Adults aged 18-30 offended more than other age groups.

*2006: 10 CASES “no demographics available.”*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>47 (6%)</td>
<td>33 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>709 (89%)</td>
<td>579 (91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>18 (2%)</td>
<td>13 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22 (3%)</td>
<td>15 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissions to Court Alcohol &amp; Drug Program</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st Time</td>
<td>2nd or More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Time</td>
<td>588 (74%)</td>
<td>470 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd or More</td>
<td>208 (26%)</td>
<td>170 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Dysfunction</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Chemically Dependent</td>
<td>292 (37%)</td>
<td>218 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug Abuser</td>
<td>365 (46%)</td>
<td>314 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Problem User</td>
<td>127 (16%)</td>
<td>89 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational User</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12 (1%)</td>
<td>19 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prior Convictions</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>372 (47%)</td>
<td>290 (45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>424 (53%)</td>
<td>350 (55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IU Student</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>197 (25%)</td>
<td>186 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>599 (75%)</td>
<td>454 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

91% of Offenses in 2006 were committed by those who identify themselves as ‘white’. The second highest rate (5%) was attributable to those who consider themselves ‘black’.

2006: 34% of offenders were assessed as alcohol and/or chemically dependent.

IU students made up 29% of all substance abuse offenders.

2006: 45% of Offenders had prior convictions.
One in five probationers in 2006 was an 18-25 yr. old arrested on an alcohol-related primary charge.

- In 2006 there were 491 OWI probationers.
- 52% of those were 18-25 yr. olds.
  - Male 188, 15 Repeat Offenders. Female 65, 4 Repeat Offenders
- IU students accounted for 26%.

State Alcohol Related Arrest Rates

In 2005, Indiana arrest rates, per 1,000 population, were 5.9 for driving under the influence (36,800 arrests), 3.3 for public intoxication (20,700 arrests), and 2.7 for liquor law violations (17,100 arrests)\(^{10}\)

National Data – Operating While Intoxicated

In 2006, an estimated 12.4 percent of persons aged 12 or older drove under the influence of alcohol at least once in the past year. This percentage has dropped since 2002, when it was 14.2 percent, and is significantly lower than 2005, when it was 13.0 percent. The 2006 estimate corresponds to 30.5 million persons.

Nationally, driving under the influence of alcohol was associated with age in 2006. An estimated 7.9 percent of 16 or 17 year olds, 19.7 percent of 18 to 20 year olds, and 27.3 percent of 21 to 25 year olds reported driving under the influence of alcohol in the past year. Beyond age 25, these rates showed a general decline with increasing age. Among persons aged 12 or older, males were nearly twice as likely as females (16.3 vs. 8.6 percent) to drive under the influence of alcohol in the past year.
**Sources & Acronyms**

**VCRS/ARIES:** The Indiana State Police Vehicle Crash Records System (VCRS) is now the Automated Reporting Information Exchange System (ARIES), incorporating various types of reports related to traffic collisions.

**FARS:** Fatality Analysis Reporting System, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

Table 22 & 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FARS Fatal Count</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE PROVISIONAL TOTAL OF TRAFFIC FATALITIES AS OF 23:59 ON DECEMBER 31ST, 2007 IS AS FOLLOWS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEATHS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CRASHES</strong></td>
<td><strong>REDUCTION/INCREASE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FARS Fatal Count</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE PROVISIONAL TOTAL OF TRAFFIC FATALITIES AS OF 9:00 A.M. ON MARCH 3RD, 2008 IS AS FOLLOWS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEATHS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CRASHES</strong></td>
<td><strong>REDUCTION/INCREASE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monroe County FARS statistics for 2006

40% of Crash Fatalities in Monroe County were Alcohol Related.
The County rate for OWI crashes is 12%

Monroe County Fatality Trends by Crash Type: 15 Total Crash Fatalities

- Alcohol Related Crashes: 6
- Single Vehicle Crashes: 12
- Speeding Involved Crashes: 3
- Roadway Departure Crashes: 14
- Passenger Car Occupants: 9
- Light Truck/Van Occupants: 2
- Motorcycle Riders: 3

Of the 11 fatalities of passenger vehicle occupants, 7 were unrestrained, 2 were restrained, and for 2 of the deaths the status is 'unknown'.

All 3 of the motorcycle fatalities were unhelmeted riders.

State of Indiana Statistics:

In 2006, a total of 11,718 alcohol-related collisions occurred in Indiana; 267 of these were fatal.

During the 2003 to 2006 period in Indiana, alcohol appeared to be an important factor in 19 percent of collisions with incapacitating injuries and 30 percent of fatal injury collisions.

Two demographic groups were at highest risk in the gender/age comparison—males between the ages of 21 and 29 and those between 30 and 39. In 2006, of the total 176 fatalities among 21 to 39 year old male drivers, 73 (41 percent) had reported BAC levels of .08 g/dL or greater.

Indiana collision data suggest Indiana counties test, on average, about one-half of their fatalities for evidence of alcohol.

When BAC results were reported to the Indiana State Police data repository, they tended to corroborate legal intoxication (.08 g/dL or greater) in crashes nominally classified as alcohol-related, but reported results were always less than the estimated number of alcohol-related collisions. The final BAC result probably reflects underreporting because crash reports might not be updated for every test performed.
Considering all 609 fatal injuries among Indiana drivers in 2006, 192 drivers were linked to alcohol-related collisions, 84 percent of them were reported as having positive BAC results (i.e., greater than .00 g/dL), and 73 percent were legally intoxicated (.08 g/dL or higher).

During weekends from 6 pm Friday to late Sunday night and early Monday morning, alcohol-related fatalities and injuries increase.

Logic Model – Consequences

Health Consequences
Health Consequences Associated with Alcohol Abuse

- Unintentional injuries (e.g. car crash, falls, burns, drowning)
- Intentional injuries (e.g. firearm injuries, sexual assault, domestic violence)
- Alcohol poisoning
- Sexually transmitted diseases
- Unintended pregnancies
- Children born with fetal alcohol syndrome
- High blood pressure, stroke, and other cardiovascular diseases
- Liver disease
- Neurological damage
- Sexual dysfunction

STATE & NATIONAL FAST FACTS

The rate for alcohol abuse and dependence in Indiana is 8%, with the highest rate among 18- to 25-year-olds (18%)
Source: SAMHSA (2007) NSDUH

Most admissions to substance abuse treatment are due to alcohol, and the percentage of admissions due to alcohol is significantly higher in Indiana (47%) than for the entire U.S. (39%)
Source: SAMHSA, Treatment Episodes Data Set (TEDS)

Highest rates of alcohol dependence in the Indiana treatment population are found among Whites (84%) and individuals 55 years and older (73%)
Source: SAMHSA – TEDS

8% of all deaths from disease in Indiana are alcohol-related
Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Alcohol Related Disease Impact (ARDI)

In 2005, 498 Hoosiers died from chronic liver disease and cirrhosis

Alcohol is a common factor in drowning accidents (34%) and suicides (23%)
Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Alcohol Related Disease Impact (ARDI)
Emergency room visits and hospital admissions linked to substance use or abuse are tracked by primary and secondary diagnosis. A patient of emergency department services may present an acute condition directly resulting from alcohol or drugs, such as an overdose, or may present an injury or condition wherein alcohol or drugs were a causal factor only. For example, a patient presenting head trauma from an automobile accident would be diagnosed with head trauma and any substance abuse indicated would be part of the secondary diagnosis.

2006: 712 ER visits and concurrent hospital admits for 18-25 yr. olds with alcohol as primary or secondary diagnosis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients with Alcohol-Related Diagnosis Ages 18-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol primary factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Sept 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER Vists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femaless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patients with Alcohol-Related Diagnosis Ages 18-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol secondary factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-Sept 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER Vists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femaless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24. Source: Bloomington Hospital Emergency Room Data
TREATMENT EPISODES DATA

Most admissions to substance abuse treatment are due to alcohol, and the percentage of admissions due to alcohol is significantly higher in Indiana (47%) than for the entire U.S. (39%)

Source: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration - Treatment Episodes Data Sets (TEDS)

Monroe County TEDS:

Number of individuals with Alcohol as primary Drug of Abuse 2005: 411 Male 133 Female
Number of individuals with Alcohol as secondary Drug of Abuse 2005: 117 Male 67 Female
The rate for alcohol abuse and dependence in Indiana is 8%, with the highest rate among 18- to 25-year-olds (18%).

TEDS 2005/ Alcohol as drug of focus by age in Monroe County:

Age          0-17  =  14
            18-24 = 134
            25-34 = 141
            35-44 = 156
            45-64 =  99
            65+  =  0

DEATHS RELATED TO ALCOHOL

National Fast Fact: Alcohol use is a major factor in homicides (47%)

In Monroe County from 2001 to 2006:
Alcohol caused an average of 20% or 1/5 of the deaths reported.

Table 25

| Estimated Role of Alcohol on Monroe County Deaths 2001-2004 |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|
|          | Deaths | Alcohol Caused | % Alcohol Caused |
| 2001     | 131    | 24          | 18%              |
| 2002     | 151    | 31          | 21%              |
| 2003     | 127    | 23          | 18%              |
| 2004     | 150    | 36          | 24%              |

Average 20%
Source ISDH; CDC, 2004; IPRC
http://www.sis.indiana.edu/MortalityFractions.aspx
Map 3.1 Number of Alcohol-Related Deaths in Indiana by County, from 2000 to 2004 (Alcohol-Attributable Mortality Data, 2000-2004)

Source: Indiana State Department of Health, Epidemiology Resource Center, 2007
Research points to a link between binge drinking and sexually transmitted diseases:

Some of the most extensive data on the consequences of binge drinking come from studies by Henry Wechsler, Ph.D., a Harvard researcher. Wechsler found that alcohol’s effects are most extreme for frequent binge drinkers (his term for those who have binged at least three times in the past two weeks). These effects include the realm of sexual health.

- Frequent binge drinkers are likely to have unplanned sex (41 percent) or unprotected sex (21 percent) after drinking.
- Thus, binge drinking increases the risk of unwanted pregnancy and sexually transmitted diseases.

County STD Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monroe County STD Morbidity</th>
<th>Chlamydia Cases</th>
<th>Gonorrhea Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Females 15-19</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females 20-24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males 15-19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males 20-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 Courtesy of Monroe County Public Health records

Morbidity by Gender:

Cases of Chlamydia and Gonorrhea recorded for males are typically lower than the cases reported for females. This may be due to infected asymptomatic males not seeking treatment. Gonorrhea presents in males with more noticeable symptoms than Chlamydia.

Additional fact: 2 county females aged 10-14 presented with Chlamydia in 2006.
Logic Model – Consumption Patterns

Youth – College – Adult
Alcohol is readily available and is the most frequently used drug in Monroe County. This is not surprising given that alcohol is the most frequently used drug in the United States.

Alcohol Consumption rates for both Indiana and the U.S. have increased from 1999 to 2005.
Source: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA), 2007

Beer comprises the largest volume of alcohol consumed in Indiana (1.14 gallons per capita), followed by liquor (0.66 gallons), and wine (0.22 gallons).
National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2007.

49.94% of Indiana residents 12 yrs. of age or older reported using alcohol during the past month.
2004-2005 National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH), conducted through SAMHSA.
In the 2006 Indiana Prevention Resource Center (IPRC) - MCCSC Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Use survey, students reported prevalence rates for alcohol and marijuana use that were higher than the state use rates reported on the state IPRC survey.

Prevalence of Drug Use, 2006
Monroe County Community School Corporation 12th Graders

Source: Indiana Prevention Resource Center at Indiana University, 2006

# Category change starting 2002: Psychedelic category split to LSD Only and Other Psychedelics. Calculations were adjusted accordingly.
Psychedelic rate computed by aggregating responses indicating either LSD or Other Psychedelics use, or endorsement of both.

Chart 7
Monroe County Community School Corporation Students

- **Lifetime Prevalence Rates:**
  11<sup>th</sup> grade lifetime prevalence rates for alcohol and 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grade lifetime prevalence rates for marijuana were higher among MCCSC students when compared to the state rates for the same grades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LIFETIME PREVALENCE RATES</th>
<th>ALCOHOL</th>
<th>MARIJUANA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCCS C</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; GRADE</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; GRADE</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; GRADE</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27

- **Annual Prevalence Rates:**
  MCCSC students' annual prevalence rates were higher for alcohol among 10<sup>th</sup> graders, and marijuana rates were higher among 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grades when compared to the state rates for the same grades. However, among 8<sup>th</sup> grade students, prevalence rates for alcohol were lower than the state rate. Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANNUAL PREVALENCE RATES</th>
<th>ALCOHOL</th>
<th>MARIJUANA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCCS C</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; GRADE</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; GRADE</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; GRADE</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 28
Monroe County Community School Corporation Students

- **Monthly Prevalence Rates:**
  MCCSC students' monthly prevalence rates were higher for alcohol among 10th and 11th grades, and higher for marijuana among 8th and 11th grades when compared to the state rates for the same grades. Among 6th grade students, however, the rates were lower than the state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONTHLY PREVALENCE RATES</th>
<th>ALCOHOL</th>
<th>MARIJUANA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCCS</td>
<td>STATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10TH GRADE</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11TH GRADE</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12TH GRADE</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29

**Monthly Alcohol Use by Grade, 2006**
Monroe County Community School Corporation

![Chart 8](image)

Monthly alcohol use rates climb as students progress to higher grades.
Monthly marijuana use peaks in 11th grade.

Chart 9

Daily Prevalence Rates:

Daily rates of binge drinking were higher among 11th grade MCCSC students than the state. However, daily prevalence rates were lower than state rates for 7th grade binge drinking.

Student Athletes Reporting Use:

Students who self reported having missed more than ten days of school (listed below as ‘troubled athletes’ and ‘high risk students’) showed higher rates of alcohol use than the general population. In the table below ‘general population’ is defined as students who reported as not being involved in after school sports or activities.

Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Binge Drinking past 2 weeks</th>
<th>Alcohol use past 30 days</th>
<th>Alcohol use past year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Population</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Athletes</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Risk Students</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troubled Athletes</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monroe County Community School Corporation Students

Trends in perceived risk:

- Perceived risk of alcohol use has gone down
- The perceived risk of marijuana has gone down
- The perceived risk of smoking has gone up slightly

% of students that perceive a risk using specific substances

Chart 10

Tobacco Use by Youth – INDIANA Data

- Among 12- to 17-year-olds in Indiana, 14% currently use a tobacco product and 12% smoke cigarettes. SAMSHA, NSDUH

- 8% of middle school students and 21% of high school students in Indiana currently smoke cigarettes. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2007) Youth Risk Behavior Survey

- White high school students have significantly higher smoking rates than Black students (22% and 13%, respectively). Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2007) Youth Risk Behavior Survey

- Cigarette use (lifetime, annual, monthly, and daily use) among Indiana students in grades 6 through 12 has remained stable or declined significantly from the previous year. Cigar and pipe use showed a significant incline in some grade levels. IPRC (2007)
Chart 11

Does the state of Indiana Require ATOD Education in schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is prevention education required?</th>
<th>yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade requirements</td>
<td>K-12 (each grade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is teacher training in drug and alcohol education required?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant content standards (if specified)</td>
<td>Indiana Academic Standards for Health Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indiana College Student Consumption Data

From the 2006 Core Survey of 14 Indiana campuses
(Sponsored by the IN Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking)

The binge drinking rate for Indiana is 45%
35% of students had trouble with police
25% reported personal problems including depression
24% reported driving while under the influence
18% reported academic failure

36% said they did something they regretted…
Like having a sexual encounter.

More than 55% said alcohol facilitates sexual opportunity…
10% reported being taken advantage of sexually.

College Students/National Data:

From SAMHSA – 2006 The National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH): Young adults aged 18 to 22 enrolled full time in college were more likely than their peers not enrolled full time (i.e., part-time college students and persons not currently enrolled in college) to use alcohol in the past month, binge drink, and drink heavily.

- Past month alcohol use was reported by 66.4 percent of full-time college students compared with 54.1 percent of persons aged 18 to 22 who were not enrolled full time.
- Binge and heavy use rates for college students were 45.5 and 19.0 percent, respectively, compared with 38.4 and 13.3 percent, respectively, for 18 to 22 year olds not enrolled full time in college.
- The pattern of higher rates of current alcohol use, binge alcohol use, and heavy alcohol use among full-time college students compared with rates for others aged 18 to 22 has remained consistent since 2002 (Figure 3.4).
ADULT CONSUMPTION DATA

National Binge and Heavy Alcohol Use Data:

Employment
From SAMHSA – 2006 The National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH):
Rates of current alcohol use were 62.0 percent for full-time employed adults aged 18 or older in 2006, higher than the rate for unemployed adults (52.1 percent). However, the pattern was different for binge and heavy alcohol use. Rates of binge and heavy use for unemployed persons were 34.2 and 12.2 percent, respectively, while these rates were 29.7 and 8.9 percent for full-time employed persons.

Most binge and heavy alcohol users were employed in 2006. Among 54.0 million adult binge drinkers, 42.9 million (79.4 percent) were employed either full or part time. Among 16.3 million heavy drinkers, 12.9 million (79.2 percent) were employed.

Geographic Area
The rate of past month alcohol use for people aged 12 or older in 2006 was lower in the South (46.9 percent) than in the Northeast (56.3 percent), Midwest (53.5 percent), or West (50.4 percent).
Among people aged 12 or older, the rate of past month alcohol use in large metropolitan areas (53.5 percent) was higher than the 49.6 percent in small metropolitan areas and 45.0 percent in nonmetropolitan areas. Binge drinking was equally prevalent in small metropolitan areas (22.6 percent), large metropolitan areas (23.4 percent), and nonmetropolitan areas (22.2 percent).

Alcohol’s Association with Illicit Drug Use
From SAMHSA – 2006 The National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH):

The level of alcohol use was associated with illicit drug use in 2006. Among the 16.9 Million heavy drinkers aged 12 or older, 32.6 percent were current illicit drug users.

Persons who were not current alcohol users were less likely to have used illicit drugs in the past month (3.4 percent) than those who reported (a) current use of alcohol but did not meet the criteria for binge or heavy use (6.4 percent), (b) binge use but did not meet the criteria for heavy use (16.0 percent), or (c) heavy use of alcohol (32.6 percent).
Alcohol consumption levels also were associated with tobacco use.
INDIANA GENERAL TOBACCO CONSUMPTION FACTS

One-third of Hoosiers (1.7 million residents) age 12 and older currently use a tobacco product—this is significantly higher than the U.S. tobacco use rate of 29%

- 28% of Hoosiers (1.4 million residents) age 12 and older smoked cigarettes in the past month—this is significantly higher than the U.S. smoking rate of 25%. Source: SAMSHA, NSDUH

- The highest smoking rate in the state is among 18- to 25-year-olds (42%). Source: SAMSHA, NSDUH

- Indiana’s adult smoking prevalence (24%) is the 5th highest in the nation and significantly higher than the U.S. prevalence of 20%. Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2007) YRBS

- 19% of Hoosiers use cigarettes every day. Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2007) YRBS

- Smokers are most likely to be male, have an annual household income under $15,000, and have neither a high school degree nor a GED. Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2007) YRBS

CONCLUSION

GOALS OF THE LOCAL EPIDEMIOLOGICAL OUTCOMES WORKGROUP FOR NEXT PROFILE:

- Analyze arrest data for ‘furnishing alcohol to minor’ totals by age, race, and gender.

- Formalize data collection in terms of when the data will be collected from respective agencies on an annual basis.

- Formalize when annual epidemiological profiles will be published.
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