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## Needs Assessment

| Year | Data Source | Value | Findings |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2009 | Furman Univ. CORE Survey | $\mathbf{7 5 . 2 \%}$ | Students reported consuming alcohol in the past year |
| 2009 | Furman Univ. CORE Survey | $\mathbf{6 0 . 3 \%}$ | Students reported consuming alcohol in the past 30 days |
| 2009 | Furman Univ. CORE Survey | $\mathbf{1 4 . 7 \%}$ | Students reported consuming alcohol $\mathbf{3}$ or more times a week |
| 2009 | Furman Univ. CORE Survey | $\mathbf{4 8 . 2 \%}$ | Underage (<21 YOA) reported consuming alcohol in past 30 days |
| 2009 | Furman Univ. CORE Survey | $\mathbf{3 3 . 3 \%}$ | Students reported having binged on alcohol past two weeks |
| 2010 | Greenville DFC Survey | $\mathbf{5 0 . 8 \%}$ | Youth reported using alcohol more than a few sips |
| 2011 | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | $21.2 \%$ | Student road in car by drinking driver, past 30 days |
| 2011 | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | $\mathbf{8 . 5 \%}$ | Student road in car after drinking, past 30 days |
| 2011 | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | $\mathbf{6 5 . 5 \%}$ | Student lifetime alcohol use |
| 2011 | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | $\mathbf{1 6 . 7 \%}$ | Student first alcohol use before age 13 |
| 2011 | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | $\mathbf{3 4 . 0 \%}$ | Student alcohol use, past 30 days |
| 2011 | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | $\mathbf{1 8 . 4 \%}$ | Student reporting 5 or more drinks in a row, past 30 days |
| 2011 | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | $\mathbf{1 0 . 0 \%}$ | Students reporting alcohol sources were retail establishments (bars, <br> stores, and restaurants) |
| 2011 | Youth Risk Behavior Survey | $\mathbf{6 6 . 3 \%}$ | Students reporting alcohol sources were from family, friends, and <br> friends |

## Needs Assessment

$\diamond$ April 2011 to February 2012: Alcohol-related crashes involving drivers < $21=$ 36.6 crashes per month. Fatal alcohol-related crashes involving drivers $<21=$ 3.4 crashes per month

- In FY 2011 (July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011) Coalition law enforcement agencies conducted 1794 compliance checks, 10 public safety checkpoints, prevented 135 underage drinking parties, and wrote 530 citations related to underage drinking.
$\diamond$ During the compliance checks, 206 stores sold alcohol to youth. This equals an 11.5\% buy rate, down from $45 \%$ in 2003.
$\diamond$ Prevention specialists trained 239 alcohol clerks and servers in alcohol retail merchant education. Most of the individuals that completed the classes were required by South Carolina state law concerning alcohol sale to underage confidential informants (youth working with law enforcement).


## Needs Assessment

$\diamond$ Based on 2011 YRBS data that showed youth obtain alcohol from retail alcohol outlets about 10\%, retail alcohol sources for underage drinkers was but one alcohol source.
$\diamond$ Social alcohol sources or alcohol from family, friends, or strangers was over 66\%.
$\diamond$ In other words, compliance checks needed to continue for retail alcohol sources; however, the high availability of alcohol to individuals under 21 years old necessitated law enforcement officers to investigate the alcohol sources and prosecute whenever possible.

2011 YRBS, Primary Source of Alcohol, past 30 days


Percentage of students responding

## Needs Assessment

$\diamond$ Despite Coalition capacity for successful work, there were areas for improvement.
$\diamond$ Despite strong enforcement of underage drinking laws such as minor in possession and consumption or sale of alcohol to a minor, investigation of the social sources of alcohol did not always occur.
$\diamond$ Existing UDL transfer law to a minor required identification of the individual providing alcohol.
$\diamond$ Identification of those individuals at the scene of the transfer, such as a social gathering where underage drinking occurred usually happened resulting in citations or arrests, depending on the circumstances.
$\diamond$ When follow-up investigations were required, the follow-up did not always transpire.
$\diamond$ Training and possible policy change was needed.

