YOUTH DRIVING WITHOUT IMPAIRMENT



119544

Youth Driving Without Impairment

Report on the Youth Impaired Driving Public Hearings

Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Fort Worth, Seattle

"A Community Challenge"

Prepared by the National Commission Against Drunk Driving --- Washington, D.C.

NATIONAL COMMISSION AGAINST DRUNK DRIVING

Dear Mr. President:

You will remember that in 1983 the Commission that you appointed to review the drunk driving problem recommended that a national commission be established to assure the implementation of the 38 other recommendations submitted to you. Accordingly, Mr. President, as chairman of that Commission, it is my special privilege to present to you this Report on Youth Impaired Driving. It is an overview of the testimony given in the five public hearings sponsored by the National Commission Against Drunk Driving in cooperation with the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration of the Department of Transportation.

Hearings in Chicago, Boston, Seattle, Atlanta and Fort Worth sought to focus national attention on the serious problem of young people drinking and driving and the need for a comprehensive response. These hearings provided an exciting exchange between adults and youth about what is or is not working, and what yet needs to be adopted. Youth leaders and youthful offenders offered compelling evidence of the scope of this problem. The testimony provided valuable insights into young America's view of drunk driving, especially as it related to attitudes within family circles and among their peers. The specific recommendations found at the end of each section in this report reflect the crying need to coordinate all elements of the community to respond effectively to youthful impaired driving.

It is not enough to lament the thousands of young lives that are lost each year on American highways. We must end the senseless behavior that makes alcohol-related crashes the American way to die for youth of driving age. The acceptance and implementation of the recommendations in this Report can make a difference in a coordinated and sustained national campaign that calls for youthful driving without impairment. The Commission is indeed grateful to you, Mr. President, for your leadership and commitment to find solutions to this issue throughout your Administration.

Very truly yours,

Jim Adduci

V.J. Adduci
Chairman

Acknowledgments

The National Commission Against Drunk Driving wishes to acknowledge those individuals and organizations who provided oral and written testimony at the five hearings. We commend the panelists who gave so generously of their time and shared their ideas and concerns with the testifiers and the audience about youthful impaired driving.

We owe a debt of gratitude to the Advisory Committee that helped in the design of the hearing format and content. These preparations were complemented by the exceptional efforts of the staffs in the Regional Offices of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in each of the five hearing sites. We also appreciate the cooperation of the respective Governors' Highway Safety Representatives and local committees at each site who assisted with the arrangements for the hearings.

While a general acknowledgment seeks to recognize everyone who assisted in some way, certain individuals should be singled out for the encouragement and support that they gave to this project. Key NHTSA regional personnel are identified for each of the five hearing sites in the appendix. The Report Writing committee is also noted therein with the Advisory Committee. The mere listing of names is a small measure of appreciation for the contribution that these people made. Finally, mention must be made of the late Edward S. Sands who volunteered so much time and talent to the advance work of the hearings. His years of professional experience was matched by his personal enthusiasm for this project. The NCADD trusts that this spirit is reflected in the following pages.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The National Commission Against Drunk Driving, working with a grant from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, conducted five public hearings in 1987-88 on the problem of youth impaired driving. From the wealth of testimony gathered in Chicago, Boston, Seattle, Atlanta and Fort Worth, many recommendations were adopted for this report.

A review of the proceedings reveals one paramount conclusion: the time has not arrived yet when we can rest content with what has been done to address the problem of youth impaired driving. Despite the spread of activist groups, the proliferation of programs, and the passage of much-needed legislation, young people continue to drink and drive with alarming frequency. Over the course of the past five years, it has become illegal for youth under age 21 to purchase and possess alcohol in every state. Nevertheless, young people continue to be involved in alcohol-related crashes at disproportionately high rates. A young person under the legal drinking age remains nearly twice as likely to die in an alcohol-related crash as an adult over 21.

Youth impaired driving cannot be solved without addressing the problem of underage drinking. Testifiers at the hearings summarized the situation:

—Drinking is endemic among American youth.
—Alcoholic beverages remain easily accessible to youth under 21.
—Peer pressure encourages young people to drink and leads many adolescents to consider alcohol a necessary accompaniment to social events.
—Advertising normalizes alcohol consumption and makes it more difficult to raise concerns about alcohol abuse.
—Drinking decreases inhibitions in young people who all too frequently possess a propensity for taking risks and naively believe that they will not be harmed.

The combination of these factors leads to a tragically predictable result: alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes constitute the leading cause of death for youth of driving age.

The NCADD-sponsored hearings confirmed that youth impaired driving is a societal problem which will not be resolved in the short term or by a single approach. Changing the attitude of youth toward impaired driving and, more fundamentally, toward underage drinking requires a sustained coordinated effort. Youth must be presented with the single message from all elements of the community that under-age drinking and impaired driving are socially intolerable.

Testimony repeatedly emphasized the pivotal role parents play in preventing youth inpaired driving. According to a University of Washington survey, parents are the most important influence on a youth's decision not to use alcohol or other drugs. Similarly, when a Michigan State University survey asked high school students what factors would reduce the amount of alcohol they consumed, 70%-90% responded that parental actions such as supervising parties, keeping a closer control over home alcohol supplies, and making a greater effort to discuss their weekend activities would reduce their drinking habits.

Unfortunately, all too many parents have abdicated their responsibilities. Testifiers described encounters with parents who criticized police officers for arresting juvenile DWI

offenders, parents who fought protracted legal battles to prevent the revocation of their child's driving license, and parents who, in the face of overwhelming evidence, steadfastly denied the existence of their child's drinking problem. These actions, one testifier noted, not only undermine the efforts of those who work to reduce youth impaired driving but fuel the young person's sense of being victimized by the system.

The reaction of these parents to the enforcement of drinking and driving laws emphasizes the need for education to inform parents about the scope of the impaired driving problem. Findings by Michigan State University researchers confirmed this need: while 60%-70% of parents are convinced that underage drinking occurs, only 20% believe that their own children are involved in such behavior. This statistic dramatically illustrates the unwillingness of parents to acknowledge the involvement of their children in underage drinking.

The hearings made it clear that every systemwide approach must combine prevention, deterrence and treatment/intervention. Preventive education for youth must start at an early age, before young people are first confronted with the decision to use alcohol or other drugs. With young people beginning, on a national average, to first use alcohol at 12.8 years of age, education clearly must start in elementary school. It must be designed to provide children with information on alcohol and drug use, but it must also teach them the skills they need to act on that information and resist pressure from friends and family to use alcohol and other drugs.

In providing youth with alcohol education and skills, considerable care should be given to selecting appropriately qualified teachers, for the teacher is the most important variable in the success of the program. These teachers should be good role models, trusted by students, and want to teach the subject.

In addition to maximizing the value of formal classroom instruction, educators should take full advantage of the possibilities of peer education. Testifiers cited numerous examples of programs involving high school youth who volunteer to work with junior high or elementary school children on highway safety and alcohol and drug issues. Like peer education, positive peer pressure has a tremendous potential for altering attitudes about drinking and driving. By banding together to form safety clubs and support groups, youth can encourage their peers to value a health lifestyle and socially-responsible behavior.

The single most controversial topic of the hearings was the safe rides programs. Supporters of safe rides programs contend that intervention is needed in the less-than-perfect world where young people drink illegally and subsequently drive. Advocates of more prevention-oriented approaches emphasized that efforts to counter youth impaired driving must address the underlying problem of underage drinking by emphasizing a no-use approach. In its recommendations, the NCADD recognizes the value of both arguments, acknowledging the need to take positive steps to discourage underage drinking while recognizing the importance of intervention measures that make our highways safer for everyone.

While preventive education is important, it alone is not sufficient to deter youths from drinking and driving. Enforcement is also necessary. Testifiers complained of a lack of enforcement. Both youth and police agreed that young people are not subject to the same level of rigorous enforcement as the older adult population. To increase the effectiveness of enforcement, testifiers suggested that police target youthful impaired driving by focusing their shift schedules and patrols on the hours when most impaired driving offenses by youth occur. Police should also patrol parks, schools, and other neighborhood locations where youth tend to gather. When youth are arrested for drinking and driving violations, they should be subject to the full penalty of the law. Releasing youth to their parents, like downgrading their offenses or diverting them into pre-adjudication programs, conveys the impression to the young offenders as well as to their parents that youthful impaired driving is not a serious offense.

The evidence suggests that communities with the best record of reducing youthful drinking and driving have succeeded by formulating an integrated, systemwide approach. If the hearings revealed one thing, it was that many good programs and successful countermeasures exist. The key is for communities to put all of these elements in place, so that the efforts of students, parents, schools, courts, businesses and police support one another. Only when all nine components that came under so much discussion during the youthful impaired hearings are put in place can we look forward to significant reductions in the serious injuries and fatalities involving thousands of young Americans. Each community must confront this serious social issue if we are to ensure that this campaign to counter youthful impaired driving is a truly national campaign. No one will admit that this is an easy challenge—but who would deny it is a challenge that every community must accept!

Preface

Year after year, young people are over-represented in alcohol-related crashes. Alcohol-related fatalities remain the leading cause of death for youth of driving age. Responding to the problem of youth impaired driving, the Presidential Commission on Drunk Driving recommended several countermeasures in 1983, including alcohol education in schools, provisional licenses for youth, and a minimum legal purchase and possession age of 21. While states and communities have begun to implement these and other measures, an integrated, systemwide approach to the problem has been slow in developing in many areas.

Aware of the need to encourage a systemwide approach, the National Commission Against Drunk Driving (NCADD) held a series of public hearings to examine the problem of youth impaired driving and to uncover, compile and share information about existing programs that might prove useful to those concerned about the problem. With a grant from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and support from Allstate Insurance and other corporate donors, the NCADD scheduled five public hearings in Chicago, Boston, Seattle, Atlanta and Fort Worth.

An advisory committee was established to structure the format of the hearings and suggest testifiers and panelists. Nine topics were selected for discussion: school responsibility, extracurricular programs, community responsibility, workplace programs, enforcement, licensing, adjudication, supervision and legislation. At each hearing, an effort was made to solicit verbal and written testimony on all nine subjects. This report represents a distillation of that testimony. Before publication, the report was submitted for review and comment to 25 professionals in the health and traffic safety field.

The public hearing format was chosen because it can draw attention to a problem, investigate the problem, and generate potential solutions through an exchange of ideas. At each hearing, testifiers spoke before a panel that included NCADD Directors and Trustees, NHTSA and state highway safety officials, and experts from the region in which the hearing was held. A wide variety of individuals testified at the hearings including school and community officials, police, judges, prosecutors, treatment professionals, business leaders and state legislators. The input of youth was considered especially valuable, and for that reason many young people were asked to testify: student leaders from middle schools, high schools and colleges; young recovering alcoholics; impaired driving offenders; and youth who had injured themselves or killed others. To promote further dialogue, discussion was opened to the public at each hearing, and members of the audience were invited to ask questions or exchange ideas with panelists and testifiers.

This report does not offer a complete solution to the problem of youth impaired driving. The youth impaired driving model around which the report is organized does not include a separate component on the family, although this subject is discussed in the section on community responsibility. As a record of the hearing testimony, the report places great emphasis upon the responsibilities of parents but does not discuss dysfunctional families or families in which one or both parents are alcoholics.

From the beginning, the National Commission believed that it was important for the report to reflect the concerns of the testifiers. The coverage given to various topics in the

report consequently depended upon how much or how little attention testifiers devoted to the subject. Readers may find areas which they believe warrant greater consideration and successful programs which are not mentioned. Given the process, these omissions are unavoidable.

The terminology of the report deserves a few words of explanation:

- Throughout the report, we use the phrase "impaired driving" rather than "drunk driving." The term "impaired" is preferred for two reasons. First, because we are concerned, particularly in the case of youth, about the impact of low levels of alcohol consumption on driving, not just drunkenness. Second, its use is intended to remind readers that drugs other than alcohol affect driving skills and that drug use, especially among young people, poses a serious highway safety problem.
- Recognizing that alcohol is a drug, we have tried whenever possible to use the phrase "alcohol and other drugs." At times this wording proved awkward and was not employed, though this should not diminish the importance of acknowledging that alcohol is a drug.
- Whenever the word "parents" is used, it is meant to include those who exercise parental authority over children, such as legal guardians.

Intended to reflect the testimony, the report is not an evaluation by the NCADD of existing programs. Instead, the report offers an opportunity for self-evaluation and seeks to provoke discussion and to be a point of departure for possible research and further efforts to combat youth impaired driving. The recommendations located at the end of each chapter are the sole responsibility of the NCADD and do not necessarily reflect the policies and programs of NHTSA or the other organizations who cooperated in this project. In selecting these recommendations from the abundance of proposals suggested by testifiers, the NCADD offers the foundation for a systemwide approach. It is the hope of the NCADD that this report and its recommendations, however obvious some of them first may appear, will encourage and support the efforts of those who have taken on the challenge of combatting youth impaired driving.

Finally, it should be noted that the report focuses on youth under age 21. In addressing the issue of youth impaired driving, the NCADD does not wish to overlook problem drivers in older age groups, for we certainly recognize that young adults ages 21-24 also exhibit an alarmingly high rate of impaired driving. Nonetheless, special reasons do exist for targeting those under age 21. During their teenage years, most young people begin both to drink and drive. Inexperience in each of these activities combines with deadly effect. By encouraging education on the effects of alcohol and by supporting measures to increase awareness of the dangers of drinking and driving, we have an opportunity to influence the lifelong driving behavior of young people. Youth-targeted activities are an investment in the future that deserve our fullest attention.

Youth Impaired Driving Model



Components of the Youth Impaired Driving Model

The goal of making youthful impaired driving socially intolerable requires a sustained, cooperative effort from all elements of the community. Testimony at the public hearings focused on the following nine crucial components of a systemwide approach:

School Responsibilities—this category encompasses both curricular and non-curricular activities including: formal classroom instruction for students from kindergarten to college that addresses alcohol/drug use and impaired driving; school intervention programs designed to address the needs of individual youth with substance abuse problems; and teacher training.

Extracurricular Activities—activities involving students which often occur in a school setting but which are outside the curriculum. Examples include student safety groups, summer camps, statewide conferences and alcohol-free activities.

Community Responsibilities—grass roots efforts where young people and adults work together to promote community awareness and activities. This area focuses on the role of parents and the actions that they can take both privately in the home and publicly in citizen groups. It encompasses the activities of activist groups, churches, civic groups and other community organizations.

Work-Based Activities—activities undertaken in the workplace or sponsored by the private sector. These activities include: informational activities for young employees; company policies prohibiting the use of alcohol and other drugs during work hours; substance abuse assistance for employees; support for community programs directed at young people; and efforts by retail vendors to stop the sale of alcohol to underage youth.

Enforcement—police or Alcohol Beverage Control agency programs designed to enforce minimum drinking age and impaired driving laws.

Licensing—primarily state programs, licensing encompasses: 1) provisional licensing for youth; 2) licensing sanctions for youth impaired driving; 3) measures to combat the manufacture and use of fraudulent forms of identification and; 4) other programs dealing with the licensure of young drivers.

Adjudication—activities in which judges or prosecutors play a central role. These include strategies for processing, sanctioning and rehabilitating youthful offenders; programs that provide information or instruction to judges or prosecutors on the problem of youth impaired driving; and activities outside the court in which the judge or prosecutor assumes a leadership role to effect change in the community.

Supervision—programs established for youthful offenders after they have been adjudicated. These include screening for drug and alcohol problems, intake, probation, education programs, treatment alternatives and case management.

Legislation—laws and policies directed at reducing impaired driving and the use of alcohol and other drugs by youth.

Introduction

In the past five years progress has been made in reducing the number of alcohol-related motor vehicle deaths involving young drivers. Between 1982 and 1987, the alcohol-related fatalities of youth under 21 declined by 21.9%. While this figure is tempered by the fact that the youth population declined by 8.4% during that time, it nonetheless represents a significant achievement.

The impressive reduction in alcohol-related youth fatalities typifies a general decline since 1982 in alcohol involvement in youth crashes. This reduction is all the more impressive given the steady increase in non-alcohol related youth fatalities over that same period. As a variety of statistics indicate, alcohol is a factor in fewer and fewer crashes involving young people. In fact, the largest decrease among all age groups in alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes has occurred within the 15-20 year old age group.

Figure 1

Youth Fatalities — Ages 15 to 20

Motor Vehicle Deaths, 1982 to 1987



Despite encouraging indications that alcohol involvement is declining, young people continue to be involved in alcohol-related crashes in disproportionately high numbers. Last year youth under the age of 21 remained significantly overrepresented when compared to the over 21-population:

* 19 young people compared to 11 adults over 21 died in alcohol-related crashes per 100,000 of their respective populations.
* 25 young drivers compared to 11 adult drivers over 21 were involved in alcohol-related crashes per 100,000 licensed drivers in each population.
* Youths under 21 comprise only 8% of the total driving population but accounted for 17% of the drivers involved in alcohol-related fatal crashes.
* 25% of all passengers killed in motor vehicle crashes were youth aged 15 to 20.

Drinking and driving continues to be the number one killer of teenagers. More than 40% of all deaths for people age 15-20 result from motor vehicle crashes; and approximately half of these fatalities involve alcohol. One in five American youths who dies between the ages of 15 and 20 will die in an alcohol-related crash. As it has often been remarked, the alcohol-related crash is the American way to die for teenagers of driving age.

Figure 18

Leading Causes of Accidental Death by Age



The problem of youth impaired driving is intimately associated with the problem of illegal

underage drinking. Self-reported surveys reveal that nine out of ten high school seniors have used alcohol by the time they graduate and that a significant number drink heavily. As testifiers repeatedly declared, regular alcohol use is seen as the norm by many American youth.

Sharing unpublished statistics from the 1987 National High School Senior Survey, Patrick O'Malley of the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research offered in his testimony a disturbing view of the problem of youth impaired driving. According to the 1987 survey of 17,000 high school seniors nationwide, 27% of the respondents reported that they had driven a car after drinking in the two weeks prior to the survey. Even more alarming, 15% reported driving after having five or more drinks in a row. Still more students are placing themselves at risk by riding as passengers in a car with a driver who has been drinking. More than one-third reported riding with a drinking driver in the prior two weeks. And the drivers with whom they risked riding more often than not were drinking heavily, with 22% of the seniors stating that they had been a passenger in a car in the prior two weeks with a driver who had consumed five or more drinks.

The danger that young people court when they drink and drive is exacerbated by three factors. First, young people are inexperienced drivers. Not only are a greater percentage of youth involved in alcohol-related crashes, but a greater percentage are involved in car crashes in general. Second, youth exhibit a propensity to risk-taking and a common feeling of invincibility that often contributes to reckless driving. Third, youth have a tendency not to use safety belts. According to the University of Michigan survey, only one third of the seniors said that they always wear a safety belt when they are driving, and even fewer always wear them when they are passengers in the front seat of a car. Given this pattern of behavior, the disproportionate number of alcohol-related crashes that claim the lives of young people becomes sadly predictable.

Our best hope of countering the pervasiveness of youth impaired driving lies in formulating an integrated systemwide approach that will present young people with a consistent message that underage drinking and impaired driving are intolerable. Testifiers clearly emphasized that this approach must involve the entire community and cited examples of the type of coordination that is necessary: parents must support student extracurricular activities and participate in community programs; judges must expand their role beyond the courts and become community catalysts for change; college administrators and retail liquor establishments must work together to stop alcohol purchases by underage college students; and business leaders must support the efforts of citizen action groups in their communities.

Within the framework of a systemwide approach, testifiers placed the single greatest emphasis upon the role and responsibility of parents. Both youth and adult testifiers stressed this point. Parents need to concern themselves with the well-being of their children and provide emotional support, moral guidance and disciplinary action. Youth are much less likely to get involved in illegal activities if they feel a sense of attachment to their family and other pro-social institutions. As a study submitted by a Vermont testifier concluded, youth impaired driving often is only one element in a larger pattern of antisocial behavior. Since parents play a pivotal role in shaping the behavior of their children, support for an integrated systemwide program must begin in the family with efforts by parents to provide their children with the information and direction that encourages socially-responsible behavior in a substance-abusing society.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS



I. School Responsibilities

Today, it is generally recognized that an effective response to the problem of youth impaired driving must extend beyond traditional law enforcement measures. Only by changing the attitudes and perceptions of young people toward alcohol use and abuse can communities achieve more than token success. Education constitutes an indispensable element of this response. Through education, youth may come to see the health risks of impaired driving and may be provided with the refusal skills necessary to resist pressures to drink and drive.

Every community possesses a variety of forums for educating its youth. Parents, employers and community organizations can all play an important role in informing youth about alcohol use and establishing clear expectations of socially-responsible behavior. Within this educational campaign, schools occupy a special place. By graduation time, a student will have spent 10,000 hours in the classroom. When considering the additional hours spent on extracurricular activities, it becomes clear that schools constitute a major site of personal and social development. Given the loss of young lives that occurs each year, communities cannot afford to neglect the school's potential for shaping the attitudes of young people toward their own well-being.

The testimony on school-based countermeasures focused on five key questions:

1) Why is education, and particularly early education, so important?
2) How should schools respond to the problem of underage drinking and impaired driving?
3) Who should provide classroom instruction?
4) What is the state's role in establishing school programs?
5) What special problems do colleges confront and what are their responsibilities?

The Importance of Education

While education remains an important element in the general battle against impaired driving, it assumes an even greater role in the campaign to stop youth from drinking and driving. Youth, as testifiers remarked, often possess a feeling of invulnerability which leads them to dismiss the risks of dangerous behavior. Education offers a means of countering this predisposition. By promoting the value of a healthy lifestyle and providing information on the physiological effects of alcohol, educators may diminish the risk-taking proclivity of young people.

Education plays a second important function in countering the mixed messages young people receive about the seriousness of impaired driving. Throughout the hearings, testifiers related accounts of parents who tolerated the early drinking habits of their children, school officials who denied the existence of student alcohol abuse, police officers who merely confiscated the alcoholic beverages of underage youth, and judges who routinely failed to impose sanctions on juvenile offenders. Each of these practices, witnesses testified, tends to undermine efforts to impress upon youth the seriousness of DWI offenses.

The gravest concern over the contradictory messages reaching youths, however, was reserved for alcohol advertisements. Numerous participants criticized the counterproductive impact of alcohol beverage commercials, expressing dismay at both their content and their quantity. Articulating the concern of many testifiers, William McCord of the South Carolina Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse, stated that alcohol advertising socializes adolescents to alcohol use and contributes to a general environment that promotes overly casual attitudes toward alcohol consumption. Advertising, he explained, may encourage potentially risky drinking and driving practices among youth and undoubtedly makes it more difficult to raise public health concerns. According to McCord, even the "moderation" message of the alcoholic beverage industry theme "know your limits" starts from and reinforces the perception that almost everybody drinks and that some drinking is always acceptable. For youth under age 21, this theme is particularly inappropriate.

The sheer number of alcohol advertisements exacerbates the educator's problem of counteracting their impact. According to Rita S. Weiss of the American Automobile Association, between the formative ages of 2 and 18, the average child in the U.S. will view approximately

100,000 television commercials for beer alone. While extensive exposure to television commercials may not cause the adoption of negative behavior, it may hinder the adoption of positive preventative measures. People who frequently watch television are more likely to accept alcohol involvement as a normal part of a wide range of activities, underestimate the social problems resulting from alcohol abuse, and view prevention as an individual concern. Given this climate of socialization, the need for formal school programs to inform youth of the harmful effects of underage drinking and impaired driving becomes all the more imperative.

Early Education

If participants at the hearings were unanimous in their advocacy of educational efforts, they were equally adamant that the education of youth must begin at an early age. Education, they insisted, must start early because youth begin using alcohol and other drugs at a young age. As Clay Roberts, a Seattle health education consultant, pointed out, the national average age of first use of alcohol is 12.8 years. With significant alcohol use occurring among preteens, preventative education must be introduced in elementary schools. To be successful, it must provide children with the information, skills and attitudes they need before they are first confronted with the decision to use alcohol. As most educators recognize, it is far easier to promote the development of good behavior patterns than to attempt to change already established habits.

As a leading sponsor of impaired driver education, the American Automobile Association offers an illuminating example of how an understanding of the importance of early educational and preventative measures evolved. Having initiated an alcohol awareness program for high school students in 1973, AAA soon realized that for some young drinkers this program occurred too late in their education. Studies revealed that ingrained drinking patterns leading to impaired driving formed at a much earlier age. A significant increase in problem drinking seemed to occur for boys between seventh and eighth grades, and for girls between eighth and ninth grades. In 1978 AAA subsequently established AL-CO-HOL, a program for junior high school students. While conducting field-testing for this junior high school program, however, investigators found convincing evidence that the earlier alcohol and traffic education began, the more effective it was likely to be in later years in combatting both impaired driving and alcohol abuse. Motivated by research suggesting that children develop a heightened concept of alcohol usage between the ages of six and ten, AAA expanded its alcohol and traffic safety efforts and introduced its "Starting Early" program to encompass elementary school children.

Expert testimony on the need for early education received convincing corroboration from the firsthand experience of the youth participants. Seattle students Megan Gleason and John Strickler noted the prevalence of alcohol consumption among their eighth-grade peers, while Fort Worth senior Cynthia Burbank spoke for many youths when she declared, "by the time you get to high school, your decisions are made. Are you going to do drugs? Are you going to experiment with alcohol? The decisions are made already. That's why right now, today, we need to work with the elementary schools and the children of that age."

The School's Response

Once schools have identified a need for preventative education programs, the question of what to teach arises. Discussion of existing approaches revealed that schools commonly engage in three principal activities: providing education on the health risks of alcohol and other drugs; teaching refusal skills; and planning intervention for students with substance abuse problems.

The first responsibility schools have is to provide education to students on the effect of alcohol and other drugs. With notable frequency, youths in particular emphasized the importance of this activity, stating that effective approaches to reaching young people begin with the presentation of factual information rather than overt attempts to sermonize. "Don't preach to us, just give us the facts" emerged as a consistent refrain.

Education is important because all too often youth are not aware of the effects that a small amount of alcohol can have on the brain. Relating the story of her own tragic auto crash, 26 year-old Alison Gentry emphasized the need to provide young people with information on the effects of alcohol, so that everyone will realize impairment occurs at low levels of consumption. "I never thought that I could hurt anyone by my ignorance," said Gentry, who killed her fiance while driving three months before their wedding. "I thought a drunk driver was someone who could not walk or was swerving all over the road. I was not slurring my words. I'd

had four drinks in a three-hour period of time. I wasn't stumbling, or slurring my words, or driving all over the road. But I was impaired."

When teachers provide instruction on the physiological effects of alcohol, they accomplish two goals. First, they impart valuable information to their students. Second, and more subtly, they portray impaired driving as a health concern rather than as a law enforcement problem. This linkage between health and alcohol is very important, according to testifiers. As Judge Boll of Ironton, Ohio noted, efforts to eliminate impaired driving depend upon youth recognizing that the costs of drinking and driving outweigh the benefits. Traditionally, the perceived benefits have not been hard to discern, for alcohol has come to be seen as a symbol of adulthood, a sign of rebellion against parental authority, a source of peer esteem. So long as drinking and driving is viewed as a law enforcement problem, the major cost that youth perceive is the risk of being caught. Portraying underage drinking and impaired driving as a health concern, however, brings to light a new dimension of the costs and may lead youth to understand that drinking and driving itself, and not just the consequences of being caught, jeopardize their well-being. Repeatedly, testifiers commended this approach. Prevention efforts, they agreed, should take a positive approach and focus on wellness and the benefits of a healthy lifestyle.

In addition to informing young people of the effects of alcohol and the benefits of healthy behavior, educators need to teach youth the refusal skills that will enable them to act on their own good judgment. As Clay Roberts noted, a fallacy exists concerning the role of education. The fallacy is that if we give our kids good information, they will make healthy choices. Information however, is only the answer as long as ignorance is the problem; and the problem of youthful impaired driving, according to Roberts, does not arise from a lack of information. The real variable determining whether a youth will drink and drive is social skills: Does the young person have the ability to refuse to drink in the presence of friends when confronted with the choice? Preventative education, therefore, must combine two elements. It must provide young people with information about the effects of alcohol; and, at the same time, it must teach young people the social skills that are necessary for them to act wisely on that information and resist the pressure to drink and drive.

Adolescents drink for a variety of reasons. They drink to replace social skills acquisition. They drink because they can't communicate, because they lack self-confidence, because they are painfully self-conscious and fear to deviate from the norm. To overcome these problems, Roberts enumerated three social skills that school programs should teach. First, schools need to teach children to be assertive, to stand up for what they believe, to say no to the pressures of peers. Second, they need to teach children self-control. Before youths can resist the advances of peers, they must be able to control their own behavior. Finally, schools need to teach children how to make new friends. Peer groups exert a dominant influence over substance use, and often substance use will not end until an individual breaks with a group that uses, and thus legitimates the use of, alcohol and drugs. Unless individuals possess the social skills to make new friends, they may hesitate to leave the security of their clique, even if, in the rare case, they do recognize its deleterious effect upon them.

Providing information on alcohol and teaching refusal skills are useful components of a school program that seeks to prevent the onset of alcohol/drug use. Their potential for successfully modifying youth behavior, however, is limited to the body of students capable of rationally understanding the consequences of substance use. Unfortunately, a significant number of adolescents are substance abusers whose chemical dependency renders them impervious to health and safety messages. These individuals often suffer from permanent neurochemical change and may have developed defense mechanisms to rationalize their behavior and deny the existence of an alcohol problem. For these youths, a prevention approach combining information and refusal skill techniques is inadequate. Only intervention and counseling offers a possibility of altering their behavior. Intervention and counseling constitute the third essential component of a school program.

Testifiers cited two important reasons why schools need to develop intervention techniques. The first reason has to do with the sheer number of students estimated in need of intervention programs. A 1987 survey of one school district in the state of Washington estimated that 40% of the high school students were substance abusers. Prevention messages offer little hope of affecting these students. Second, the very existence of such a large body of substance abusers and chemical dependents limits the effectiveness of education on the remaining 60% of the adolescent population. As David Moore, the Director of Olympic Counseling Services in Washington, testified:

"The disordered thought process of the substance-impaired student competes with our prevention messages for the belief systems enacted by the non-impaired student. It would be a fallacy to believe that the non-impaired will not sometimes succumb to the influence of their impaired peers—particularly in the crucial social milieu of the teenage party scene. The concept of "too drunk to drive" may be clear in a Friday afternoon health education class. But at a Friday evening kegger wher 0% of the seniors are drinking alcohol, istinction becomes quite hazy. The 40% r adolescents who think irrationally about substance use have a peer influence which extends well beyond their own group.

A concerted effort must be made to address the 40% of our adolescents who are substance-impaired. It is far easier, and certainly more emotionally satisfying, to discuss prevention topics with the 60% of our teenagers who respond rationally to such educational messages. The more difficult task, and certainly [one] critical to highway safety, is to intervene on the substance impaired population who, through their delusion and denial, tune out our safety messages."

Intervention measures constitute the third component of a triadic approach to school-based programs. While education curricula and even instruction in refusal skills frequently garner greater attention, intervention programs that provide counseling, referral services and aftercare are essential. In the past, substance abuse treatment largely depended on an adolescent being caught drinking and driving by the police. According to testimony, however, apprehension occurs notoriously seldom and clearly not often enough to alleviate the high rate of adolescent use. Consequently, many schools are now assuming responsibility for intervention programs.

Classroom Instructors

While testifiers devoted much time to delineating the three essential components of a school based program—information, refusal skills and intervention—they also gave considerable attention to the question of who should teach these programs. According to Clay Roberts of Roberts, Fitzmahan and Associates, the creators of "Here's Looking at You, 2000", the most important variable in a school prevention program may be the teacher who teaches it. Effective instructors, Roberts noted, display five characteristics: 1) they are good role models; 2) they feel comfortable employing a variety of teaching strategies; 3) they inspire the trust of students so that students feel able to turn to them in times of trouble; 4) they are capable of making the subject come alive with humor and anecdotes; and 5) they want to teach the subject.

Throughout the hearings, testifiers emphasized the importance of teacher training. Alcohol and drug abuse education is very different from traditional academic subjects, for it is not primarily an intellectual subject somewhat removed from everyday life. On the contrary, for both staff and students, it can be a sensitive, confusing, often controversial and, all too frequently, painful area of their daily lives. In this setting, proper teacher training becomes essential. Therefore, testifiers recommended that all teachers receive in-service training to learn how to recognize the signs of alcohol use and what to do in the case of students who need intervention. More extensive training, ideally offered by professionals in the treatment community, should be provided to those who teach specific courses on alcohol and other drugs. Effective instructors need a knowledge base in the emerging health care field of substance abuse education. Teacher training is enhanced when state educational agencies and teacher certification programs design and encourage formal drug-alcohol education.

If the testifiers demonstrated a strong commitment to proper teacher training, they revealed an unshakeable faith in the efficacy of peer education. The concept of students helping students received unanimous approval. Educators, law enforcement officials and the youth themselves all testified that young people are more likely to respond positively to instruction from peers than from adults. According to Clay Roberts, youth tend to pattern themselves after those who are three years older. Therefore, youth volunteers should work with students who are three years younger for best effect.

At the hearings, participants described a plethora of innovative programs involving peer education. Programs utilizing rehabilitated substance abusers received particularly strong support. Recovering teen alcoholics such as Brian Cooper who testified in Seattle and John Rossi who spoke in Boston maintained that recovering abusers like themselves, who can speak with personal knowledge of the dangers of alcohol use, have a special ability to reach young

people. Similarly in Ft. Worth, 16 year-old substance abuser Edward Muldowney testified that while high school students may not respond to cautionary messages from their straight peers, they may listen to a peer who can speak from experience of the effect of drug and alcohol use.

Classroom instructors in drinking and driving need not be limited to teachers and peers. Anyone capable of earning the respect of students constitutes a potentially valuable resource. Alcohol-related crash victim Richard Gallaspie of the Georgia Arrive Alive program, testified that his high school football coach was the one person who might have been able to reach him before alcohol abuse nearly claimed his life. A Vermont survey on adolescent alcohol consumption offers even more compelling evidence for enlisting the aid of coaches, for it revealed that males engaged in sports activities exhibited higher-than-average rates of alcohol use.

Who else can be used to teach students? Communities possess an abundance of individuals whose backgrounds enable them to bring a unique perspective to classroom discussions on drinking and driving. To complement traditional classroom teachers, schools are bringing in an ever broader spectrum of professionals to provide instruction. In Illinois, for instance, the state police have adopted a program entitled DARE - Drug Abuse Resistance Education - from the Los Angeles Police Department and implemented it in 123 school districts. The program begins with a selective screening process and intensive educational program for state police volunteers and involves weekly visits by officers to fifth and sixth grade classrooms to build rapport between the officers and children. In addition to DARE, the Illinois State Police have also participated in STAR, a classroom instruction program with a curriculum for grades K-12 that covers such subjects as substance abuse, decision making, choosing friends, saying "no" and self-esteem.

Other notable school programs seek to utilize such assets as the expertise of health care professionals and the popularity of professional athletes. Emergency Nurses C.A.R.E., for example, operates in 19 states and brings emergency room nurses into classrooms to present slide shows of hospital patients being treated for alcohol-related crashes. Professional athletes have also figured prominently in school programs. A four-state cooperative project known as the "Road to Winning" trained professional and collegiate athletes to give presentations at schools in Washington, Idaho, Oregon and Alaska; while in Massachusetts, a statewide program entitled the "Celtics Challenge" capitalized on the popularity of the Boston Celtics to promote educational activities.

The State's Role

While primary responsibility for education programs rests with local communities, state agencies can play key roles in initiating and coordinating school-based programs. Both the "Road to Winning" and the "Celtic Challenge," serve as examples of programs that involved the participation of state governors. In addition to promoting programs, an active governor can use political pressure to overcome the reluctance of a community to acknowledge that a problem of alcohol usage exists in its schools. And in districts where the education authorities lack either the funds or motivation to establish alcohol programs, state health or criminal agencies can take the lead in implementing school activities.

One of the most important state activities that testifiers mentioned concerned the establishment of educational requirements. In 1983 the state legislature in Vermont, for example, mandated that alcohol and drug education programs for grades K-12 be fully implemented in all school districts. State funding was appropriated to help school districts meet this mandate. A state program planning group was established to formulate a series of learning objectives for each grade and to evaluate a variety of curricula available for implementation. Each year school districts are required to file a report with the Commissioner of Education that evaluates the effectiveness of the district's alcohol and drug abuse program.

With an increased number of school programs, a state level task force or state sponsored conference can perform a valuable coordinative function. In Rhode Island, the Governor's Committee on Youth, Alcohol and Substance Abuse established a statewide system of high school substance abuse coordinators and formulated a curriculum with mandated guidelines. Similarly, in Massachusetts eight Prevention Centers were established under the auspices of the Department of Public Health to deliver teacher training, provide a speaker's bureau, and act as a repository for information on drug and alcohol prevention programs.

In addition to coordinating activities and facilitating the flow of information, state agencies can provide support for neglected areas of the school curriculum. In Texas, for example, high

schools offer driver education courses as electives but devote little in-service instruction for teachers on the subject. Consequently, the Texas Education Agency developed a curriculum unit on alcohol and drugs for driver education classes, prepared a teachers' manual on the unit, and held instructor classes for driver education teachers.

College Responsibilities

Throughout the hearings, participants devoted the great majority of their attention to elementary and secondary programs. Relatively few speakers addressed the subject of educational programming for college students. While some elements of the school programs implemented in grades K-12 may be applicable to college programs, underage drinking and driving among college students occurs within a different set of circumstances and, consequently, requires a somewhat different response.

According to David Winer, Dean of Students at Trinity College, university administrators confront a unique situation. Most college students are at least 18 years old and are considered adults in every respect with the exception of purchase and possession of alcohol. Expected to act as adults, students generally are conceded the right to regulate their lives without undue interference from university officials. The exercise of this right, in fact, is seen as an important element of university education.

Wishing to respect the rights of young adult students, university officials nonetheless have begun to recognize the need to respond to the problem of underage drinking and impaired driving. Despite increases in the purchase and possession age to 21, alcohol continues to remain the primary substance abuse concern of college faculty and administrators, Dean Winer stated. Raising the purchase and possession age, in fact, has worsened the problem on college campuses, according to Winer, for it has driven drinking underground and increased the problem of false forms of identification.

The task of ending underage college drinking is made more difficult by the fact that a large percentage of students have been drinking for several years by the time they arrive at college. Acquired drinking habits prove more difficult to change at this point. Further, even students who previously did not drink may be tempted to drink, and drink without restraint, as they experience the first blush of freedom from parental authority.

Mindful of their responsibility, some higher education institutions have begun to address the problem of illegal campus drinking. Gloria Busch-Johnson, Dean of Student Services at Aiken Technical College, described the auto safety program entitled "Project Think" that the South Carolina Technical College system has devised. Implemented at all 16 technical colleges in the state, the program is designed to increase student awareness of the problem of impaired driving and discourage the use of alcohol and other drugs when driving. A paid staff coordinates the state-wide effort by providing technical assistance to each college, operating an audiovisual aids loan program, assisting in the planning of campus activities, and acquiring and distributing educational materials. Campus activities include informational lectures, simulated automobile crashes, and live impaired driving demonstrations where alcohol-free bars are provided. To inform students over 21 of their responsibilities when hosting a party where alcohol is served, participants at campus activities are given literature which describes the host's responsibilities and the danger of drinking and driving.

Other testifiers described further measures. Vince Burgess of the Virginia Department of Motor Vehicles noted that an alliance of organizations in his state holds an annual conference known as "Alternatives" for college administrators to discuss the problem of how to handle underage drinking and driving. David Winer of Trinity College stated that his institution had established a policy prohibiting the consumption of alcohol by large groups on weekdays.

In concluding his discussion of the options available to administrators, Dean Winer remarked that colleges must be careful that policies aimed at curbing underage drinking on campus do not exacerbate the problem of impaired driving. Without efforts to inform students of the dangers of drinking and driving, limitations on campus drinking merely may cause students to relocate their drinking off-campus, thus increasing the likelihood that they will drink and drive.

Like their junior high and high school counterparts, college officials must adopt a comprehensive approach to the problem. They must act to inform students about the effects of drinking and driving. They must work with other members of the community, particularly law enforcement agents and bar owners in the vicinity of the campus, to ensure that their underage students do not relocate their drinking off-campus. And they must communicate the message, through their policies and through the activities

they sponsor, that impaired driving is intolerable and that college students will not be exempted from the purchase and possession laws that seek to eradicate it.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

School Responsibilities

* States should require alcohol/drug education programs to be fully implemented in all school districts.
  —Education should begin at an early age. Curriculum standards should be set for each grade, K-12. Alcohol/other drug curricula should be identified which meet these standards.
  —States should require each school to report on its program and the program's effectiveness and offer an assessment of problems to the State Commissioner of Education every year. These local level assessments should in turn be evaluated by the state, and findings communicated back to the school districts.
* Goals for both K-12 and college educational programs should include:
  1) preventing the illegal use of alcohol and other drugs;
  2) providing the information and life skills necessary for underage youths to resist peer and advertising pressure to use alcohol and other drugs and to drive impaired. Social skills taught should include modules on assertiveness, self-control, how to say 'no,' how to make friends and how to counter alcohol advertising.
* Periodic statewide evaluations on student knowledge and attitudes concerning alcohol and other drugs should be conducted as an effectiveness and assessment measure.
* All classroom teachers should receive minimal training regarding alcohol/other drug issues. This training should include:
  —how to recognize the signs of alcohol and other drug use.
  —appropriate intervention and referral techniques
  —how to incorporate drug and alcohol issues into their daily lessons.
* Those designated to teach alcohol and other drug curricula should:
  1) be good role models; 2) be trusted by students; 3) be adept at using a variety of teaching strategies; and 4) want to teach the subject.
  —Teachers of alcohol and other drug curricula should receive special in-service training.
* Communities possess an abundance of human resources that schools should tap for classroom instruction.
  —Peer education should be used. Trained, volunteer students should work with students who are three years younger for best effect.
  —Specially trained uniformed police officers should be enlisted to speak at alcohol and other drug classes.
  —Judges or court referees should be used in driver education classes to inform students of laws and sanctions.
* Universities should take steps to ensure that drinking and driving laws are obeyed and that counseling is available for students with substance abuse problems.



II. Extracurricular Activities

Thousands of young people nation-wide are participating in the fight to stop alcohol and drug use and to prevent impaired driving. Through the pioneering efforts of Students Against Driving Drunk (SADD), youth are finding it acceptable to speak out against drinking and driving. National organizations such as SADD and Just Say No are not alone in organizing networks of students to become active in prevention and intervention. State-wide efforts are numerous and include groups like OSSOM (Oregon), SAFTYE (Washington), Friday Night Live Clubs (California), SWAT (Texas), Arrive Alive (Georgia), STOPP (New Hampshire), and Oklahoma Challenge (Oklahoma) to name but a few.

The testimony on extracurricular activities largely consisted of descriptions of the events and programs sponsored by student groups. In recounting these activities testifiers dwelt on three prominent topics: safe rides programs, peer pressure and community support. The first topic—safe rides programs provoked extended debate. Critics contend that safe rides programs send a mixed message to youth by implicitly condoning underage drinking, while advocates maintained that it is only realistic to attend to the immediate safety concerns of impaired driving before addressing the more intractable problem of adolescent drinking.

The second topic—peer pressure—generated little controversy. Testifiers repeatedly affirmed that peer pressure constitutes the greatest impediment to the success of extracurricular activities. It inhibits both the participation of youths in programs and their receptiveness to the message of those programs. If peer pressure constitutes the problem, however, it also holds the promise of a solution. Programs that utilize positive peer pressure to dissuade youths from drinking and driving were praised consistently for their ability to change the attitudes and behavior of young people.

The third topic concerned the importance of community support. Extracurricular activities begin with a concern by youths about the harmful behavior of their peers. To be effective, however, these programs require more than concern and more, even, than the dedicated effort of participants. They require the active support of the entire community. With remarkable consistency, youth emphasized that their efforts require reinforcement from parents, teachers, employers, judges and police. For positive peer pressure to work, extracurricular activities must be supported by a consistent message from all elements of the community that underage drinking and impaired driving are intolerable.

A variety of means exist for youth to encourage their peers to refrain from drinking and driving. These means extend well beyond the traditional range of informational activities used to warn students about the dangers of impaired driving. Increasingly, student groups are developing approaches that emphasize the positive ways in which youths can help their friends and classmates. A number of student testifiers, for instance, reported their experiences with intervention, peer-to-peer counsel, and role modeling. Listening to more than 40 high school students and several adult organizers, the Commission learned of an impressive array of extracurricular programs. Essentially, these programs consisted of various combinations of six different types of activities:

Programs

1. Education. Aimed at informing peers, parents, and younger students, activities in this category included sponsoring speakers, performing skits and plays, composing rap songs, developing public service announcements, simulating car crashes and displaying wrecked automobiles. Among the more creative activities was the publication of a Youth Yellow Pages by Rhode Island high school students that contained information (and telephone numbers for further information) on potentially embarrassing subjects such as the use of alcohol and other drugs, pregnancy, obtaining a job, and overcoming a poor self-image. Other innovative activities included the development of video tapes depicting what happens when youths are arrested, adjudicated, and punished for driving while impaired; and the publication of a parent resource booklet that explained the school's drug and alcohol problems, informed parents how to detect signs of drug abuse, and provided a list of substance abuse treatment centers.

2. Role Modeling. As previously noted, older students can perform a valuable role in working with children in lower grades. This work need not be limited to classroom instruction. As testimony revealed, opportunities exist for high school and college students to participate in the extracurricular events of younger students. For instance, members from Washington SAFTYE clubs have acted as chaperones at alcohol-free junior high school dances, while one SAFTYE club instituted an Adopt-a-buddy program in which a high school student adopts an elementary student and acts as a positive role model.

3. Peer Counseling. Although it usually requires training from professional counselors, some student groups provide peer counseling. A variety of formats are available to student groups that wish to offer counseling. Teen advice columns in school newspapers, alcohol hot lines, and face-to-face counseling have all been used. One high school reported establishing two peer support groups, one group for students returning from rehabilitation centers and one for students who have family members with problems involving alcohol and other drugs.

4. Alcohol-free activities. The most common form of extracurricular activity is the sponsorship of alcohol and drug-free events. Events range from once-a-year celebrations such as Project Graduation to the regularly-scheduled activities of organizations like STOPP which sponsors hayrides, sleighrides, barbeques, bowl-a-thons, ski trips, canoe trips, and dances. Discussions revealed that groups which desire to change significantly the behavior of their peers must offer activities on a regular basis. Once-a-year celebrations may publicize the issue of youth impaired driving, but they offer little promise of altering the habits of adolescents who routinely drink and drive while socializing.

According to a Vermont survey, a high correlation exists between social activities and substance abuse. The more frequently students participate in social activities, the greater their reported use of alcohol and other drugs. This data emphasizes the importance of alcohol-free events; for it suggests that those who socialize most are the ones whom anti-impaired driving efforts need to reach to reduce the occurrence of drinking and driving. The problem, of course, is to persuade young people that alcohol is not a necessary ingredient of social activity. Here, the alcohol beverage industry's identification of alcohol with entertainment is an impediment, as is the limited concept of entertainment that too often exists among youths. Several times during the hearings youths complained that there was nothing to do for fun in their town except drink. Imaginatively planned extacurricular events are important if they demonstrate, by example, that keg parties and tailgate bashes do not exhaust the possibilities of social entertainment.

5. Conferences and Summer Camps. Camps and conferences play an important role in program development and expansion. Ranging in scope from one day annual conferences to week long summer camps, they provide a forum for exchanging information, evaluating activities, teaching leadership skills, and renewing the enthusiasm and commitment of those involved in youth programs. As one youth testified, the Texas War on Drugs summer camp "showed that you were able to have fun without using drugs and alcohol and that there were all these other kids out there that were saying the same thing that you were, that you weren't alone."

6. Safe Rides Programs. The final type of extracurricular activity, and undoubtedly the most controversial, is the safe rides program. Although hotly debated at the hearings, safe rides programs are popular in many communities. The Safe Rides Program of Whatcom County, Washington serves as an example of a project that has successfully generated community support. Designed by a community task force composed of high school students, law enforcement officials, Red Cross workers, members of the local DWI Task Force, and representatives of the church community, it solicited funding from the United Way and received liability insurance from the Boy Scouts Explorers program. Operating out of the Red Cross office, it uses a Red Cross vehicle to transport students home. A local video store donates movies to students on duty; and, at the time of the Seattle hearing, a Red Cross intern had been working with the students to develop public service announcements to publicize the program. Community support, according to Julia Peterson of the Whatcom County Safety Council, has made the program a success.

Although the hearings could hardly be described as contentious, the subject of safe rides programs provoked considerable debate. It was, in fact, the only topic which elicited an irreconcilable difference of opinion among the testifiers. The controversy centered on the perception that safe rides programs focus only on the problem of impaired driving without condemning underage drinking. Those who criticized SADD and safe rides programs argued that the best

prevention of teen impaired driving incidents is the prevention of impairment. "We want [students] to realize", said Tom Cullen, Executive Director of the Massachusetts Governor's Alliance Against Drugs, "that not only is drunk driving wrong, but drunkenness per se is wrong. [Young people] are rational human beings, and they should do nothing to render that rationality inoperable." Opponents of safe rides programs maintained that eliminating youth impaired driving requires a clear and consistent message that alcohol consumption by underage youths is unacceptable. All other efforts, they contended, are halfway measures that fail to address the root of the problem: societal tolerance of underage drinking and a norm of alcohol use among teenagers. As Deborah Jarvis, coordinator of the Oregon student movement OSSOM, pointed out, it is laudable that students care enough not to allow others to drink and drive. However, it is equally important, she continued, that young people participating in safe rides programs don't enable their friends to continue to drink, leading them to expect that someone will always be there to take care of them. "We must teach young people", she concluded, "that friends care enough to confront friends about behaviors that are harmful to themselves or others."

Proponents of safe rides programs readily agreed that the norm of alcohol use among youth lies at the heart of the problem, but they were less optimistic about the prospect of altering that norm. Recovering teen alcoholic Susan Holbrook declared that "there's a lot of peer pressure to drink . . . and that's not going to stop". As president of a SADD chapter, she noted, "the motto of our group is 'Friends don't let friends drive drunk' . . . not 'Friends don't let friends drink'. And with peer pressure, and with the way it is, we're going to have to keep that, until things change." Educator and football coach Roy Curtis concurred: "SADD is not the answer, but it begins where the action is, at the parties . . . Somebody has to take the initiative and plan some intervention." Speaking for the national SADD organization, Bill Cullinane reiterated the defense of safe rides programs: "SADD is concerned with the reality of life. If we lived in a perfect world, we could tell the youth of America 'don't do illegal drugs or drink' and they would respond in a very positive way. The Contract for Life and SADD address that less than perfect world where some young people choose to drink illegally and drive."

Safe rides programs may not be the final solution to the problem of youth impaired driving, but according to their supporters, they are a helpful step toward saving lives. Through the establishment of such programs, the roads are made safer for everyone. Furthermore, proponents declared, safe rides programs attract students who might be turned off by a message of abstinence. Once youth have become accustomed to not drinking and driving, they may cut back or stop drinking. The important thing, as one youth program coordinator emphasized, is to get students involved with choices and responsibilities in the hope that they will learn to make the right decisions. If safe rides programs can promote even an incremental increase in responsible behavior among young people, supporters agreed, then they make a positive contribution worthy of support.

During the course of the hearings, it became apparent that the five categories of extracurricular activities—peer education, role counseling, alcohol-free events, summer camps and safe rides programs—all encountered similar problems. These problems included difficulty in obtaining the active involvement of more than a small percentage of the student body, difficulty in reaching high risk segments of the youth population, especially males, and difficulty in retaining membership. Behind all these difficulties lay the phenomenon of peer pressure.

Peer Pressure

Peer pressure is clearly a factor with which all youths and all activity organizers must contend. One college student, testifying on its pervasiveness, went so far as to say, "peer pressure is probably the most important thing in many teenagers' lives. If they don't fit in with their peers then life isn't worth living. Even if it goes against the morals and teachings of their parents." The susceptibility of youth to peer pressure manifests itself in two ways. Not only does it make it more difficult to gain student support for extracurricular activities, but it also may divide the student body into two groups—those who drink and those who do not—and cause extracurricular programs to become a haven for the latter rather than a vehicle for changing the behavior of the former. This problem may be compounded by complacency. Parents, teachers, and even the student members themselves may believe that the problems of underage drinking and impaired driving are being adequately addressed by the mere presence of organizational countermeasures when, in fact, the student groups sponsoring those activities have

little contact with those who actually drink and drive.

Suggestions From Testifiers

Six suggestions were made for increasing the effectiveness of extracurricular programs.

First, a forum should exist for the regular exchange of ideas and information. Newsletters, conferences, and networking are indispensable elements for disseminating information and should be encouraged.

Second, student safety groups should develop the concept of linkage. Linkage, in this sense, involves conducting joint projects with other school clubs and encouraging other clubs to promote driving and alcohol awareness. Linkage is useful in that it not only expands the number of students involved, but also prevents safety club members from getting burned out by attempting to do too much.

Third, students should be permitted to run their own activities. Programs are most effective when the initiative for the activity as well as the implementation are left to youths.

Fourth, high school program organizers should reach out to freshmen or sophomores when they first enter high school to compensate for high turnover rates. If high school programs complement this thrust with a program of visiting elementary and junior high school classrooms, incoming freshmen or sophomores may be predisposed to participate in high school activities.

Fifth, communities should recognize the contributions of young people who work to reduce impaired driving by granting them scholarships and awards. Sixth, laws should be strictly enforced and adult support readily given to youth efforts to change the norm of drinking and driving. This last point deserves further elaboration.

With notable regularity, youth testifiers called for stricter enforcement of laws and harsher penalties for DWI offenders. "I believe that we need stiffer penalties," said one youth. "For instance, if you can put them in jail or take away their driver's license. . . . We need stiffer penalties because the students will just keep on doing it over and over again until they find out something's really going to happen." In the light of pervasive peer pressure to drink, calls from youth for stricter laws and better enforcement should come as no surprise; for adult support legitimates the decisions of youth who choose not to drink and makes it easier for them to justify their actions to their peers. Petitions from young people for stronger sanctions should be seen as a plea to the adult community, a plea to buttress the efforts of concerned students to change the norm of underage drinking that exists among their peers.

As Clay Roberts noted, young people become uncomfortable when they see themselves outside the norm. The task, then, is to change the norm so that youths no longer consider it "cool" to drink and drive. The extracurricular activities outlined in this section constitute the first step toward that goal. But these efforts require community support. The following sections outline ways in which parents, community leaders, employers, law enforcement officials, licensing authorities and the judiciary can contribute to this effort to make youth impaired driving socially intolerable.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Extacurricular

* Youth programs should focus on preventing drinking and other drug use, while recognizing the need for intervention strategies to address drinking and driving problems and other dangerous behaviors. These programs should be based on a clear, consistent philosophy and should be evaluated regularly.
* School authorities should encourage extracurricular safety clubs and activities. These activities should be student run and emphasize a peer-to-peer approach. Parents need to be actively involved in supporting these activities.
* To communicate the seriousness of impaired driving violations and legitimate youth-based extracurricular programs, effective police enforcement and court sanctions for youthful drinking and driving are necessary.
* Every high school should have a staff person who coordinates substance abuse and impaired driving prevention activities. Schools should work closely with personnel from the treatment community, law enforcement agencies, social service organizations, and other community groups to establish guidelines and develop training programs for these substance abuse coordinators.
* States should establish and participate in a network of student safety clubs and sponsor statewide student safety conferences. Awards, grants and scholarships should be given in recognition of outstanding work in youth impaired driving programs.
* State, local and private sources should pledge funding for student extracurricular activities.



III. Community Responsibilities

The campaign to end youthful impaired driving takes as its aim nothing less than changing the norms of youth behavior. To achieve this goal, young people must be presented with a consistent message and clear expectations of conduct from all elements of the community. Schools, businesses, court officials, law enforcement agents, community associations and the media each have important roles in this endeavor. Nonetheless, the primary responsibility for instilling in children a sense of social responsibility lies with parents. By taking a firm stand within their family against underage drinking and by joining forces with other concerned citizens in the community, parents possess a means of influencing their own children's behavior as well as changing the general societal tolerance of alcohol consumption by youth.

The testimony on community-based programs focused on the role of parents. Testifiers emphasized that parents have a responsibility to respond to the problem of youth impaired driving in two ways. First, parents have an obligation to undertake individual prevention efforts in the home. These efforts include both general measures, such as instilling in children an ability to resist peer pressure, as well as specific actions such as learning to detect the signs of alcohol and drug use. Second, parents have an obligation to support organized community action groups. Working as a group, parents can promote the social norm of alcohol-free activities and can encourage police, judges, lawmakers and retail alcohol dispensers to address seriously the issue of youth impaired driving.

In discussing the dual responsibility of parents, both in the home and in the community, testifiers emphasized three themes:

- A need exists for parental education. Without education, parents often remain unaware of the seriousness of the problem and uninformed about the countermeasures they can initiate.
- A need exists to utilize the media effectively. The media, as speakers noted, constitutes an important tool for drawing attention to social problems and can stimulate parental involvement in impaired driving countermeasures.
- A need exists to coordinate community activities at the local and state level. As Major Woodmansee of the Washington State Patrol declared, communities possess an abundance of talent and resources to combat the problem of youth impaired driving. The need is to coordinate effectively these resources in a community-wide network so that the activities of those involved in education, adjudication, alcohol counseling, law enforcement and highway safety complement and reinforce one another.

The ultimate goal of community-based activities is to change the norm that encourages young people to drink and drive. To accomplish this, youth must understand that they have a responsibility to refrain from activities that are harmful to themselves and others. The development of this sense of responsibility originates at home with the effort of parents to instruct their children. Therefore, the discussion of community-based activities began with a description of the parents' role. In this discussion, testifiers covered three important subjects. They explained why the parents' role is so crucial. They explained what parents can do to influence their children's drinking and driving behavior. And they expounded on the need for parental education.

The Important Role of Parents

The first topic concerned the importance of parental instruction and received considerable attention. New Hampshire high school senior Michelle Haas pointed out that laws are less effective in reducing underage drinking than the expectations parents set for their children's behavior. Compliance with a law, after all, depends on an individual's willingness to abide by it. "If teenagers want to drink, they're going to drink; they'll find a way to do it," Haas declared. "So it's really in the house, the education from inside the home, that's what it's all about."

The testimony of Michelle supported research findings which suggested that parents are the most important influence on a youth's decision not to use alcohol and other drugs. Dr. David Hawkins reported that surveys by the Universi-

ty of Washington reveal that when students were asked why they had not used alcohol, they most frequently mentioned their own parents as the reason for that decision. Similarly, when a Michigan State University survey asked teenagers what factors would reduce the amount of alcohol they consumed, 70% to 90% responded that parental actions such as supervising parties, keeping a closer control over home alcohol supplies, and making a greater effort to discuss their weekend activities would reduce their drinking habits.

Testifiers emphasized the central role of parents because a lack of parental support can undermine even the best programs instituted by schools, courts and law enforcement agencies. Texas police officer Eddie Garth spoke of the counterproductive effect parents have when they tolerate their child's impaired driving. He described what frequently happens after arresting a youth for impaired driving: "the next day Mom and Dad will give me a call and [ask] why aren't the police catching burglars and rapists instead of arresting Johnny or Suzy who has never touched a drop of alcohol. . . An attitude like this by parents is frustrating and discouraging to officers. Similar reactions by parents just give more fuel to the teen's own sense of being wronged by the system."

Instead of undermining the efforts of law enforcement officials, parents should develop a concern about youth impaired driving and act to reduce the potential for its occurrence. Testifiers recommended, for instance, that parents work to instill self-confidence in their children, since self-confidence is so important for resisting peer pressure. Parents also should insist that children obey the law and discipline them for misconduct. Testifiers elaborated further on the subject of good parenting skills.

To reduce the likelihood of troubled adolescents turning to alcohol as an escape from the problems of life, parents need to foster a sense of security and self-worth in their children. In the words of Texas high school student Margaret Bergdoll, "kids need smart adults, parents and teachers that teach them right from wrong. But perhaps most importantly, children need a positive image about themselves. If children are able to maintain such a positive image, then maybe when they reach high school, they will have enough pride in themselves to be able to say 'no' to these negative pressures."

Emotional support and a positive self-image may deter adolescents from drinking because of personal problems or peer pressure, but they do not necessarily discourage the youthful bent toward experimentation and the search for novel sensations that also contribute to underage drinking. To restrict this tendency, parents need to establish and enforce consequences. Testifiers of all ages testified to the indispensability of supervision and consequences. As Judge Andy Devine of Toledo, Ohio, observed, "if you're raising children, there's got to be consequences [for misconduct]." Love, like discipline, is insufficient by itself. Only the combination of love and discipline, he remarked, "gets a kid from childhood to adulthood".

Parents can take a range of specific actions to reduce the potential for underage drinking to occur. Openly expressing concern and disapproval, stressing rules more clearly, monitoring social activities, trying harder to detect drinking, applying discipline, keeping watch over the household alcohol supply, and prohibiting youth from having unsupervised parties while the parents are away from home are all important activities. Of these, the last activity deserves particular attention, for research profiling youth impaired driving incidents by Michigan State University professor Charles Atkins found that a large portion of incidents followed weekend parties that typically occurred when parents were not at home.

Parental Education

The central role that parents can play in curbing underage impaired driving led to the conclusion that greater emphasis must be placed on educating parents. Youth testifiers, in particular, stressed the need for parental education. It's true, said high school student Maurita Mader, "that parents are totally oblivious to what's going on in their children's lives. Many parents don't even [know] that the students are going out and getting drunk. And they don't ask enough questions from their kids like where they were the night before, or how come they came in so late." Miss Mader's conclusion that parents need to be made more aware of their children's behavior was corroborated by research at Michigan State University. According to Professor Atkins, researchers found that while 60% to 70% of parents believed underage drinking occurs, only 20% believe that their own children drink. Findings such as these suggest that education is needed to inform parents of the scope of the youth drinking problem and to convince them that their children, not just other youth, may be drinking and driving.

Role Modeling

The discussion of parental education led many testifiers to address the subject of role modeling. Both educators and youths consistently emphasized the importance of good adult role models, maintaining that heavy drinking among parents legitimates drinking in the eyes of many children. "What we don't often impress upon adults is how intoxication by parents sets an example for their children," said Tom Taylor, President of the Independent Insurance Brokers of Washington. "What kind of example do we set if we drink and drive, or let a friend have one too many at a party and look the other way when they pull out of the drive, or boast about drinking exploits in front of children? . . . The connection between our actions as adults and our children's actions needs to be stressed," Taylor concluded, and an ideal place to stress it is in parental education programs.

Testimony on parental role modeling raised the question of whether parents have a special responsibility not to drink and drive. Testifiers were divided in opinion. Some believed that parents should refrain from drinking and driving in order to set a good example for their children. Others noted that youth and adults exhibit different drinking and driving patterns that justify the prohibition on underage drinking while permitting adults to drink in moderation and drive.

In general, youth testifiers were very sensitive to the appearance of a double standard. High school student Karen Olsen, for example, stated: "One thing I think is real important is that parents aren't hypocritical and say 'Please don't drink and drive' and then go out and do the same thing." Juvenile court judge Philip Trompeter, on the other hand, noted that young people display distinctly different habits of drinking and driving that place them at greater risk than adult drivers. Youth tend to drink more in a shorter period of time, drive longer distances, carry more passengers, drive faster, and possess a greater feeling of invulnerability than adults who drink and drive. These characteristics suggest the dilemma of parents who insist that their children not drink and drive even if they do so themselves.

The first half of the testimony on community-based activities described what parents can do in their own homes to combat the problem of youth impaired driving. In the second half of the testimony, speakers discussed the impact parents can make when they join together to form community groups.

Community Organizations

Working as a group, parents can take a number of measures to combat the problem. They can promote social norms for alcohol-free parties. They can encourage informal networking among parents. They can produce informational materials. They can provide constructive alternative activities. They can publicize the teenage alcohol problem through the mass media. They can persuade police to give higher priority to surveillance and enforcement. They can lobby for more effective legislation. And they can encourage stores and bars to stop selling alcohol to minors.

Building an effective community organization is often a difficult process. Testifiers devoted attention to two recurring problems: 1) the problem of attracting and maintaining an active membership; and 2) the problem of establishing satisfactory liaisons with schools, courts and law enforcement agencies. To overcome these difficulties, testifiers recommended that community organizers: make effective use of the media; share information and borrow ideas from other community organizations; and coordinate activities at both the local and state level.

Using the Media

One of the most common obstacles community groups encounter is enlisting public participation. To overcome this problem, testifiers recommended using the media. Organizers of a Washington community campaign generated public involvement by utilizing local television personalities to publicize and participate in the campaign. According to David Hawkins, "It was the combination of TV and the school inviting them that got parents to become involved." Tom Cullen noted a second reason why community groups should make use of the media: if an issue is not in the newspapers, people do not believe it is a problem. Furthermore, the public attention cast on the issue by such publicity often puts pressure on police, schools and businesses to become more involved, thus facilitating an integrated strategy.

In addition to using the media, it is important for community groups to establish contacts with other groups, find out what they are doing, and share information with them. Guidance, as testifiers noted, can often best be obtained from those who already have experience in dealing with similar problems. Resources, such as a handbook that the state of Michigan distributed to all parent groups, provide an excellent means

of disseminating information among community organizations.

Coordination

While information exchanges and an effective use of the media are important elements in community programs, testifiers most frequently singled out proper coordination as the crucial variable of success. Coordination needs to occur at both the local and state level. At the local level, a community task force provides the vehicle for collaboration and may include such figures as the superintendent of schools, the police chief, the juvenile court judge, health professionals, the ABC license inspector, students, business leaders and representatives of parent organizations. Responsibility for organizing a community task force differs from one area to another. In Massachusetts, the superintendent of schools commonly assumes responsibility for leading the task force, although some testifiers argued that juvenile court judges also are well-suited to act as community catalysts.

Community organizations engage in a wide variety of activities. The Tarrant County Task Force, Texas, for instance, reported offering recommendations to solve problems associated with processing DWI offenders, purchasing breath testing and video taping equipment for law enforcement agencies, developing training programs for public prosecutors who handle DWI cases, and sponsoring a contest for high school students to design an anti-DWI billboard. A community task force can also facilitate the resolution of potential problems. It provides a forum for resolving jurisdictional disputes that may arise between school principals and law enforcement officials. Finally, it offers the possibility of enhancing the effectiveness of programs that require cooperation between different sectors of the community. Colleges, for example, can enforce a policy of no underage drinking on campus; but this policy may only worsen the problem of drinking and driving if bars in the vicinity of the campus continue to serve minors. A community task force that brings together college administrators and bar owners offers the possibility of ensuring that the college policy, which looks good in theory, actually works in practice.

In addition to coordinating their efforts at the local level, community groups need to ensure that proper coordination occurs with state-wide organizations. Typically, coordinative bodies at the state level are composed of individuals such as the Attorney General, the Commissioner of Education, the Governor's Highway Safety Representative, the Director of the State Department of Mental Health, business leaders and representatives from major anti-drunk driving organizations. Examples of the usefulness of such coordinative bodies abound. In Virginia, an alliance of state level agencies formed a foundation composed of business leaders to solicit funds for programs to supplement public sector activities. The Virginia alliance, known as CADRE, also conducts workshops on how to organize local communities and reported establishing 107 community-level organizations.

State level coordinative bodies also can perform an important role in encouraging legislation. In Ohio, a highway safety coalition of more than 500 companies formed a few years ago to work for seat belt legislation. Since that time, it has gone on to support other highway safety measures, including legislation that succeeded in raising the minimum drinking age. As the testimony made clear, business participation in community coalitions like this is a key ingredient of success. Descriptions of some of the ways in which the business community can uniquely contribute to the battle against youth impaired driving may be found in the next chapter.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Community Responsibilities

* All elements of the community must be coordinated in a system-wide approach to share resources and support each other in responding to alcohol, drugs and impaired driving problems among youths.
  All elements must agree upon and communicate the single message that underage drinking, illegal drug use and impaired driving are unlawful, unhealthy and unacceptable.
  One means of achieving this coordinated community approach is through a regional task force.
* Based on their stature and authority in the community, juvenile court judges should be enlisted to lead community efforts to combat the problem of drinking and driving by youth.
* Parents should be active in community efforts to counter drinking and other drug use among youth. Parental responsibilities include:
  1) supporting enforcement of minimum drinking age laws for youths
  2) promoting the social norm of alcohol-free parties for youths
  3) talking with other parents about teenage activities.
* Within their own families, parents must establish clearly-stated and firmly-enforced consequences for children who unlawfully consume alcohol or drive impaired.
* Communities should provide information and make classes available to parents that:
  1) helps parents become aware of the problem of underage alcohol and other drug use
  2) stresses the importance of parental role modeling and family communication
  3) offers effective strategies for parenting
  4) assists parents in identifying problems that may lead to drinking.
* State agencies involved in traffic safety, substance abuse, law enforcement and alcoholic beverage control should work together with local agencies and the private sector to provide resources for community activities.
* Communities should periodically evaluate the success and problems of their programs and assess the level of community awareness.



IV. Work-Based Activities

As a category, work-based programs encompass three distinct types of activities: 1) programs that businesses institute for their employees; 2) activities that businesses sponsor for the community; and 3) measures that one particular type of business - retail alcohol vendors - implement to restrict the sale of beverages to youth. In the discussion of work-based programs, testifiers maintained that private sector efforts have been too limited. Retail vendors, for example, have not taken adequate steps to limit the availability of alcohol to youth; while the business community in general, with a few exceptions, has not recognized its potential for influencing the problem of youth-impaired driving through employee programs and community activities.

Employee Programs

Employee programs constitute the most obvious avenue for business activity. Although under-utilized, they are an important countermeasure; for they offer the possibility of reaching portions of the youth population that school programs and extracurricular activities often miss, namely school dropouts and high school graduates under the age of 21. Possessing the most promising forum for educating these hard-to-reach youth groups, businesses bear a particular responsibility for instituting education programs that target young employees.

The rationale for the private sector to introduce employee programs is not purely altruistic. As Nick Kirchoff, Corporate Safety Manager of Pacific Northwest Bell, noted, drug and alcohol programs for employees of all ages often make good business sense: "Because most companies provide health insurance for employees, retirees and dependents, it makes good sense that accident prevention programs extend beyond the confines of the work place. One family member's abuse of drugs and/or alcohol will affect the entire family's ability to function safely. It's for this reason that a wide variety of educational and awareness programs should be developed and presented to employees and their families on an ongoing basis."

If businesses wish to minimize off-the-job injuries to employees, the question arises: what type of programs should they consider? Hearing testifiers recommended five initiatives for employers:

1) Include sanctions in the company policy for employee drinking during work hours;
2) Institute an employee assistance program that offers counseling and alcohol rehabilitation treatment to employees who have drinking problems;
3) Develop an educational program on alcohol use and the dangers of impaired driving that targets young employees in particular;
4) Provide an education program for employees with children that provides information on parenting skills and role modeling;
5) Encourage community groups to address employees on the subject of alcohol abuse and impaired driving.

During the testimony, witnesses cited successful examples of each of these five types of initiatives. Tom Cullen of the Governor's Alliance Against Drugs, for instance, spoke of the participation of Massachusetts businesses in a program entitled "Employees Are Parents, Too" which featured workplace discussions of family dynamics involving alcohol. Shirley Anderson of the Washington DWI Victims' Panel described how her organization brings a panel composed of DWI victims and offenders to workplaces, such as military bases, to discuss the tragedy of impaired driving accidents. As these cases illustrate, the business community can either devise alcohol and drug programs themselves or encourage community groups to conduct programs. In either case, the important thing is to utilize fully the possibilities that the workplace offers as a forum for drug and alcohol education and training.

Community Involvement

In addition to providing programs for their own employees, businesses make an important contribution by supporting community based and school based activities. As with employee programs, testifiers emphasized that the private sector has much to gain from promoting com-

munity programs. "We tell people in the workplace, 'you've a much better chance of drug free employees if we can get a drug free school,'" said Tom Cullen in describing how the governor's office in Massachusetts promotes public-private alliances.

In deciding how to assist a community, a business needs to identify its most effective means of reaching young people. Often, this will be through a community or state coalition. The Bank of Boston, for instance, has provided support for community programs by donating one cent from each credit card transaction during the holiday season to a statewide coalition. Tom Taylor, President of the Independent Insurance Agents of Washington, suggested that businesses coordinate their support for youth programs through the Chambers of Commerce. Businesses need to be contacted, asked for support and rewarded, he remarked; and the Chamber of Commerce offers a vehicle for doing that.

Successful programs, however, do not always depend on the existence of a well-organized coalition. In some instances, a single company may see the possibility for making a positive contribution and take the initiative without waiting for a coordinated community effort. The example of Bally's Aladdin's Castle provides a case in point. Recognizing that impaired driving constituted the primary cause of death of its clientele, principally youth between the ages of 15 and 19, Bally's decided to capitalize on its access to youth and devised a video driving game for its entertainment centers that included a warning to players at the end of the game not to drink and drive. Working in conjunction with MADD and SADD, Bally's also produced an informational flier on impaired driving that is mailed to youth on their birthdays along with a gift certificate. Further, it has used its video games in sponsoring national fund raising events for MADD and SADD, produced Public Service Announcements in cooperation with the Amusement Machine Manufacturers Association, and hosted what it termed "None for The Road" parties for youth on holidays such as St. Patrick's Day and New Year's Eve when young people frequently drink. In all of these activities, Bally's demonstrated the means by which a corporation can creatively utilize its own unique resources in contributing to the campaign against youth-impaired driving.

The Responsibilities of Alcohol Beverage Retailers

The final theme of the testimony on work-based programs concerned what one type of business—retail alcohol vendors—can do to restrict the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors. Retail sellers and servers have a double incentive for undertaking efforts to prevent drinking and driving by youth. Not only do they have a responsibility to uphold the law prohibiting alcohol sales to individuals under 21, but they also may have a liability for the injuries caused by those to whom they sell alcohol. Several participants noted that the issue of liability in particular has served as a strong stimulus for motivating retail vendors to acquaint themselves with their legal responsibilities and take steps to ensure that those responsibilities are met.

Testifiers identified three steps that retail dispensers can take to restrict alcohol sales to youth. Dispensers can implement training programs for sales clerks or bar servers; they can publicize their alcohol sale policies; and they can institute self-policing measures. Of these three steps, training programs received the greatest attention, as testifiers repeatedly mentioned the necessity of properly training employees who sell alcohol. Training, noted Alcohol Beverage Safety Commissioner George McCarthy, is especially important in situations where the bartenders or sales clerks themselves are under 21 and may be friends of the youths attempting to purchase alcohol illegally.

Testifiers identified five skills that every training program should include:

1) How to ask for identification;
2) How to spot false ID's;
3) How to identify second party sales (purchases of alcohol by an adult on behalf of underage youths);
4) How to refuse to sell alcohol to patrons (because they lack proper identification, because it appears that they are buying it for youth, or because they are visibly inebriated);
5) How to handle difficult customers, particularly those who become belligerent at a refusal to sell them alcohol;

Testifiers identified several problems connected with server training courses. The first problem is the high rate of employee turnover that bars and convenience stores frequently experience. When employers must pay for the cost of sending their employees to training courses, a

high rate of turnover may deter an employer from participating in the program. The second problem centered on the question of who should take responsibility for establishing server training courses. Three alternatives seem to exist. Courses may be developed by the retail dispensers themselves, by government agencies, or by private institutions such as colleges. Successful examples of each arrangement were presented at the hearings.

Southland Corporation's "Come of Age" program for its 7-Eleven stores serves as an example of an employer training course. Concerned about the problem of underage alcohol purchasers, Southland Corporation instituted a program to train all of its employees who sell beer and wine. According to Southland spokeswoman Rosemary Parker, 7-Eleven stores display signs on the front door and cooler doors where beer and wine are kept that point out the state law, the age requirement, and the forms of identification which the stores accept. In addition, clerks wear buttons clearly informing customers "We ID under 25."

Not every company has the resources or the inclination to develop server training courses. Consequently, government agencies may wish to assume responsibility for offering training courses. In general, testifiers felt that when government action is required, the responsibility to train licensees belongs at the most localized level. District Attorney Bob Wilson from DeKalb County, Georgia, testified how his office had established a training program for all establishments in the county that serve and sell alcohol. Believing that the district attorney has an obligation not only to inform these businesses of their legal liability but also to show them how to handle their responsibilities, Wilson organized an alliance with the organization Arrive Alive, the Georgia Travel and Hospitality Association, the county Solicitor's office, and the Chamber of Commerce to cosponsor a program to educate county liquor licensees.

While a government entity like the district attorney's office may be able to organize a program at the county level, state-level agencies wishing to initiate server education programs seldom have the resources to provide education directly to all the alcohol licensees in a state. Consequently, a need may exist for the development of a private delivery system. Roy Hale, Coordinator of Seller Training for the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission, described the private delivery system his agency supervises. In Texas, education is provided by training schools certified by the Alcoholic Beverage Commission. To obtain certification, a prospective training school must have its proposed curriculum reviewed. The Commission investigates the school's seller training course and randomly monitors course sessions to ensure the quality of instruction. Roy Hale concluded that a successful program must include three elements: strong minimum course requirements; an effective monitoring system to maintain the integrity of the instruction; and a broad-based delivery system.

Neither the training programs organized by the DeKalb County district attorney's office nor the private school network supervised by the Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission compels the attendance of retail sellers or servers. The discussion of both programs therefore raised the issue of participation by retailers. In the case of the DeKalb county program, District Attorney Wilson stressed that organizers must establish a credible program and approach retailers in a non-confrontational manner. He stated that by involving the police chiefs, judges, state legislators and the Georgia Attorney General, and soliciting the support of the wine and beer distributors, the retailers were placed in a position where they could not afford to ignore the invitation to participate. In the case of the Texas program, incentives were offered to participating retailers. Employers who sent their employees to a certified training course enjoyed conditional absolution from liability. This liability absolution may be withdrawn, however, if ABC investigators discover that an employer directly or indirectly encourages his employees to engage in unlawful behavior.

Once retail establishments have made a commitment to restrict the purchase of alcohol by minors, they need to communicate this policy to their patrons. Publicity for their policy serves four purposes: it educates patrons who may be unfamiliar with the law and reminds the public of the problem of alcohol misuse; it establishes the expectation that young customers will be required to show an ID, thus making it easier on servers and sales clerks; it deters attempts by underage youth to purchase alcoholic beverages; and it stands as evidence that the establishment made a good faith effort to uphold their legal responsibilities in the event of a liability lawsuit.

Participating in server training programs and publicizing a store or bar's ID policy constitute the first two components of a responsible retail program. The third element is self-policing. Retailers have a responsibility to ensure that their

employees adhere to company policies, make use of the training provided, and refuse to sell to minors. While law enforcement agents often employ strategies for testing establishments to see if they adhere to standards regarding sales to minors, they are capable of investigating only a small percentage of the licensed establishments. Therefore, self-regulation remains an indispensable element in efforts to restrict the supply of alcohol to youth.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Work-based Activities

* Employers should establish employee education programs that:
  1) acquaint young employees with the dangers of alcohol/other drug use and impaired driving
  2) offer adult employees parent training and information on juvenile substance abuse
  3) offer counseling and alcohol rehabilitation treatment to employees who have drinking problems.
* Employers should establish workplace policies for youths that include sanctions for drinking and impaired driving during working hours.
* Businesses selling youth products and services should identify ways in which they interface with underage youths and utilize this opportunity to provide prevention messages to them.
* Business leaders should be called upon to support local youth programs by providing facilities and fund-raising assistance.
* Retailers of alcoholic beverages should recognize that the sale of their products confers special responsibilities. To uphold these responsibilities, retailers should establish and enforce policies that prohibit the purchase of beverage alcohol by underage youths. These policies should include:
  —training all employees to 1) ask for identification; 2) refuse sales to those who appear to be underage; 3) spot false forms of ID; 4) handle difficult customers; 5) identify second party sales
  —displaying the company policy at the point of sale (e.g. at the cash register or on a beverage cooler)
  —offering incentives to clerks/bartenders who refuse sales to underage youths
  —implementing self-policing strategies.
* State beverage control agencies should ensure that training programs are provided for all licensees.



V. Enforcement

Until the early 1980's, the problem of drinking and driving was generally perceived as a problem to be handled solely by law enforcement efforts. Today that limited view of the problem has disappeared, and the public has come to recognize that impaired driving is a complex issue whose solution requires far more than law enforcement countermeasures alone. Enforcement, as testifiers repeatedly emphasized, must be coupled with preventative education. "While enforcement action is necessary, the most effective weapon against substance abuse is education for the community and our youth," stated Illinois State Police Deputy Superintendent William O'Sullivan. The importance of combining education with enforcement was highlighted by New York Motor Vehicle Commissioner Patricia Adduci: "You only encounter an enforcement program after you've made the mistake. My hope is that, with these other [educational] programs, it will encourage young people...not to make the mistake." Both enforcement and education, Adduci continued, are important. Enforcement is necessary as a deterrent; but because adolescents tend to ignore the risk of arrest believing that they will not be caught, enforcement alone is insufficient. It must be supplemented with educational programs that teach young people the health hazards of drinking and driving.

Testimony at the hearings revealed that many law enforcement departments are actively involved in educational programs. The Illinois State Police, for example, engage in classroom instruction programs such as Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) and State Trooper Attitudes and Responsibilities (STAR). The Washington State Patrol joined in developing a multi-image program entitled "It's a Matter of Time." The program utilizes nine computer-operated projectors, a stereo system and an 8 by 25 foot screen for high school presentations. Young victims of auto crashes are featured in the program.

Though educational activities are achieving greater prominence on law enforcement agendas, enforcement nevertheless remains their primary responsibility. When asked about the comparative effectiveness of education versus enforcement, New Jersey Highway Safety Director William Hayes replied, "In the best of all possible worlds, I'd say I'd love to give everybody all the education and public information they could handle, but in terms of effectiveness, the deterrence must be there from enforcement." The question then arises: Is the deterrence there? Is effective enforcement occurring today? According to many witnesses, the answer is no—law enforcement efforts are inadequate.

Perceptions of Risk

At the Fort Worth hearing, youth testifiers were asked explicitly, "Do you feel that enforcement is out there? Is there a perception of risk of being caught if you were underage and you're stopped [for impaired driving]?" Each of the three high school students queried replied negatively. One of the students, Kevin Brown, went on to explain: "No, because I hear a lot of kids who get pulled over for MIP [minor in possession] and all they do is just confiscate what they have and let them go. . . . I think that instead of just confiscating whatever it is you have and then letting you go, that there ought to be some sort of punishment."

In Chicago, high school students offered similar comments regarding the leniency of law enforcement officials. According to high school senior Angie Stanfield: "From my own peer group, most people who drink and drive, when they're caught, they're just released; and I think they should be sent to some kind of rehab program where they might have some counseling. . . . And [for a] second offense, I think they should be suspended from their driving. And maybe some jail sentence. They need to realize that they can't get away with it."

Kay Chopard, the prosecuting attorney's counsel from Des Moines, agreed with the youth testifiers and went on to explain why, in Iowa, enforcement for youth offenders is not always strict:

"The arrest of adult offenders has been on the rise. But there has not been a similar correlation with juvenile offenders. There is also a differentiation in treatment, not only in the field but once they're brought into the system. One of the first barriers, I guess, in the detection process and apprehensions is the attitude that we see in the law enforcement officers out in the field. I really feel that their attitude reflects society's

attitudes. . . . A very common attitude is the feeling that impaired behavior or experimenting is part of the growing-up process; that it is often viewed as a rite of passage, rather than a crime committed by juveniles and therefore, rather than bringing that juvenile into the system, where we might begin to assess and approach the problem, the juvenile is instead either taken home or taken to some location such as the station where he is not actually processed in any way, but the parents are contacted and then they are taken home."

Within the enforcement community itself, a recognition exists that laws concerning impaired driving are not always rigorously enforced. Enforcement must occur primarily at the local level because local officials know their own turf better than anyone else; yet it is at the local level that violations are most likely to be ignored because of the familiarity between police and citizens. According to George McCarthy of the Massachusetts Alcohol Beverage Control Commission, "The ABCC gets hundreds of complaints from people, sometimes anonymous, who say their complaints have been ignored by local authorities." Follow-up by the ABCC, McCarthy said, may result in angry denunciations from local officials and police who dislike state authorities entering their jurisdiction without forewarning.

Not all testifiers agreed that law enforcement involving minors is lax. Massachusetts Secretary for Public Safety Charles Barry noted that the fear of liability helps deter enforcement officials from overlooking adolescent drinking. Barry recalled an episode in which two police officers from the town of Ware stopped an impaired driver but then allowed him to continue on. Less than a mile from where he was stopped, the driver was involved in a collision, and the town was sued successfully for over a million dollars. The knowledge that they will be liable for irresponsible acts encourages police to enforce the law, Barry stated.

Obstacles to Effect Enforcement

Though police may desire to enforce the law, obstacles exist to impede their effort. At each of the hearings, law enforcement officers recounted the problems they face. Their complaints frequently focused on the cumbersome and time-consuming procedures required for the arrest and detention of juveniles. The problems they cited included the following:

—In Iowa, the law requires juveniles to be detained in separate facilities from adults, not just in a separated area at an adult facility. This law, it was reported, deters the arrest of youths, particularly in rural areas that are a long distance from a juvenile facility.

—In Tennessee, among other places, witnesses complained of inefficient juvenile court schedules and the inordinate length of time that police officers sometimes must spend waiting for a case to be heard. Knowing that each arrest may require spending hours in a courthouse, officers become less likely to arrest youths for drinking violations.

—In Texas, police officers are not allowed to administer a breath test to minors in the same area where an adult DWI suspect is being tested; and that, according to one police sergeant, has created problems.

—In some cases, the law is too narrow to combat effectively drunk driving. The Texas open container law, for example, requires that a police officer actually witness the driver consuming alcohol. According to one frustrated officer, a driver may have an open can of beer in his hand and alcohol on his breath; but until the policeman sees the driver drink from the can, he cannot make an arrest.

Proposed Improvements

Having cited some of the problems they encounter, law enforcement officials offered recommendations to increase the effectiveness of enforcement measures. The first recommendation responded directly to the problem of arresting and detaining youth. "We have to make it as easy to arrest a juvenile DUI offender as it is an adult if we're going to get the police officers to start making DUI arrests," said Tennessee Sergeant Ken Taylor of the Hamilton County Sheriff's Department. As a first step, he suggested that the police and courts work together to develop arrest guidelines for juvenile DWI offenders and thereby remove obstacles in the arrest process.

Further recommendations may be classified as falling within two categories: those that aim to prevent minors from obtaining alcohol, and those that would increase the likelihood of arrest for youth who drive impaired. Within the first category of recommendations, measures were outlined that would target both the youth who purchase alcohol and the bars and stores that sell it to them.

1. Restricting Sales. Much of the commentary on law enforcement concerned the ready availability of alcohol and the need to restrict young people's access to it. As testifiers from many states pointed out, the accessibility of alcohol is greatly facilitated by the use of false forms of identification. A number of recommendations were made to reduce the use of fake ID's. In Florida, law enforcement officials found that a major problem existed with underage youth obtaining driver's licenses in the name of an older brother or sister. According to John Harris of the Alcoholic Beverages and Tobacco Division, Florida officials were able to reduce this problem by providing special training to the Department of Motor Vehicles personnel who issue licenses. To combat the general problem of fake ID's and not only the problem of fraudulently obtained licenses, Alcohol Public Safety Commissioner George McCarthy recommended actively prosecuting youths who use fake ID's and suggested establishing a national universal ID.

Enforcement efforts to restrict underage drinking need to focus on the retailers who sell alcohol as well as the youth who buy it. Officials from Washington, Massachusetts and Florida all recommended programs that they have found effective in policing bars and liquor stores. In Washington, the adoption of new technologies has enabled law enforcement officials to develop more effective enforcement procedures. Acquiring a centralized computer system, officials are able to gather data from police reports throughout the state on underage drinking incidents. Receiving a monthly printout on all licensed establishments, the Liquor Control Board is able to take administrative action against establishments that repeatedly have been reported to have served minors. Statistics compiled on alcohol abuse are made available to town officials, school departments and businesses to inform them of the scope of the alcohol abuse problem in their community.

Massachusetts and Florida have employed similar programs to monitor bars and stores with reported sales to minors. In Massachusetts, where the program is known as Operation Last Call, the law requires judges to ask DWI offenders where they were drinking. When a licensed establishment is named by offenders four times in a six-month period, the ABC Commission sends the licensee a warning letter. In Florida, the Division of Alcoholic Beverages and Tobacco experimented with a similar program but, finding it unsuccessful, dropped the program and focused its efforts on sting operations that employ underage youth to investigate complaints against stores and bars selling alcohol to minors. According to a Florida official, the sting program has been successful because industry leaders were consulted at the outset and assured that the program would initially concentrate on the actual servers and sellers rather than the store owners.

2. Detecting Impaired Driving. The law enforcement strategy outlined by testifiers consisted of two complementary approaches: restrict the availability of alcohol so that those youth who drive cannot drink; and establish DWI patrols and checkpoints to deter driving by those who drink. In pursuing the first approach, testifiers encouraged police to crack down on youth who use fake ID's and bars and stores that sell alcohol to young people. In pursuing the second approach, testifiers recommended the following three measures:

1. Establish highly publicized checkpoints. According to New Jersey Highway Safety Director William Hayes, highway checkpoints are the most effective deterrent to impaired driving.
2. Reorganize DWI enforcement activities. As Sergeant Ken Taylor noted, juvenile drinking habits differ from adult drinking habits and therefore require a different enforcement strategy. In general, school-age juveniles are required to be home around midnight, and so DWI patrols need to be scheduled on earlier shifts. Furthermore, juveniles are less likely to drink in bars and more likely to drink in parking lots, game rooms, at football or basketball games, at dances, and at lakes or beaches. Therefore, police need to patrol different areas than they would for adult DWI enforcement. Finally, police need to develop a good working relationship with high school safety clubs to determine where juveniles are having parties.
3. Impose penalties that really affect youth. In discussing his participation in programs to restrict impaired driving, Officer Eddie Garth stated that instead of merely issuing citations for MIP offenders, police need to arrest violators, take them to jail, and impound their cars. Stringent measures, Garth noted, are necessary to impress upon youth the seriousness of the offense.

3. Enforcing the Law. A review of the testimony reveals that witnesses, including youth,

strongly supported active enforcement. Testifiers urged police to combat the problem of fraudulent ID's and encouraged investigators to crack down on businesses that sell alcohol to youth. Support for strict enforcement arose from a recognition of the inter-dependence of all efforts to stop underage drinking and driving. Poor enforcement, they pointed out, adversely affects the entire range of anti-impaired driving activities:

* It emboldens youth to break the law and drink illegally.
* It encourages unscrupulous stores and bars to sell alcohol to youth.
* It removes an incentive for retailers to institute seller training programs.
* It undermines educational activities and makes it more difficult for young people to persuade their peers not to drink and drive.

Finally, testifiers supported active enforcement because of the attitude it breeds toward the law itself. Mr. Wes Smith elucidated this important dimension of enforcement. By permitting underage youth to drink, Smith declared, "We're not only allowing those kids to be victims of their own drug use, but we're also in a situation now where we're making the law the victim, because kids are arrested for use of drugs or alcohol and that's filed away and nothing happens. And what we've taught kids is the law doesn't mean what it says. So we've not only betrayed the kids, but we've betrayed the law."

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Enforcement

* DWI patrols should target youthful impaired driving by:
  1) focusing shift schedules and patrols on the hours when most impaired driving offenses by youths occur
  2) patrolling parties, parks, school events and other locations where young people tend to gather
  3) using sobriety checkpoints.
* Law enforcement officials and judges should work together to streamline arrest procedures for juvenile impaired driving offenders. The following areas should be targeted for reform:
  1) arrangements for separate holding of juvenile offenders
  2) procedures for contacting parents
  3) procedures for providing juvenile offenders with medical checks
  4) excessive paperwork and down time for arresting officers
  5) lengthy court procedures that consume the time of arresting officers
  6) mechanisms for courts to provide feedback to arresting officers.
* Special training should be provided to police officers to alert them to the seriousness of juvenile drinking and driving violations and to teach police effective enforcement techniques for this age group.
* Command police and court officials should support the efforts of line officers to enforce the legal drinking age and youth impaired driving laws.
* Police agencies should work with the schools to develop joint programs that use uniformed officers to teach classes on substance-impaired driving.
* Police agencies should establish strategies to deter the sale of alcoholic beverages to underage youths. Possible programs include:
  1) sting operations that employ supervised juveniles who attempt to purchase beverage alcohol
  2) operations which ask DWI offenders where they were served and then investigate frequently named establishments
  3) tracking procedures that maintain a statistical record of establishments reported to have made illegal sales of alcoholic beverages to youths.



VI. Licensing

Testimony during the hearings revealed a variety of ways in which licensing procedures and sanctions can be used to combat youth impaired driving. While 23 states now administratively revoke the licenses of drivers operating under the influence of alcohol, a number of states have gone a step further and utilize license sanctions to combat the specific problem of underage drinking. In those states, the use of a fraudulent ID or the mere possession of alcohol by a minor may result in a license suspension. Suspensions or revocations, however, are not the only means that licensing authorities have of affecting the problem of impaired driving.

In addition to punishing offenders, licensing procedures can be used to educate and evaluate drivers. License applicants under age 18 in Georgia, for instance, are required to attend an educational course on the effects of alcohol, while convicted DWI offenders in some states may be granted a provisional license or have the length of their suspension shortened upon completion of an alcohol treatment program. Licensing authorities also might consider the creation of a provisional license for youths. Carrying special restrictions and revocable for violations of drinking and driving laws, provisional licenses could ease novice drivers into responsibility and full license privileges.

Licensing authorities possess four principal means of affecting the problem of youth impaired driving. They can:

1. Require the completion of an educational program as a prerequisite to issuing licenses to youth;
2. Suspend or revoke the licenses of youth who violate underage drinking or impaired driving laws;
3. Require the completion of educational, assessment, or treatment programs before relicensing youth whose licenses have been revoked;
4. Take steps to ensure that the licenses they issue are not misused or fraudulently obtained.

Driver Education

Educational requirements constitute perhaps the most common means for licensing authorities to influence the driving patterns of youth. Testifiers repeatedly urged that maximum use be made of this opportunity to reach young people by requiring driver education courses to devote a specific amount of time to the subject of impaired driving. To ensure that impaired driving received adequate attention in North Carolina, the state legislature passed a law requiring driver education courses to devote 6 out of 30 hours of instruction to alcohol and its effects. Authorities in Georgia devised an alternative arrangement which requires all license applicants under the age of 18 to attend a course strictly devoted to drug and alcohol issues. The course is offered in high schools and community colleges by the Georgia State Patrol or its trained instructors. A third variant on driver education exists in New York where all new license applicants, regardless of age, must take a five-hour course which includes two hours devoted to the effects of alcohol on driving. Courses in New York have eliminated the need for public funding by using state-approved private agencies which collect a nominal fee from each applicant.

Driver education courses do not constitute the sole forum for licensing authorities to inform young people of the perils of drinking and driving. In Virginia, every 16 year-old who receives a license must appear with his or her parents before a juvenile court judge who hands over the license to the child's parents in a special courtroom ceremony. Judges use this opportunity to explain the rationale for a minimum drinking age of 21, inform youth of the penalties they can expect if caught drinking and driving, and ask parents to discuss the problem of impaired driving with their child. By appearing personally before a judge in the presence of their parents, youth hopefully will recognize that driving is a privilege entailing serious responsibilities.

Driver education enables authorities to reach youth before they receive their licenses. Once youth are licensed, the threat of license suspension or revocation constitutes the chief means for licensing authorities to influence driver behavior.

License Sanctions

License sanctions received an enthusiastic endorsement from hearing participants. Judge Christopher Foley of the Milwaukee Children's Court declared that license sanctions have had a tremendous deterrent effect on the drinking and driving behavior of young people in his jurisdiction, while Massachusetts Secretary of Public Safety Charles Barry stated that license sanctions have had more impact on the teenage drinking and driving problem than any other single measure. Speaking in favor of administrative revocation, Maine Highway Safety Commissioner Albert Godfrey argued that revocation is both more appropriate than a jail sentence and more effective in our affluent society than a fine. Its effectiveness as a deterrent is due to the fact that, among youth, licenses are valued for their symbolic importance as a sign of independence as well as for their practical utility.

Proponents of license sanctions declared that suspensions or revocations have a number of potential effects. They deter drinking and driving by individuals who fear the loss of their license; they remove convicted offenders from the roads; and they send a message that drinking and driving is intolerable and that violations will result in a serious penalty.

The hearings revealed that at least six different types of youth offenses are subject to punishment involving license sanctions.

1. First and most commonly, license revocation is used to punish DWI offenses. Encouragingly, states are beginning to differentiate between the impairment level for youth and the legal intoxication level for adults. In North Carolina, youth under 18 are subject to a zero Blood Alcohol Content (BAC), and the penalty for DWI offenders is license suspension for 45 days or until the offender's 18th birthday, whichever is longer. Similarly, Wisconsin's "Not a Drop Law" establishes a zero BAC for anyone under 19, while in Maine a .02 BAC exists for anyone under 21. Throughout the hearings, witnesses emphasized the importance of establishing lower BAC levels for youth as a deterrent to drinking and driving.
2. In some states the mere possession of alcohol by a minor, even when the youth is not driving, is punishable by license suspension. Possession or consumption of alcohol by youths under 18 in Wisconsin is subject to a 90-day suspension for the first offense, while in North Carolina the penalty is a one year suspension.
3. Furthermore, in North Carolina, the attempt to purchase or abetting someone else in purchasing results in a one year license revocation.
4. Oregon youth age 13-18 who are convicted of any offense involving the possession of a controlled substance may lose their license for one year or until they are 17, whichever is longer.
5. The possession or use of a fake ID is penalized by suspension in several states.
6. In New York, any serious motor vehicle offense may be punishable by the loss of license for probationary license holders. Six-month probationary licenses are issued to all new licensees, not just youth, in New York.

While testifiers applauded the deterrent effect of license sanctions, they pointed to two serious problems associated with revocations. First, the punishment may be perceived by law enforcement officers as too harsh and thus, paradoxically, contribute to greater non-enforcement of drinking and driving laws. Second, license revocation may not keep convicted offenders off the roads, for statistics indicate that a large number of youth drive without licenses.

The Problem of Non-enforcement

Testifiers cited both Oregon and New Mexico as examples of states where licensing sanctions have created a disincentive for enforcement. In Oregon, the disincentive is apparently linked to insurance rate increases. According to Linda Todd, a former county DUI coordinator, communities have failed to enforce underage drinking laws because the conviction of youths for non-driving offenses such as possession of alcohol has led insurance companies to raise family auto insurance premiums. In New Mexico, the lack of enforcement seems to result from the attitude of police. According to Mary Ann Hughes of the New Mexico Department of Public Safety, many law enforcement officials still consider adolescent drinking a part of growing up and believe that youthful violations of drinking and driving laws should not be severely punished. Consequently, the state's administrative revocation law has been, in Hughes' words, "a dismal failure for drivers under the age of 18." While New Mexico police do not hesitate to enforce the law for adult violators,

they are not arresting youth for driving while impaired but prefer instead to bring young people home or release them to their parents.

Recognizing that licensing sanctions are meaningless as long as police and judges fail to enforce the law, testifiers offered two recommendations. First, as Judge Foley stated, law enforcement officials must be informed that non-enforcement of the law sends the wrong message to youth. The discretion to not punish an offender lies with the judge, not the arresting officer. Second, innovative adjudication measures such as diversion programs or community service sentences need to be devised to give judges a sentencing option in cases where they believe the full penalty is too severe. As long as judges and police perceive the sentence as disproportionate to the offense, sentencing and enforcement may be compromised.

The Problem of Unlicensed Drivers

License sanctions are also being undermined by youth who continue to drive after their licenses have been revoked. The problem of young unlicensed drivers is alarming. New Mexico statistics reveal that 23% of the youth involved in fatal DWI accidents are unlicensed, while 16% of the youth arrested for DWI are unlicensed. One testifier from North Carolina estimated that 30-50% of the people under license suspension or revocation continue to drive. The implications of these statistics are clear. Administrative revocation, as Mary Ann Hughes noted, is not an effective deterrent for a large percentage of drivers. To combat the problem of unlicensed adolescent drivers, testifiers suggested that courts impose stiff penalties for those caught driving under revocation and consider assessing penalties against the parents of youth who drive after their licenses have been revoked.

As noted at the beginning of this section, authorities possess four means of using the power of licensing to effect the problem of youth impaired driving. First, they can mandate the inclusion of information on alcohol impairment in driver education courses and require youth to complete a driver education course before receiving a license. Second, they can levy license sanctions against youth who violate drinking or driving laws. These two means have been discussed. The third means at the disposal of authorities involves the relicensing of youth whose licenses have been revoked.

Relicensing

In some states, relicensing is used by authorities to encourage offenders to participate in educational or evaluative programs. In Maine, for instance, any youth under age 21 caught operating a motor vehicle with a BAC level over .02 is subject to a one-year license suspension. However, if the offender completes a ten-hour course designed to screen and educate youth on the hazards of drinking and driving, the Secretary of State may restore the offender's license after six months. A similar program exists in New York, where eligible motorists, usually first-time offenders, are invited to enroll in an alcohol education and screening program. Conditional licenses are issued to program participants enabling them to drive to the program and to work or school. The educational course consists of 16 hours of classroom instruction taught by a team with expertise in traffic safety and alcoholism. The course must be completed before the offender qualifies for relicensing. Those referred for treatment of alcohol problems must also complete the treatment program before relicensing is approved.

In discussing relicensing, testifiers noted that a problem may exist in ensuring that offenders satisfy the requirements or conditions of relicensing. The state of Oregon encountered this problem and took steps to overcome it. In Oregon, for instance, hardship licenses are granted to DWI offenders on condition that the offenders do not drink and drive. To ensure that offenders adhere to this condition, licensing authorities have experimented with ignition interlock devices that are installed on the cars of offenders. Before starting the car, the driver must blow an alcohol-free air sample into a breath tester that is connected to the car ignition. If the breath tester detects any trace of alcohol, the device prevents the key from starting the car. State officials in Oregon also discovered that they had a problem with DUI offenders failing to complete the treatment programs to which judges assigned them. To ensure that an offender completed the treatment program before being relicensed, the Oregon Department of Motor Vehicles devised a form that was supplied to all approved treatment centers. When a DWI offender completes a treatment program, the center sends the form to the DMV and the information is entered into the department's computer records. Before the DMV can reinstate a license, its records must show that the offender completed the assigned treatment program.

Combatting Fraudulent ID's

In addition to driver education courses, license sanctions and relicensing conditions, authorities possess a fourth means of affecting the incidence of youth impaired driving. They can take steps to ensure that the licenses they issue are not misused or fraudulently obtained.

License abuse is a common problem. To prevent youths from altering the birth date on licenses or using the license of an older friend or sibling to buy alcohol, testifiers offered two recommendations: distinctively code the licenses of drivers under 21 and include a profile photograph of the licensee on the license.

Several states reported problems with underage youth fraudulently obtaining driver licenses using the birth certificate of an older sibling or friend. To combat this problem, testifiers recommended three measures. First, they urged DMV authorities to acknowledge the seriousness of the problem and to place less emphasis on quick turnaround time and the rapid issuance of licenses and more emphasis on stopping attempts by youth to obtain licenses fraudulently. Second, they recommended that department of motor vehicle personnel be trained to recognize the ruses youth commonly employ. And third, they supported the establishment of a centralized licensing system in each state. With each licensee's photograph on record in a central computer, it would be easier for DMV personnel to catch youth who attempt to obtain a license using another person's name. By increasing efforts to prevent the misuse of licenses by youth, state motor vehicle departments can contribute to reducing the ease with which young people obtain alcohol.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Licensing

* Administrative per se laws should be enacted to ensure immediate and certain license suspensions for youthful impaired driving offenses.
* Possession of alcohol by an underage youth should be punishable by license sanctions.
* States should impose licensing sanctions for underage impaired driving offenses which recognize the additional violation of state minimum drinking age laws.
  —Sufficient steps should be taken to guarantee that parents and young people are aware of drinking and impaired driving laws and sanctions for their violation.
  —License suspensions for juvenile as well as adult offenders should be reported to the state driver licensing agency and considered when assessing penalties for any subsequent violations.
  —Juveniles whose licenses have been suspended should have to secure juvenile court permission to have their licenses reinstated.
* The manufacture or possession of fraudulent licenses should be outlawed and viewed as serious offenses.
  —Use of fraudulent licenses should result in strict sanctions involving license suspensions for an extended period of time.
  —State motor vehicle departments should train licensing personnel to recognize fraudulent license applications.
  —States should cooperate in the development of a national uniform driver license.
* States should establish a provisional license for young beginner drivers.
  —Provisional licenses should be withdrawn for any impaired driving conviction or implied consent refusal for a period not less than the length of revocation to which full licenses are subject.
  —Provisional licenses should be distinguishable from adult licenses by the use of a side profile photograph, a different color or some other distinctive mark.
* An alcohol/drug module should be incorporated into driver education courses.
* Juveniles who are new licensees should appear in juvenile court with their parents to receive licenses and instruction on driving laws, sanctions and responsibilities from a judge.
* Strict sanctions should exist for those who drive without a license, with particularly severe sanctions for driving with a suspended or revoked license. Sanctions could include insurance rate increases or surcharges and vehicle impoundment.
* Parents whose underage children drive with a suspended or revoked license should be held liable.



VII. Adjudication

The issue of adjudication provides an excellent example of the interdependence of impaired driving countermeasures. As the hearings revealed, perceptions about the adjudicatory system greatly influence the success of the entire effort to counter impaired driving. A sure, consistent and immediate judicial response is absolutely imperative. Without effective adjudication, attempts to formulate an integrated strategy stand little chance of success.

A successful adjudicatory process has three effects:

First, it teaches youth that drinking and driving is a serious violation of the law and, at the same time, often affords youth with substance abuse problems their first chance for treatment and professional counseling.

Second, it encourages police enforcement of drinking and driving laws. As law enforcement officials themselves testified, police officers will not expend the time and effort to arrest youth for impaired driving offenses if, in their experience, they find that little or nothing happens to offenders in the courts.

Third, an effective judicial response promotes parental involvement. At times, this involvement may be mandatory, as when the court orders parents to attend educational or treatment programs with their child. At other times, the involvement may be voluntary. Penalties such as fines, insurance surcharges, and automobile impoundment may induce parents to confront their child's illegal drinking and take a more active interest in their child's behavior.

A review of the testimony on adjudication reveals that the commentary may be subdivided into three broad categories. First, testifiers discussed preliminary subjects such as the role of judges, the proper jurisdiction for juvenile impaired driving offenses, and the usefulness of pre-adjudicatory diversion programs. Second, testifiers offered opinions about the sentences that ought to be imposed for youthful DWI convictions. And third, testifiers enumerated the problems most frequently encountered in adjudicating young offenders.

The first category of testimony concerned adjudicatory issues that arise before the sentencing of youthful DWI offenders takes place. Within this category, discussion focused on three major themes:

1) the role of judges and the need for judicial education

2) the jurisdiction of juvenile courts and the question of whether DWI offenders under age 18 should be tried as adults

3) the appropriateness of pre-adjudicatory diversion programs.

Judicial Education

Extensive testimony was presented about the need to educate judges in view of the unique opportunity informed judges have to exercise community leadership. In general, testifiers agreed that judges lacked sufficient information about the problem of alcohol use among youth. As Judge Devine pointed out, judges usually go straight from practicing law to the bench and consequently do not have a sufficient knowledge of the community resources available to treat young people with alcohol problems. According to Judge Heckemeyer, "We as a society are not training our judges. There's no manual; there's no training program. We [judges] don't even know what it is we're looking at the first day we're on the bench."

Judge Willett concurred. Believe it or not, he said, there are still some judges who do not believe the underage use of alcohol is a problem. To Willett, this suggested a need for instruction: "I am talking about teaching the judiciary that this problem is in each of their respective jurisdictions. It's probably in each of their homes." Judges need to be able to recognize substance abuse and know when and how to intervene. The key, Willett concluded, is education—education for the judiciary and the judicial support staff.

The problem of inadequate training is compounded by the perception that some judges have of their judicial responsibilities. As Judge Heckemeyer noted, judges are not a uniform group. There are, he maintained, three kinds of judges: those who are activists and become involved in community efforts to halt youth impaired driving; those who recognize their responsibility but do not become personally involved; and those who believe that the sole role of the judiciary is to sentence offenders. It is the last category of judges who are most in need of

education and the people best equipped to train them are other judges, according to Heckemeyer.

Judicial Leadership

The leadership opportunities afforded an active judge extend well beyond the courtroom. Throughout the hearings, witnesses cited examples of judges who used their judicial convening power to call together law enforcement officials, school administrators and civic leaders to formulate strategies for combatting youth impaired driving. Many of the testifiers emphasized that judges have both an opportunity and a professional obligation to become involved in community programs. "The judge has got to be a catalyst in the community for change," Judge Devine declared. His counterpart in Ironton, Ohio, Judge Boll, concurred: "I believe the judge in the courtroom has a duty beyond the individual juvenile who appears in the courtroom. I feel he or she must have a plan to stop drinking and driving entirely along with a program for each individual offender." For a judge who takes this duty seriously, a tremendous opportunity exists to channel community opposition to youth impaired driving into programs that translate sentiment into action.

The Jurisdictional Debate

The need for judicial education and judicial participation in community programs constituted the first of three preliminary themes. The second theme concerned the question of how juvenile DWI offenders should be handled in the adjudicatory process. Testimony on this issue revealed a division of opinion. While some testifiers argued that driving is an adult responsibility and that driving offenses ought to be adjudicated in adult courts, others maintained that jurisdiction over juvenile DWI offenders should remain with the juvenile courts.

Those who favored assigning juvenile offenders to adult courts observed that driving is an adult responsibility. When youth choose to assume this responsibility, they ask to be treated as adults. Consequently, they ought to be held accountable for their actions and subject to the same penalties as adult offenders. Testimony was presented from New Jersey, a state that does adjudicate juvenile offenders as adults. According to William Hayes, Director of the New Jersey Office of Highway Safety, the key to his state's success with this procedure lies in the status of DWI offenses. In New Jersey, DWI violations are considered motor vehicle violations rather than criminal offenses; consequently they do not necessitate criminal court procedures such as pretrial intervention, jury trials, and referral of youths under 18 to juvenile courts. By applying the law equally and consistently to all offenders, including juveniles, New Jersey has experienced notable success in lowering the incidence of youth impaired driving, Hayes declared.

While the reduction of impaired driving fatalities in New Jersey speaks for the success of that state's approach, most testifiers maintained that separate adjudicatory procedures ought to exist for youth. Juvenile Court Judge Andy Devine was among those who urged that youth under age 18 who are arrested for impaired driving violations should be tried in juvenile courts. "What I would like to see you do," said Devine, "that probably would help as much as anything, is to begin to distinguish between adults and juveniles. In an adult court, the judge deals with an individual. But in a juvenile court, you are able to deal not only with the child who has a problem but with the whole family. And often a parent or sibling may also have a problem. In the juvenile court you have jurisdiction over all those people. So you can not only mandate punishment or education; you have the opportunity to deal with the most important resource in correcting the behavior of youths—the parents."

For lesser traffic offenses, alternatives exist to adjudicating youth in either an adult or a juvenile court. In Texas, for instance, an innovative program known as the Teen Court has been established to adjudicate youth guilty of minor driving violations. Used to sentence juvenile offenders, the Teen Court employs youth as attorneys, bailiffs and juries. Only the judge is an adult. The philosophy underlying the Teen Court rests on the observation that young offenders are often encouraged to break the law by their peers. If peer pressure can encourage deviant behavior, perhaps it can also be used to discourage it. According to Teen Court coordinator Natalie Rothstein, "Every community needs to find a way to let its young people hear from their peers that drinking and driving and drug usage . . . is not cool." A program like the Teen Court provides a forum in which young offenders can learn of their peers' disapproval of their illegal behavior.

Pre-adjudication Diversion

The third theme, and also a theme that provoked a difference of opinion, concerned pre-

adjudication diversion programs. In general, testifiers expressed dissatisfaction with pre-adjudication diversion programs. Most witnesses urged judges not to allow youth to opt for an alternative form of punishment instead of being tried in court for a DWI violation. Judge Foley spoke for many when he said that, as a general rule, judges are better off imposing the sanctions authorized by law rather than permitting youth who have been arrested to perform some type of compensatory service, such as working in a hospital. One of the major problems with diversion programs, Foley noted, is that no record of a driving offense appears on the motor vehicle record of the offender, and therefore it becomes difficult to track young multiple offenders.

One type of pre-adjudicatory diversion program did receive support, however. District Court Judge James Kizer of Kings County, Washington, testified in favor of diversion programs that allow offenders to enter a treatment program in exchange for deferred prosecution. Kizer cited five reasons for supporting such programs. First, one cannot guarantee that those who are guilty of DWI offences will be convicted, and therefore there is no guarantee that arrested drivers in need of treatment will receive it. Second, even if offenders are convicted, the conviction often occurs only after a long court case, during which time offenders can continue to drive. Third, those who opt for treatment, which in Washington lasts for a minimum of two years, benefit from a sense of voluntary entry into the program thereby enabling the treatment to break through the denial stage more quickly. Fourth, defense attorneys become an advocate for treatment and consequently seek fewer delays, which relieves pressure on the courts and, at the same time, enables offenders to receive treatment quickly. And fifth, in Judge Kizer's experience, those who receive treatment through deferred prosecution have a much lower recidivism rate than those who are convicted and receive treatment as part of their sentence.

Sentencing

Having discussed the subject of pre-adjudicatory diversion, testifiers turned their attention to the subject of sentencing. The proposals for sentences differed in their details, but nearly all reflected a broad consensus that the adjudicatory response to impaired driving must go beyond mere punishment. To change the behavior of youth who commit alcohol-related offenses, sentences must combine three elements: punishment, education and treatment. Each of these three elements received extensive comment.

The need for sentences to include strict punishment emerged as a dominant theme during the hearings. In general, testifiers supported strong sanctions, believing they would encourage young people to take the problem of drinking and driving seriously. Repeatedly, witnesses stated that youth must be taught that actions have consequences and that the law cannot be violated without penalty. One witness, however, Juvenile Court Judge Dennis Boll, dissented, declaring that while he believes punishment has a real place in juvenile justice, it does not work for DWI offenders in his area. The problem, Boll explained, is that youth in his district perceive anti-impaired driving laws as rules intended to keep them from having fun, rather than as safeguards to keep them from injuring themselves and others. The solution, therefore, lies in changing the attitude of young people toward drinking and driving. As Boll noted: "Youthful offenders must see how the results of their drinking and driving have caused them real problems. . . . I feel that doing this is my major responsibility as a juvenile judge in these cases. Make them see that they are hurt by the drinking and driving rather than being hurt only because they were caught." Boll's response to the problem of youth impaired driving and his preference for instruction rather than punishment leads to the second essential component of sentencing—education.

In sentencing youthful offenders, education must be combined with punishment; neither education nor punishment is sufficient by itself. To use the favored formula of Judge Devine, "consequences plus education equals responsibility." Education may take a variety of forms. Juvenile Court Judge Romae Powell requires juvenile offenders to do research into the effects of alcohol on the health of young people because, in her words, "Some young people just don't know the extent to which they are ruining their lives by using alcohol and drugs." A second form of education, employed in Washington courts, utilizes an innovative Victims' Panel to instruct youth about the dangers and tragic results of drinking and driving.

Other judges reported using educational programs and presentations to compel young offenders and their families to take the time to reflect on what they are doing when they drive impaired. Judge Boll, for instance, described a 48-hour weekend program that he established

for young DWI offenders in his jurisdiction. The program begins with two movies which describe how impaired driving hurts the offender as well as society. Afterwards, the attendees participate in group discussions which focus on three topics: 1) the physiological aspects of alcohol and the effect of alcohol and other drugs on driving; 2) the state's DWI laws; and 3) the stages and symptoms of chemical dependency. The third topic is particularly important, according to Boll, because it encourages participants to judge their state of dependency for themselves. As Boll noted, it is much more effective for young persons to arrive at the conclusion that they are advancing toward dependency rather than for a doctor or counselor to make that assessment. This subject of assessment leads to the third component of sentencing: evaluation and treatment.

The juvenile justice system in our country is a two-pronged system. Juvenile court judges first must confront the legal aspects of adjudication and determine the guilt or innocence of an offender. Once that is resolved, judges change roles and become social workers, psychologists and parents. In cases of youthful impaired driving, this second dimension of the judge's role is critically important. Testifiers repeatedly declared that the court's involvement must be designed to detect the alcohol problems of young offenders and respond with evaluation and treatment. At minimum, this recommendation requires two measures. First, all DWI offenders should be required to submit to an alcohol evaluation, preferably prior to sentencing. Second, sentences should include provisions for treatment, with the level of treatment dependent on the severity of the substance abuse problem.

Successful adjudication involves punishment, education and treatment. During the hearings, several adjudicatory programs were cited that combine all three components. Juvenile DWI offenders appearing in the court of Judge Devine are punished by a one-year loss of license and sentenced to three days in a detention center. Together with their family, they are required to attend a 15-hour Comprehensive Awareness Program that uses medical experts and law enforcement officials to teach the dangers of drinking and driving. All offenders assigned to the program are evaluated for substance abuse problems and assigned to treatment if a problem is discovered.

A different comprehensive program was established by Judge Boll. Convicted DWI juvenile offenders in Boll's court are sentenced to spend a weekend at a special school. There, convicted offenders are provided instruction about drinking and driving, listen to a speaker from Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous, receive individual counseling, and undergo evaluation. Youth who are assessed as having a risk of chemical dependency are required to obtain treatment. With the approval of their parents or guardians, youth then are sentenced to work on a community farm as wage laborers to pay off their fines and court costs.

Problems with Adjudication Procedures

In the course of the hearings, testifiers enumerated five major problems encountered in adjudicating juvenile offenders:

1) the pressure to plea bargain in juvenile DWI cases;
2) the ineffectiveness of diversion programs;
3) the lack of statutory guidelines in sentencing juveniles;
4) the confidentiality of records for offenders who are adjudicated in juvenile courts;
5) the high rate of recidivism among young drivers.

1. Plea Bargaining. The first problem faced by prosecutors in adjudicating young offenders concerns plea bargaining. The problem arises from the fact that the juvenile court system is often overloaded. Consequently, prosecutors are under considerable pressure to find alternatives to the process. Given that DWI offenses may be considered a low priority when compared with violent and property crimes, a tendency arises to plea bargain: DWI charges are often downgraded to possession of alcohol, or charges are dismissed if an offender agrees to participate in a diversion program. Testifiers decried such plea bargaining. Not only does it send youth the mixed message that impaired driving violations are insignificant, it also substitutes meaningful sanctions such as license suspension and mandatory evaluation for comparatively trivial punishments.

2. Diversion Programs. When frequent plea bargaining occurs, it becomes even more important to have effective diversionary programs in place. Unfortunately diversion programs are not always taken seriously by young offenders. Young offenders themselves testified that they opted for diversion because it was an easy way to evade the penalties prescribed by law. Concerned about the merit of diversion programs,

Oregon state senator Rod Monroe recommended four guidelines to which diversion programs should adhere: 1) driving privileges should be suspended pending successful completion of the program; 2) an initial substance abuse evaluation should be mandatory and should lead to placement in an appropriate treatment program if evidence exists of a problem; 3) parents should be required to participate in the program with their child; and 4) any youth who violates the terms of the diversion program should be subject to the full penalties imposed upon convicted DWI offenders.

3. Statutory Guidelines. In addition to plea bargaining and ineffective diversion programs, testifiers complained of a lack of statutory guidelines in sentencing juvenile offenders. In Iowa, according to Kay Chopard, the law establishes minimum penalties for adults but never mentions the subject of sanctions for juvenile offenders. Consequently, penalties for youth under 18 depend entirely on the discretion of the judge. This creates two problems. First, penalties vary considerably from one Iowa jurisdiction to another; and second, Iowa educators engaged in instructing youth in the dangers of drinking and driving have no penalties to which they can point and state to youth that this is what will happen if you are caught driving impaired.

4. Confidentiality. The fourth problem associated with adjudicating juvenile offenders concerns the inaccessibility of juvenile court records. In many states, juvenile court proceedings are not considered convictions and therefore do not appear on the offender's record. In other states, the confidentiality of juvenile court proceedings results in the juvenile offender's record being wiped clean upon reaching age 18. In both cases, efforts to track multiple offenders are frustrated. Since driving is an adult responsibility and the status of driving violations somewhat different than other offenses committed by juveniles, testifiers recommended that juvenile DWI convictions be reported to the department of motor vehicles and included on the driver's permanent record.

5. Recidivism. The fifth problem concerns the high rate of recidivism exhibited by young drivers. Testifiers from several states cited statistics indicating that youth under the age of 21 have a higher rate of recidivism than drivers in other age groups. According to Judge Montelione, a 10-year study in Cook County, Illinois, revealed that the recidivism rate for the entire DUI offender population was 9.1%, while the recidivism rate for offenders under the age of 21 was more than 14%. Significantly greater recidivism rates for youth were also reported in Texas, where recent work by the Texas Commission Against Alcohol and Drug Abuse found that the younger an individual is at the time of first arrest the more likely the individual is to be rearrested for DWI within any given period of time.

In general, testifiers believed that the key to reducing the recidivism rate among youth lies in improving and expanding education and treatment programs for young offenders. Their specific recommendations on how to improve these programs are the subject of the following chapter on supervision.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Adjudication

* Juvenile courts should be assigned jurisdiction over juvenile impaired driving violations.
  —States need to establish statutory sentencing guidelines for cases involving juvenile DWI offenders.
  —DWI convictions for impaired driving by juveniles should be reported to the state department of motor vehicles and included on the driver's permanent record.
* Courts should work closely with police to remove obstacles to the enforcement of drinking and impaired driving laws for youths and to provide feedback to police on sentencing.
* Courts should require the involvement of parents in the adjudication, education, and treatment of underage drinking and impaired driving offenders.
* Pre-conviction diversions for underage impaired driving offenses should not be used. A finding on the charge should be rendered, and participation in education or treatment programs should then become a condition of sentencing.
* Plea-bargaining and downgrading of DWI offenses should not be permitted.
* Innovative adjudicatory processes such as the teen court should be considered for lesser traffic offenses.
* Minimum disposition for underage impaired driving violations should include a mandatory loss of license for 180 days for first offenders and a mandatory substance abuse evaluation that is specifically designed for youths.
  —Other sanctions could include:
  1) fines and restitution
  2) education and treatment when appropriate
  3) community service
  4) exposure to hospital emergency rooms, shock trauma units and victim panels.
* Training should be provided for judges and court personnel who handle youthful drinking and impaired driving offenses.
* Juvenile court judges should take a leadership role in community activities designed to prevent substance abuse and impaired driving by youths. Judges should actively communicate laws, sanctions and existing problems to schools and communities.



VIII. Supervision

The topic of supervision encompasses all post-adjudicatory measures ordered by the court for convicted offenders. For youths guilty of impaired driving, these measures primarily consist of educational and treatment programs. The previous chapter related the testifiers' conviction that sentences for youthful offenders must include three components: punishment, education and treatment. This chapter will review the requirements set forth by testifiers for effective education and treatment programs.

In discussing the requirements of effective education and treatment programs, testifiers offered two sets of recommendations. The first set concerned young offenders and their parents and focused on what should be required of them. Four recommendations were proposed:

1) parents of offenders must be involved in post-adjudicatory programs;
2) offenders receiving treatment for substance abuse problems must be required to abstain from substance use;
3) treatment patients should be subject to random drug and alcohol tests;
4) treatment patients should be obliged to report to a judge upon completion of their program.

The second set of recommendations concerned the programmatic features which testifiers believed to be necessary for the success of any treatment program. Again four recommendations were offered:

1) treatment programs must be specifically designed for youth;
2) well-established lines of communication must exist between the courts and treatment personnel;
3) treatment programs need to include a special monitoring unit to supervise youth with severe substance abuse problems;
4) effectiveness of treatment programs needs constant evaluation.

Parental Involvement

In the first set of recommendations testifiers offered four requirements for participants in post-adjudicatory programs. The first of these requirements concerned parental involvement. Throughout the hearings, testifiers recalled the crucial importance of parental participation in education and treatment programs. "Never just deal with the child," Judge Devine declared. "It does not work." Neither the courts nor the police have the resources to ensure that young people adhere to the requirements of treatment programs; only parents are in a position to monitor the daily behavior of their children and provide them with the support and discipline needed to overcome substance abuse problem. "The only way that I know that we're going to get on top of this thing," said Devine, "is if we get the parents involved."

Parental involvement is important not only because parents can help their children overcome substance abuse problems but because parental denial of a problem undermines the potential effectiveness of treatment. Both recovering alcoholics and treatment personnel noted this point. Brian Cooper, a youth whose alcohol problem was recognized by a school substance abuse specialist, spoke of how his parents denied that he had a problem and told school counselors that he could work through his difficulties without treatment. David Moore, director of Olympic Counseling Services, related similar responses from the parents of young alcoholics in need of treatment. "I'll have a parent come into my office in an evaluation conference," Moore stated, "and I will be literally describing how their son or daughter is dying in front of them. And what that parent will say is, 'But I used to drink like that when I was a teenager. I got blasted like that when I was a teenager. I still do once in a while. What's the big deal? Why send him to treatment?' That is not a bad parent. That is a parent who has been a substance abuser, who maybe now is no longer a substance abuser, but whose thinking is so disordered that they can't see when somebody right in front of them in their own home is dying."

Recognizing the importance of parental involvement, testifiers complained that not enough was being done to induce parents to participate in adjudicatory proceedings and post-adjudicatory programs. Kay Chopard, among others, noted that the issue of parental

involvement has not been adequately addressed: "What I hear from prosecutors around the state is that they're really feeling that they need to involve parents, that it's really got to start with them, and that the state, at this point, has not taken any kind of lead or come up with any kind of solution about how to do that."

At the Atlanta hearing, Judge Romae Powell proposed a means of stimulating parental involvement. She suggested that the courts take the lead and develop courses for parents. These courses, she said, could teach parents to recognize the signs of substance abuse, inform them of the importance of role modeling, and provide them with good parenting skills.

Abstinence

The second recommendation was that abstinence must be required for those in treatment programs. The problem, said treatment specialists, is that the courts do not always make it clear to youths that substance use will not be tolerated while an offender undergoes treatment. Tom Murphy of the Mainstream Youth Program in Oregon singled out this problem:

> *I think the frustration that we run into working with diversion laws is that in the State of Oregon abstinence is not viewed as a requirement of the diversion policies. . . . We, as a treatment community, do not feel that it is beneficial for anyone to be in treatment unless they remain clean. Yet clients often will sign up for diversion, thinking that it's simply a way out of a DUI ticket and not realizing the effort that they are going to have to put forth to stay clean from alcohol and drugs."*

The courts, Murphy concluded, have a duty to inform offenders who opt for diversion that they will be expected to remain clean and that those who do not adhere to this requirement invite extended sentences.

The importance of abstinence was underscored by the testimony of a young recovering alcoholic. By his own admission, he entered the treatment program because it seemed the easier route. Being forced to abstain provided him with the chance to step back and examine his own behavior. Given this opportunity, he realized that he had a drinking problem and, consequently, his attitude toward the treatment program changed. Instead of seeing it as a joke, as an easy alternative to punishment, he came to view it as a means of helping him overcome his problem.

Drug and Alcohol Screening

The need for abstinence in treatment programs led testifiers to make a third recommendation. Random screening for alcohol and other drugs should be conducted at the discretion of probation officers or court staff. Testimony was heard from treatment officials whose programs routinely employ alcohol and drug testing. Tom Murphy of the Mainstream Youth Program related how his program handles juvenile offenders who test positive for alcohol or other drug use. According to Murphy, any offender assigned by a court to his program for treatment must abstain from alcohol. Urinalysis is used to test clients. If a client tests positive for substance use, the treatment begins anew. For instance, if a youth is referred to treatment for two months and in the seventh week tests positive for alcohol, then the youth is required to start over again and remain clean for another two months before the treatment is considered complete. This provision emphasizes the seriousness of the abstinence requirement and leads many offenders to remain in treatment for a period of time far longer than their original sentence.

Treatment Termination

Like alcohol and drug testing, the fourth recommendation of this section was also prompted by a desire to ensure that juvenile offenders comply with court orders. Judge Montelione proposed that other states adopt Illinois' procedure of requiring DWI offenders to appear before their sentencing judge for a formal termination of their treatment. This procedure has two effects. It emphasizes at the outset that the offender will have to take the post-adjudicatory program seriously and complete it satisfactorily, and it provides a means for judges to determine that the sentences they impose are completed.

The four proposed supervision recommendations concerned young offenders and their parents and focused on what should be required of participants in post-adjudicatory treatment programs. In addition to these four recommendations, testifiers offered a second set of recommendations dealing with the treatment itself and the programmatic elements necessary for effectively addressing the substance abuse problems of young offenders.

Age-specific Programs

The first programmatic recommendation concerned the need to establish separate treatment

programs for adults and juveniles. Two problems were commonly cited in treatment programs that fail to distinguish between these two groups. First, treatment programs for adults promote a message of responsible drinking that is inappropriate for youths under age 21. Testifiers from Georgia and Ohio expressed similar dismay that treatment programs in their states made no effort to teach young offenders that it is irresponsible for underage youths to drink. Second, adult education and treatment programs may not take into consideration the learning disabilities of some young people and their possible sensitivity when discussing certain subjects. For this reason, Judge Montelione recommended that special remedial education courses be designed for those youthful offenders who proceed at a slower pace than is anticipated for the normal adult remedial education program. Special physiological and developmental concerns also should be addressed in a distinct youth guidance track that might appear inappropriate or embarrassing if discussed in a non-age-specific group.

Good Communication

The second recommendation to emerge from the testimony concerned the indispensability of communication between the judiciary and the treatment community. Testifiers cited two ways in which close interaction and good communication benefits the post-adjudicatory process. First, judges can use their convening authority to call together treatment professionals to establish uniform standards and procedures for adjudicatory programs or to develop solutions to problems in existing juvenile treatment programs. Second, when a court-referred offender does not adhere to the recommendations of the treatment facility, it may be necessary to send the offender back to the courts for a reprimand. Because treatment centers rely on the courts to enforce their requirements, it is necessary for good communication to exist between the two institutions. Only an integrated network of court officials, treatment personnel and police can ensure that offenders complete the prescribed treatment.

Monitoring

The third recommendation called for the establishment of a special monitoring unit to supervise youths with severe alcohol problems. Building upon the idea of an integrated network of officials involved in post- adjudicatory supervision, Judge Montelione stated that communities should establish an intensive monitoring unit for high-risk DWI offenders. The functions of this unit would include meeting frequently with an offender, visiting the offender's family, monitoring the offender's participation in remedial education or intervention programs, and reporting to the court on the offender's progress.

Evaluation

The fourth and final recommendation concerned the need to evaluate treatment programs to determine which programs work. As one testifier noted, the traditional and accepted education and treatment programs currently being employed by the criminal justice system have not been entirely effective in combatting the problem of youth impaired driving. The high rate of recidivism among young offenders underscores this fact. Therefore, it appears incumbent upon those engaged in post-adjudicatory programs to design an evaluative instrument and a research program which can be used to determine which courses of intervention are most effective in reducing youthful impaired driving.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Supervision

* Treatment programs must be specifically designed for youth.
* Well-established lines of communication should be developed between the courts and treatment professionals.
* Treatment programs need to include a special monitoring unit to supervise youth with severe substance abuse problems.
* The effectiveness of treatment programs must be periodically evaluated.
* Parents of offenders must be involved in post-adjudicatory programs.
* Offenders receiving treatment for substance abuse problems must be required to abstain from substance use.
* Consideration should be given to referring youthful impaired driving offenders to self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, Al-Anon, etc.
* Treatment patients should be obliged to report to a judge upon completion of their program.
* Youth in recovery should be considered for their potential to deliver prevention messages to their peers.



IX. Legislation

A pressing need exists for legislative leadership. Youth, as Rod Monroe declared, are crying out for proper rules with certainty of consequences. Inadequate laws, combined with lax enforcement and irregular sentencing, have contributed to a situation in which adolescent youths routinely drink and often drink and drive. The effects of this situation are manifold. Not only do young people form bad habits and fail to get help for their substance abuse problems, but they learn that the law means nothing and that they can violate it with impunity. The challenge exists for legislators to enact laws that combat the problem of alcohol abuse, that reflect the concerns of the community, and that gain the respect of youth.

Testifiers were united in affirming that a need exists for additional legislation. In discussing areas for legislative activity, testifiers offered both specific recommendations and general guidelines. The specific recommendations have been discussed in earlier chapters of this report. They included such measures as a 0.0 BAC for youths under age 21; administrative per se license revocations; prohibitions on the manufacture and possession of fraudulent driving licenses; increased penalties for persons convicted of selling alcohol to minors; and mandatory classroom instruction in grades K-12 on the effects and use of alcohol and other drugs.

In addition to specific legislative recommendations, testifiers offered four general guidelines for the formulation of more effective impaired driving laws:

1) laws must be perceived as fair and the penalty proportionate to the offense;
2) laws must not confound or frustrate law enforcement officers in the pursuit of their responsibilities;
3) laws must complement and reinforce one another;
4) laws must discriminate between adults and youths and provide separate provisions and punishments for each.

The Perception of Fairness

The first of the guidelines concerned fairness. In order for impaired driving legislation to be effective, it must be perceived as fair. Penalties must be seen as proportional to the offense; sentences must be consistent. Though an apparently simple guideline, testifiers cited numerous examples of laws designed to reduce youth impaired driving which failed because of the perception that they were unfair. The issue of fairness poses a problem to lawmakers because judging the fairness of a penalty involves one's assessment of the seriousness of the problem. In a community where drinking and driving by youth is not perceived as a serious offense, penalties that might be considered entirely reasonable in another location may be viewed as excessively harsh. This problem highlights the fact that no single measure can solve the problem of youth impaired driving. Legislation is important but, by itself, insufficient; it often must be combined with community education to make people aware of the seriousness of impaired driving violations.

When laws are perceived as unfair and the penalties excessively harsh, three problems may arise: 1) police may not enforce the law; 2) judges may not sentence offenders; and 3) youths may be alienated and rebel against the law. Testifiers related examples of each problem.

The failure of police to enforce the law was cited commonly as a problem. In Iowa, for instance, legislation has increased the punishments for DWI offenses in recent years, and this has resulted in an enforcement problem. According to Kay Chopard, "Officers are hesitant to take in a juvenile whom they fear will be treated harshly." Viewing adolescent drinking as a part of growing up and not sufficient reason to saddle youths with a criminal record, Iowa police reportedly are reluctant to arrest youths for drinking and driving violations.

A similar problem may arise with judges who resist sentencing offenders to what they consider unfair punishments. Sergeant Ken Taylor, a Tennessee sheriff, described how the unwillingness of judges to sentence offenders hampered his county's efforts to stop convenience stores from selling alcohol to underage youth. Despite an undercover operation that was successful in catching clerks selling beer to youth, the sheriff's office encountered trouble obtaining convictions. As Taylor explained, "the reason we were having trouble getting the convictions was be-

cause of the severity of Tennessee's law. If a person is convicted of selling alcohol to a minor, then he is prohibited from working in a place that sells alcohol for 10 years. The judges looked at that as a little strong. So they would pass a case for six months and render judgment at the end of six months. And most of the time they dismissed the cases if the person had not been involved in another offense of this nature."

Judges and law enforcement officials are not the only ones whose actions are compromised by the enactment of laws perceived as unfair. Youth may also react negatively to the perception of unfairness. Dr. Hawkins of the Center for Social Research at the University of Washington expressed concern at the effect that disproportionate penalties may have on the behavior of youth. "We have to be careful," he said, "that our efforts to develop sanctions and punishment-oriented strategies do not create another generation of outsiders. It does not require a driver's license to drink and drive. Withholding a driver's license alone will not prevent drinking and driving." Concluding his comments with a warning that harsh penalties may only produce a youth subculture that defies the law, Hawkins urged legislators to consider strategies that emphasize rewards for responsible behavior rather than punishments for violations.

When punishments are necessary, William Hayes of the New Jersey Office of Highway Safety offered a word of advice: "The advice that New Jersey would offer would be to keep your laws simple, keep them at a level where you really intend to assess the penalty. Don't have penalties in there that say you go to jail for two years if nobody really goes to jail for two years." Such penalties have a two-fold negative effect: first, they may undermine the enforcement of a legitimately needed law; and second, they may give the appearance that progress is occurring when in fact nothing is really been done to reduce the frequency of youth-impaired driving.

While laws undermine their own effectiveness when the penalties appear too harsh, they achieve equally little when the penalties are too weak. For example, when the Iowa legislature raised the minimum drinking age to 21, it made the sale of alcohol to 19 and 20 year olds a misdemeanor, punishable only by a fine. Since Iowa establishments know that they cannot be punished by a jail sentence or by the revocation of their liquor license, they continue to serve 19 and 20 year olds with impunity, according to testifiers, and have merely raised their cover charges to pay for the fines they might incur. Examples such as this led a number of testifiers to call for increased severity of sanctions for establishments that engage in a regular practice of selling alcohol to underage youth. These sanctions, they asserted, must include the threat of losing their liquor license for repeated violations.

Eliminating Encumbrances to Law Enforcement

The second guideline testifiers offered expressed the conviction that laws should not confound or frustrate law enforcement officers in the pursuit of their duty. In framing legislation, lawmakers must make it as simple as possible for police to arrest and detain youths, while still protecting the rights of young people. The impetus for this recommendation arose from complaints about legislation that has complicated enforcement. Several states, for instance, require that juveniles and adults be detained in separate facilities and not merely in segregated areas at the same facility. This provision, testifiers noted, has deterred the arrest of youth for "minor" offenses like impaired driving, particularly in rural areas that may be a long distance from the nearest juvenile detention center. Similarly, laws such as the Texas "Open Container" Law requiring officers to witness the consumption of alcohol by a driver in order to make an arrest increase the difficulty of the officer's task and reduce the likelihood of an arrest. Finally, the complexity of juvenile court proceedings and the demand that such proceedings often make upon an arresting officer's time were said to deter police from arresting youth for impaired driving violations.

Consistent Law

The third guideline that testifiers emphasized was the need for laws to complement and reinforce one another. In several states, older laws need to be amended to reflect more recent legislation. Wisconsin's "Not a Drop" Law, for example, establishes a zero BAC level for drivers under age 19. With a minimum drinking age of 21, however, the "Not A Drop" Law appears inconsistent. If drinking is illegal for 19 and 20 year olds, why shouldn't a 19 or 20 year old who is caught driving impaired be subject to the same penalties as an 18 year old? Similar inconsistencies plague drinking and driving laws in other states. In Iowa, when the drinking age was 18, the license of an underage DWI offender could be revoked until the offender reached the

legal drinking age. When the minimum drinking age was raised to 19, licenses of underage DWI offenders were revoked until the offender reached his or her 19th birthday. With the enactment of legislation raising the drinking age to 21, however, the age of revocation was lowered rather than raised, so that the license of an underage offender could be reinstated at age 18 rather than 21. Inconsistencies such as this, intentional or otherwise, obviously weaken the effect of the law and send a conflicting message to youth about the seriousness of the offense.

The Unique Nature of Youth Impaired Driving

The fourth and final guideline that testifiers offered concerned the need for legislation that deals specifically with the problem of youth impaired driving. Throughout the hearings, testifiers declared that impaired driving legislation must discriminate between youth and adults. All too often, legislation is framed with the adult driver in mind and is consequently inapplicable for youths. For example, in Iowa, drivers arrested with a BAC level in excess of .20 are required to obtain substance abuse evaluation. By the time youths reach a .20 BAC level, however, they are often incapacitated. Due to their lower alcohol tolerance, juveniles may have a serious dependency problem and require treatment even though they never exhibit a .20 BAC level. Therefore, the BAC level at which youth are sent for evaluation ought to be lower than the level established for adults.

The need for legislation to distinguish between youth and adults raises a theme that emerged as the hearings progressed. In many ways, youth impaired driving is a separate issue from adult drunk driving. The difference lies in both the problem and the solution. The problem is different in that the circumstances in which youth drink and drive differ from the circumstances of adult violators. As testifiers noted, youth exhibit a decided proclivity to risk-taking behavior; they are less experienced drivers; and they are highly sensitive to peer pressure. Differences in circumstances demand different solutions. Provisional licenses for youth under 21, lower BAC levels, and differing license sanctions are among the areas where legislation is needed to reduce the incidence of drinking and driving by youth.

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Legislation

The following legislative measures should be enacted to deter impaired driving by youth:

* For youth under the legal drinking age, impairment should be defined as any blood alcohol level above 0.0 BAC.
* Administrative per se license suspensions should be statutorily permitted.
* Open container laws should be promulgated.
* Strict sanctions should exist for the sale or transfer of alcoholic beverages to youths under the legal drinking age.
* The manufacture of fraudulent driving licenses should be prohibited and punished severely.
* In the absence of administrative action by the appropriate state agencies, state legislatures should consider legislation in the following areas:
    1) mandatory classroom instruction on alcohol use, other drug use, and impaired driving for grades K-12 together with curriculum guidelines for each grade level
    2) insurance rebates for drivers who take an approved driving risk reduction course and have a clean driving record
    3) mandatory component on alcohol use and impaired driving in driver education courses.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

* In the absence of alcohol industry action, legislation should be enacted to regulate alcohol beverage advertising. Repeatedly, testifiers at the hearings voiced concern about its detrimental influence on young people; and with near unanimity, the youths themselves declared that advertising encourages adolescents to drink.
* Education programs directed at youth impaired driving should stress the importance of wearing safety belts.
* Everyone involved in the effort to eliminate youth impaired driving must recognize that a continuous need exists to evaluate the effectiveness of all programs and activities, including a determination of what works, what does not work, and what can be replicated.
* Communities must recognize that youth impaired driving is a distinct problem, demanding specific strategies that go beyond the existing measure in place for the drunk driving problem.

CONCLUSION

While this concludes the recommendations that came out of the hearings, the Report does not presume to respond to every problem that might be associated with youthful impaired driving. In fact, many more recommendations could have been included, but those offered should be regarded as priorities for prompt action. A word of caution, however - the listening to, the recording of, and the making of recommendations for youthful impaired driving, is but a beginning.

This Report can serve as a focus for communities to see what has been done and what yet needs to be done to ensure the well-being of our young people. As they are identified as a population at risk on our highways, especially when impaired, we must recognize that the American people, in both the public and private sectors, must respond with a responsible plan of action. The testimony of the young people at all the hearing sites demanded adult concern, correction and above all, love. Such candor surely deserves a community commitment to remedy the problem. The youth impaired driving model which was used as the basis for this Report is the National Commission's prescription for the health and safety of American youth.

APPENDIX I

DIRECTORY OF YOUTH PROGRAMS

PROGRAMS

The following list consists of programs discussed by testifiers at the five hearings. The programs are listed alphabetically according to the hearing site at which they were mentioned. The descriptions are those given by testifiers.

CHICAGO

AL-CO-HOL—a classroom alcohol education program for junior high school students developed by the American Automobile Association.

Alcohol and the Driving Task—a course sponsored by the American Automobile Association for college students who are preparing for teacher training.

Boy Scouts of America Explorers Division—sponsors safe rides programs.

Come of Age—a program developed by Southland Corporation that was distributed to 40,000 junior high schools around the country to encourage youth not to drink while underage.

Comprehensive Awareness Program (CAP)—a 15 hour court-run program in Toledo, Ohio, for juveniles convicted of alcohol-related offenses. The program assesses the offender's level of alcohol involvement and employs police officers, health professionals and youth testifiers to instruct participants and their families about the problem of underage drinking and impaired driving.

Comprehensive Chemical Abuse Reduction through Educational Services (CARES)—a county-wide program in Lucas County (Toledo), Ohio, which utilizes a multi-disciplinary approach to combat substance abuse by youth.

Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE)—a cooperative law enforcement and education effort developed by the Los Angeles Police Department in which police officers teach classes and give presentations in elementary schools on drug abuse.

Harm's Way—a prevention program that includes a film presentation on spinal cord injuries and presentations from paraplegics who were paralyzed in motor vehicle crashes involving alcohol.

Illinois Alcoholism and Drug Dependence Association: Illinois Teenage Institute on Substance Abuse—a 6-day live-in experience to provide teens an opportunity to learn positive life-skills and enhance positive approaches to changing drinking and drug-related attitudes and behavior of their peers.

In Touch—a network of program coordinators who facilitate other prevention programs.

Intervention/Crossroads—poly-drug residential treatment programs for offenders age 25 and under that maintain a structured "peer family setting" and are used by the Illinois courts.

Just Say No Foundation—a foundation which supports drug prevention programs including Just Say No Clubs, where members gain information, skills, and support to resist peer pressure and other influences to use drugs.

Parents Helping Parents—a parent support group based on 'Tough Love' concept. Seeks to assist parents troubled by undesirable behavior of children.

Operation Snowball—a program sponsored by the Illinois Alcoholism and Drug Dependence Association in which students receive information on alcohol and drugs and are taught to become community leaders at weekend camps. High school participants in turn give talks to junior high and elementary school children at sessions known as Snowflakes.

Outlaws—an Iowa organization formed by teenagers who have decided not to use alcohol or drugs.

Project Graduation—a federal program that provides information on how to initiate, organize and generate support for alcohol and drug-free graduation parties.

Quest International—an educational organization based in Columbus, Ohio, that addresses a variety of problems that youth experience such as alienation, alcohol and drug use and teenage pregnancy.

Skills for Adolescents—developed by the Quest National Center in Columbus, Ohio, it is designed to help students, primarily those in junior high school, increase self-confidence, set personal goals and resist negative peer pressure to use alcohol.

Starting Early—an alcohol and traffic safety awareness program for elementary schools, grades K-6, developed by the American Automobile Association.

State Trooper Attitudes and Responsibilities (STAR)—a classroom program for grades K-12 employed by the Illinois State Police in which law enforcement officers discuss a six-point agenda covering substance abuse, self-esteem, making friends, decision-making skills, saying "no" and alternatives to substance abuse.

Techniques for Effective Alcohol Management (T.E.A.M.)—a program supported by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the National Basketball Association, Major League Baseball, and other public and private organizations promoting responsible alcohol service in public assembly facilities.

Teen Leader—a pilot project sponsored by the Ohio Department of Public Safety that attempts to change student attitudes toward drinking and driving by providing leadership training to teams of 24 juniors and seniors in selected schools over a two-year period.

The Clown Program—a program in which high school students in Illinois use clowns to provide information to young children about alcohol and drugs.

The Control Factor—a program developed by the Minnesota chapter of the National Safety Council which uses high school students to address key issues in preventing youth from becoming involved in drinking.

Washington Regional Alcohol Program (WRAP)—a coalition of individuals from public agencies, private organizations and businesses in the Washington, D.C. region that sponsors seasonal media campaigns and supports legislation to strengthen impaired driving countermeasures.

BOSTON

Athletes Against Drunk Driving—a program sponsored by New York state involving professional athletes who speak in high schools about the dangers of drinking and driving.

Emergency Nurses C.A.R.E. (Cancel Alcohol Related Emergencies)—a nationwide organization of nurses that volunteer their services to teach about the hazards of impaired driving.

Make Up Your Mind—a program prepared by the New York 4-H Foundation that helps middle school students understand the physiological and psychological effects of alcohol.

No Booze the Clown—a program in Tompkins County, New York, in which a clown speaks to fourth graders about the dangers of drinking and driving.

Operation Last Call—a program implemented by the Massachusetts State Police to deter licensed liquor establishments from selling beverage alcohol to underage youth.

Price Chopper's 21-year-old Button Campaign—provides training to employees on how to identify underage individuals and deny sales of beverage alcohol.

Students Against Driving Drunk (SADD)—a national organization started in Wayland High School, Massachusetts, which encourages high school chapters to promote anti-drinking driving activities and a student/parent safe rides contract.

Staying Alive—a program prepared by the Orange County, California, Trauma Society that provides alternative alcohol-free activities for high school students.

Students to Offset Peer Pressure (S.T.O.P.P.)—a student organization originating in New Hampshire that sponsors alcohol and drug-free events among other activities.

21 Enforcement Program—an effort underway in three New York counties in cooperation with 19 police agencies that aims to develop low-cost programs to deter alcohol consumption by underage youth.

You're Looking Younger Every Day—a program sponsored by Atlantic Refining and Marketing for its "A Plus" Stores that trains employees to require proof of age for all alcohol purchases by young adults. Customers under 30 who are not asked for proof are given $1 coupons.

SEATTLE

Children of Alcoholics—a statewide program in Idaho sponsored by the Office of Highway Safety that attempts to reach those youth who are at especially high risk of drinking and driving.

Chemical People Institute—an organization that promotes awareness, understanding and action concerning alcohol and other drug problems through the promotion of community task forces.

Dram-edy—an Alaskan version of the "Friday Night Live" program developed by the Alaska Council on the Prevention of Alcohol and Drug Abuse that uses a mixture of comedy and drama to teach safety messages and refusal skills through student theater.

DWI Victims Panel—a panel composed of five people whose lives have been affected by an impaired driving crash. The program is designed to provide convicted DWI offenders with a personal perspective on the agony inflicted upon victims by drunk drivers. The panel also speaks to driver education classes and military base personnel.

Friday Night Live—a school-based prevention program implemented in many states that uses school assemblies and refusal skills training to teach students to stop their friends from drinking and driving.

Here's Looking at You, Two—a comprehensive school curriculum for grades K-12, together with a teacher training program to prepare teachers to implement the curriculum in their classrooms. The curriculum focuses on providing students with facts about alcohol and other drugs and helping them to develop the self-esteem and inter-personal skills necessary to handle situations where they are confronted with the choice of using drugs.

Here's Looking at You, 2000—a K-12 school-based curriculum that is developed around 11 key risk factors of adolescent substance abuse and focuses on gateway drugs such as nicotine, alcohol and marijuana. It is a multimedia approach that utilizes cross-age teaching to reinforce prevention messages and is designed to teach students information and social skills, while promoting school and family bonding.

In Harm's Way—A school assembly program developed by the Oregon Neurological Society and nurses in the state to explain the importance of good health relating to traffic safety programs such as seat belts and drunk driving awareness campaigns.

It's a Matter of Time—a multimedia program developed by the Washington Traffic Safety Commission that uses young people who have been involved in motor vehicle crashes to inform youth of the dangers of impaired driving.

Life Skills for Little People—an educational program for elementary school children sponsored by the Alaska Highway Safety Office.

Mainstream Youth Program—an adolescent treatment program in Oregon that receives court-referred youth with alcohol problems.

Natural Helpers—a program that uses a school-wide survey to identify students and staff members who are trusted by students. Natural Helpers receive training in listening, decision-making and referral skills so that they can assist students with problems such as drug use. The program was developed as a way of helping adolescents deal with problems by utilizing the peer network existing in their environment.

Oregon Student Safety On the Move (OSSOM)—a youth traffic safety organization that sponsors peer education programs, provides alternative activities to drug and alcohol use, and encourages the practice of safe driving habits.

OSSOM Pipeline—a preventative peer education program for grades K-12 that trains high school and middle school students to provide classroom instruction to younger students on highway safety issues.

Pros for Kids—a program that brings professional athletes into schools to talk to students about issues such as impaired driving.

Reducing Adolescent Drinking and Driving (RADD)—a high school-based intervention project devised by the Division of Adolescent Medicine at the University of Washington that aims to reduce automobile crashes by implementing within high school drivers' training classes, a "pre-driving" curriculum on drinking and driving. The project uses an assessment package to identify those students at highest risk and entails specialized programming for high-risk students.

Road to Winning—a program developed by NHTSA and currently used in the states of Alaska, Idaho, Oregon and Washington that is designed to create an awareness among high school students of the dangers of alcohol and other drugs. The program uses college and professional athletes to promote highway safety.

Safe Rides—a program in several Washington counties (including Whatcom County) that provides a confidential service for youth who need a ride home after they have been drinking.

Sober Graduation—a California program which, like Project Graduation, offers alcohol-free events at graduation time.

Stop Auto Fatalities Through Youth Efforts (SAFTYE)—funded and coordinated by the Washington Traffic Safety Commission, SAFTYE is designed to encourage school and community projects that deal with alcohol and drug abuse and safety belt use by teenage drivers. SAFTYE networks with other high school clubs and conducts workshops, holds an annual conference, sponsors a spring Youth Week, and gives awards to outstanding member clubs.

Stop the Drinking Driver Project—an Alaska program that trains students to refuse to drink and drive and to stop a friend from driving impaired. The program begins with a school-wide assembly conducted by students and employs role-playing techniques to teach students how to resist peer pressure.

Students Offering Better Evening Recreation (SOBER)—a student-run program in Oregon that provides youth with drug-free alternatives for weekend entertainment to help combat teen drinking and driving.

Washington Teen Institute—an organization that promotes peer instruction and trains high school students to talk to children in lower grades about alcohol and drug use.

ATLANTA

Alternatives—an annual conference conducted by the Virginia Alcohol Beverage Control Board for colleges and institutions of higher learning in the state to discuss the problem of underage campus drinking and share ideas for dealing with it.

Arrive Alive Georgia—a program designed to increase the awareness of high school students by sponsoring presentations by convicted DWI offenders and asking youth to sign a pledge stating that they will not drink, use drugs or ride with a drunken driver.

Commonwealth Alliance for Drug Rehabilitation and Education (CADRE)—a Virginia alliance of state level agencies, chaired by the state attorney general, that has sought the support of the business community in promoting a comprehensive program against youth impaired driving.

Faces—a Mississippi program that uses a small group format to teach youth to develop a positive self-image.

Project Think—a pilot program implemented in the 16 colleges of the South Carolina Technical College system that involves activities designed to reduce underage campus drinking and impaired driving among college students.

School Intervention Program (ScIP)—a South Carolina program that operates through the combined efforts of the states' network of county alcohol and drug abuse programs, the local school districts, and the South Carolina Commission on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse in an effort to prevent or reduce the inappropriate use of alcohol and other drugs among students.

Students Staying Straight—an organization of high school students in Hamilton County, Tennessee, who contract with themselves to stay straight, and promote activities to encourage other students who exhibit problems with alcohol or other drugs to stay straight.

FORT WORTH

Alcohol Drug Abuse Really Destroys You (AARDY)—AARDY's Army is a prevention program sponsored by MADD that targets elementary school students.

Fort Worth Challenge—an organization formed to reduce the harmful effects of substance abuse in Tarrant County, Texas.

Free For Life—a refusal skills development program developed by MADD and Lifetime Learning Systems which targets junior high age youth and helps them to recognize and deal with peer pressure.

Metroplex Project Graduation—an alcohol and drug-free high school graduation event attended by 15,000 students that occurs at a Texas amusement park and includes a contest which awards prizes to the best alcohol or drug-related project devised over the past year by a high school in the region.

Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD)—a national organization with over 400 local chapters dedicated to establishing the public conviction that drunk driving is unacceptable and criminal in order to promote public policies, programs and personal accountability.

None for the Road Parties—a program sponsored by Bally's Aladdin's Castle in which Bally's makes their video entertainment stores available to groups like MADD and SADD for alcohol-free parties on holidays when youth frequently drink.

Oklahoma Challenge—a program sponsored by the Oklahoma Highway Safety Office that uses one-day regional workshops and videotapes to develop youth leaders and train them to conduct activities in their schools and communities.

Project Celebration—an expanded version of Project Graduation that offers alcohol and drug-free events for high school students throughout the year in Texas.

Students Working All Together (SWAT)—an alcohol/drug prevention support group for high school students in Hurst, Euless and Bedford, Texas.

Tarrant County DWI Task Force—a regional task force composed of representatives from law enforcement agencies, criminal justice and community organizations in Tarrant County, Texas.

Teen Court—a court composed of young people who serve as attorneys, bailiffs, and jurors. Only the judge is an adult. The court adjudicates youth age 10 to 16 who are arrested for class C driving offenses and enables young people to judge their peers' behavior.

Texans' War on Drugs—a statewide illegal drug use prevention organization that encourages each community to address its drug problem through education programs targeting youth, parents, schools and other community influences.

Texas Youth in Action—the youth component of Texans' War on Drugs. It promotes the philosophy of youth reaching youth to develop positive peer influence. It works with young people across the state to educate peers on the danger of alcohol and other drug use and the value of a drug-free lifestyle.

Texas Youth in Action leadership camp—a summer camp involving workshops and activities designed to promote an exchange of ideas and assist high school students in organizing anti-impaired driving programs in their schools.

Young Oklahoman Drinking and Driving Alternative Programs (YODDAP)—a program of the Oklahoma Highway Safety Office that offers a course for youth who are stopped for drinking and driving. The course is designed as an alternative in sentencing.

APPENDIX II

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

David Anderson
Arlington, Virginia

Elaine Bratic Arkin
North Arlington, Virginia

Rory Benson
National Association of Broadcasters
Washington, D.C.

Dr. William Butynski
National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors (NASADAD)
Washington, D.C.

Jude Cashman
National Association of State Boards of Education
Washington, D.C.

Robert Denniston
Office of Substance Abuse Prevention
Rockville, Maryland

Karen Dodge
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Washington, D.C.

Donna Feeley
American Red Cross
Washington, D.C.

Carol Giannini
Substance Abuse Coordinator, Montgomery County
Rockville, Maryland

Allen Goldhamer
Allstate Insurance Company
Northbrook, Illinois

John J. Grant
National Commission Against Drunk Driving
Washington, D.C.

Susan Herbel
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Lithicum, Maryland

Francis A. Ianni
Delaware Office of Highway Safety
Dover, Delaware

Ralph J. Jackson
Allstate Insurance Company
Northbrook, Illinois

Francis C. Kenel
American Automobile Association
Falls Church, Virginia

James Nichols
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Washington, D.C.

Jim Onder
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Washington, D.C.

George Reagle
Associate AdministratorNational Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Washington, D.C.

Virginia Roach
National Association of State Boards of Education
Washington, D.C.

James Ryan
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Edward S. Sands
National Commission Against Drunk Driving
Washington, D.C.

Judith L. Stone
National Assn. of Governors' Highway Safety Representatives
Washington, D.C.

Judge Roy B. Willett
Roanoke City Courthouse
Roanoke, Virginia

James Wright
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Washington, D.C.

REPORT WRITING COMMITTEE

David Anderson
David N. Bragdon - Editor*
Allen Goldhamer
John J. Grant
Michelle Monroe-Glenn
James Wright

* David Bragdon reviewed all the written and oral testimony; studied the full transcripts of the five hearings; prepared the preliminary draft; and edited the final copy.

CHICAGO, IL—October 27, 1987

PANELISTS

V.J. Adduci, Chairman
National Commission Against Drunk Driving
Washington, D.C.

Debra Camren
Youth Panelist
Charleston, Illinois

*Jim Edgar
Secretary of State
Springfield, Illinois

Jordan Kagan
Youth Panelist
Skokie, Illinois

James S. Kemper, Jr., Corporate Consultant
Kemper Group Companies
Skokie, Illinois

Margot Klimczak
Youth Panelist
Lake Forest, Illinois

George Reagle, Associate Administrator
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Washington, D.C.

Melvin Smith, Director - Div. of Traffic Safety
Illinois State Department of Transportation
Springfield, Illinois

Lawrence H. Williford, Vice Chairman-NCADD
V.P.-Corporate Relations, Allstate Insurance Company
Northbrook, Illinois

PRESENTORS

Charles Atkin, Professor
Department of Communications
Michigan State University

Kay Chopard
Prosecuting Attorney's Council
Des Moines, Iowa

Deputy William M. Denihan
Director, Department of Highway Safety
Columbus, Ohio

Judge Andy Devine
Lucas County Court of Common Pleas
Juvenile Division
Toledo, Ohio

Jerome England
Youth Presentor
Sparta, Tennessee

Judge Christopher Foley
Children's Court - Branch 14
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Susan Holbrook
Youth Presentor
Belleville, Illinois

Judge Anthony Montelione
Presiding Justice - Circuit Court
Chicago, Illinois

William O'Sullivan, Superintendent of Troopers
Department of State Police
Springfield, Illinois

Rosemary Parker
Southland Corporation
Alexandria, Virginia

Angie Stanfield
Youth Presentor
Grant Park, Illinois

Rita Weiss
American Automobile Association
Falls Church, Virginia

Region V NHTSA Contacts:

Richard M. Cook, Administrator

James Downey, Highway Safety Specialist

BOSTON, MA—November 17, 1987

PANELISTS

V.J. Adduci, Chairman
National Commission Against Drunk Driving
Washington, D.C.

Doris Aiken, President
Remove Intoxicated Drivers
Schenectady, New York

John P. Giuggio, President
The Boston Globe
Boston, Massachusetts

Jennifer Hall
Youth Panelist, Trinity College
Hartford, Connecticut

James Nichols, Chief
Alcohol Programs Division, NHTSA
Washington, D.C.

Terrance Schiavone, Executive Director
Governor's Highway Safety Bureau
Boston, Massachusetts

*John A. Volpe, Chairman Emeritus
National Commission Against Drunk Driving
Nahant, Massachusetts

PRESENTORS

Patricia Adduci, Commissioner
Department of Motor Vehicles
Albany, New York

Anna Barraza
Governor's Youth Alcohol Commission
Providence, Rhode Island

Thomas Cullen
Governor's Alliance Against Drugs
Boston, Massachusetts

William Cullinane
Students Against Driving Drunk
Malboro, Massachusetts

Sandra Del Sesto
Governor's Youth Alcohol Commission
Providence, Rhode Island

Vicki Fisichelli
STOPP Program
Nashua, New Hampshire

Barbara Foley
Emergency Nurses C.A.R.E.
Westborough, Massachusetts

Albert Godfrey
Maine Highway Safety Commission
Winthrop, Maine

Michelle Haas
STOPP Program
Nashua, New Hampshire

William Hayes, Director
Office of Highway Safety
Trenton, New Jersey

George McCarthy
Alcohol Beverage Control Commission
Boston, Massachusetts

Martha O'Connor, Chair
State Board of Education
Brattleboro, Vermont

Diane Rogers
Governor's Youth Alcohol Commission
Providence, Rhode Island

John Rossi
Youth Presentor
Framingham, Massachusetts

Judge Phillip Trompeter
Juvenile Justice
Roanoke, Virginia

Dr. David Winer, Dean of Students
Trinity College
Hartford, Connecticut

Region I NHTSA Contacts:

John T. Connors (Former Administrator Retired)

George Luciano, Administrator

James Ryan, Highway Safety Specialist

SEATTLE, WA—February 22, 1988

PANELISTS

V.J. Adduci, Chairman
National Commission Against Drunk Driving
Washington, D.C.

Gil W. Bellamy, Administrator
Oregon Traffic Safety Commission
Salem, Oregon

*Michael D. Bradbury, Esq.
District Attorney
Ventura, California

Niki King
Youth Panelist
Hood River, Oregon

Samuel C. McCullum, Director
Washington Traffic Safety Commission
Olympia, Washington

Jerome J. Mitchell
Youth Panelist
Portland, Oregon

Karen Olsen
Youth Panelist
Shelton, Washington

William Scott, Director
Office of Alcohol and State Programs, NHTSA
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence H. Williford, Vice Chairman - NCADD
V.P. Corporate Relations, Allstate Insurance Company
Northbrook, Illinois

PRESENTORS

Shirley Anderson
Snohomish County MADD
Rothell, Washington

Peter Brissing, Project Director
Div. of Adolescent Medicine
University of Washington at Seattle

Lin Carlson, Drug/Alcohol Coordinator
Seattle Public Schools
Seattle, Washington

Brian Cooper
Curtis High School
Tacoma, Washington

Crystal Dodds
Youth Presentor
Seattle, Washington

Tom Franey
Youth Presentor
Portland, Oregon

Megan Gleason
Washington Middle School
Seattle, Washington

Dr. David Hawkins
School of Social Science
University of Washington at Seattle

Norma Jaeger, Project Director
Multnomah County DWI Coordinator
Portland, Oregon

Debra Jarvis
Oregon Students for Safety on the Move
Corvallis, Oregon

Jennifer Juckett
"ROAD TO WINNING" Program
Everett, Washington

T. Michael Lewis, Program Director
Highway Safety Planning Agency
Jeneau, Alaska

Maurita Mader
Youth Presentor
Seattle, Washington

Rod Monroe
State Senator
Portland, Oregon

Susan Montgomery
Mainstream Youth Program - Multnomah County
Portland, Oregon

David Moore
Olympic Counseling
Gig Harbor, Washington

Tom Murphy
Mainstream Youth Program - Multnomah County
Portland, Oregon

Renee Nibler
SAFTYE, Youth Program Manager
Olympia, Washington

Peter Nunnenkamp, Driver Safety Manager
Division of Motor Vehicles
Salem, Oregon

Julie Peterson, Deputy Director
Washington Traffic Safety Commission
Olympia, Washington

Tarrol Peterson
Youth Presentor
Ellensburg, Washington

Pat Raino, Acting Program Manager
Idaho Department of Transportation
Boise, Idaho

Clay Roberts
Roberts, Fitzmahan Associates
Seattle,Washington

James E. Smith, Commissioner
California Highway Patrol
Sacramento, California

Wes Smith
Greater Albany Public Schools
Albany, Oregon

Tony Snyder
Youth Presentor
Portland, Oregon

John Strickler
Washington Middle School
Seattle, Washington

Bruce Strothers
Youth Presentor
Seattle, Washington

Major Lynden W. Woodmansee
Washington State Patrol
Olympia, Washington

Bruce Yates, Youth Alcohol Coordinator
Prevention of Alcoholism and Drug Abuse
Anchorage, Alaska

Region X NHTSA Contacts:

Curtis A. Winston, Administrator
Michael Baldwin, Highway Safety Specialist

ATLANTA, GA—March 3, 1988

PANELISTS

V.J. Adduci, Chairman
National Commission Against Drunk Driving
Washington, D.C.

Cecil Alexander
Committee to Comabat Drugged and Drunken Driving
Atlanta, Georgia

Beverly Campbell, Director of Public Communication
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
Washington, D.C.

Thomas Enright, Regional Administrator
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
Atlanta, Georgia

*Robert Kirk, Professor - Health & Safety
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee

Dan Latham
Youth Panelist
Ridgeland, Mississippi

Minuard C. McGuire, Director
Office of Highway Safety
Atlanta, Georgia

Edward L. Morgan, Asst. V.P. Corporate Relations
Allstate Insurance Company
Northbrook, Illinois

PRESENTORS

Vincent M. Burgess
Transportation Safety Administrator, DMV
Richmond, Virginia

Gloria Busch-Johnson, Dean of Student Services
Aiken Technical College
Aiken, South Carolina

Larry M. Ellis, Coordinator
Governor's Highway Safety Program
Nashville, Tennessee

Richard Gallaspie
Youth Presentor
Crawfordville, Georgia

Alison Gentry
Youth Presentor
Atlanta, Georgia

John Harris, Director
Bureau of Law Enforcement
Tallahassee, Florida

Angie Howington
Youth Presentor
Jefferson, Georgia

Representative Jerry D. Jackson
Chairman - House Motor Vehicle Committee
Atlanta, Georgia

John Lacey
Highway Safety Research Center
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Jack L. Mathis, Founder and Chairman
Arrive Alive
Decatur, Georgia

William J. McCord, Director
SC Commission on Alcohol & Drug Abuse
Columbia, South Carolina

Judge Romae T. Powell, President
National Council of Juvenile/Family Court Judges
Atlanta, Georgia

Sergeant Ken Taylor, Commander
DUI Task Force-Hamilton County Sheriff's Department
Chattanooga, Tennessee

Judge Roy B. Willett, Vice President
National Council of Juvenile/Family Court Judges
Roanoke, Virginia

Bob Wilson
District Attorney
Decatur, Georgia

Region IV NHTSA Contacts:

Thomas Enright, Administrator

C.V. Rice, Highway Safety Specialist

Romell W. Cooks, Highway Safety Specialist

FT. WORTH—March 29 1988

PANELISTS

Beverly Campbell, Director of Public Communications
The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints
Washington, D.C.

Tim Curry
Criminal District Attorney
Fort Worth, Texas

Allen Goldhamer, Manager-Advocacy Programs
Allstate Insurance Company
Northbrook, Illinois

John J. Grant, Program Director
National Commission Against Drunk Driving
Washington, D.C.

Keith McBurnett
Youth Panelist
Euless, Texas

Wayne Nash
Youth Panelist
Euless, Texas

*Norma Phillips, President
Mothers Against Drunk Driving
Escondido, California

William Scott, Director
Office of Alcohol and State Programs, NHTSA
Washington, D.C.

Betty Theis, Executive Director
Louisiana Highway Safety Commission
Baton Rouge, Louisiana

PRESENTORS

Sgt. Esther Alvarez
Fort Worth Police Department
Fort Worth, Texas

Margaret Bergdoll
Youth Presentor
Euless, Texas

Kevin Brown, Youth Presentor
Texans' War on Drugs/Texas Youth in Action
Bedford, Texas

Cindy Burbank
Youth Presentor
Euless, Texas

Jimmy Evans, Youth Presentor
Austin College
Sherman, Texas

Brian Garner, Youth Presentor
Students Working All Together
Hurst, Texas

Eddie Garth, Officer
Arlington Police Department
Arlington, Texas

Mekecia Hadi, Youth Presentor
Texans' War on Drugs/Texas Youth in Action
Bedford, Texas

Roy Hale, Coordinator of Seller Training
Texas Alcohol Beverage Commission
Austin, Texas

Judge Anthony Heckemeyer
Presiding Circuit Judge
Benton, Missouri

Mary Ann Hughes, Special Asst. Attorney General
New Mexico Department of Public Safety
Santa Fe, New Mexico

Fran Hurtado, National Youth Program Coordinator
Mothers Against Drunk Driving
Hurst, Texas

Delbert Karnes
Alcohol Program Manager
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Stephanie Lauridsen, Youth Presentor
Texans' War on Drugs/Texas Youth in Action
Bedford, Texas

Monica Lopez, Youth Presentor
Students Working All Together
Euless, Texas

Kevin McCombs
Youth Presentor
Euless, Texas

Edward Muldowney
Youth Presentor
Bedford, Texas

Patrick O'Malley
University of Michigan Institute for Social Research
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Terry Pence
Texas Department of Highway Public Transportation
Austin, Texas

Lori Price, Youth Presentor
Students Working All Together
Hurst, Texas

Jim Rodriguez
Oklahoma Governor's Highway Safety Rep.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Amy Saladino, Youth Presentor
Students Working All Together
Hurst, Texas

Carol Savage
Tarrant County DWI Task Force
Ft. Worth, Texas

Harold Simmons, Chairman
Project Graduation
Euless, Texas

Gary Trietsch
State Department of Highways and Public Transportation
Austin, Texas

Mark Whittaker, Director of Sales
Bally's Aladdin's Castle
Arlington, Texas

Terry Wilbanks
Youth Presentor
Euless, Texas

Gene Wilkins, Driver Education Specialist
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas

Region VI NHTSA Contact:

Georgia Jupinko, Administrator

Vernon L. With, Highway Safety Specialist

---

*Panel Chairperson at each hearing

APPENDIX III

III.1 1988 Survey on Drinking and Driving Among High School Seniors

III.2 Youth Fatal Crash Statistics

1988 Survey

Drinking and Driving Among American High School Seniors

Institute for Social Research
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987
Percent Having Used Alcohol in Past 30 days:	69.7	69.4	67.2	65.9	65.3	66.4
Percent Drinking Five or More Drinks in a Row in Past Two Weeks:	40.5	40.8	38.7	36.7	36.8	37.5
Percent Driving After Drinking Alcohol:	—	—	31.2	29.0	26.8	26.6
Percent Driving After Having Five or More Drinks:	—	—	18.3	16.6	15.8	15.0
Percent Riding as Passenger After Driver Had Been Drinking Alcohol:	—	—	44.2	39.1	38.2	38.2
Percent Riding as Passenger After Driver Had Five or More Drinks:	—	25.4	21.5	21.2	21.9	
Percent of Seniors Using Seatbeltes When Driving:						
Never, Seldom	—	—	—	—	43.2	36.7
Always	—	—	—	—	25.0	33.0
Percent Reporting One or More Accidents in Past 12 Months:	22.2	22.2	22.8	24.4	25.1	25.6
Percent Having One or More Accidents After Alcohol Use in Past 12 Months:	3.3	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.2	2.5
Percent Reporting One or More Moving Violations in Past 12 Months:	24.8	27.1	26.5	27.6	30.4	31.7
Percent Cited for Moving Violation After Alcohol Use in Past 12 Months:	5.0	5.1	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.6

Youth Fatalities and Alcohol-Related Fatalities 1982-1987

	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	Percent Change From: 1982-1987	Percent Change From: 1986-1987
I. Youth (15-20) Fatalities								
Total Fatalities	8508	7914	8101	7663	8553	8215	−3.4	−4.0
Alcohol-Related Fatalities	5380	4747	4718	4184	4642	4204	−21.9	−9.4
Percent	63.2	60.0	58.2	54.6	54.3	51.2	−19.1	−5.7
Fatalities with .10% BAC or Greater	4123	3617	3487	3048	3271	2888	−30.0	−11.7
Percent	48.5	45.7	43.0	39.8	38.2	35.2	−27.5	−8.1
II. Young Drivers Involved in Fatal Crashes								
Total Drivers	10080	9547	10046	9659	10470	10194	1.1	−2.6
Alcohol-Related Fatalities	4379	3966	3927	3387	3761	3356	−23.4	−10.8
Percent	43.4	41.5	39.1	35.1	35.9	32.9	−24.2	−8.4
Driver BAC .10% or Greater	3092	2789	2636	2276	2434	2109	−31.8	−13.4
Percent	30.7	29.2	26.2	23.6	23.2	20.7	−32.6	−11.0
III. Young Drivers Killed								
Total Drivers	4526	4252	4525	4281	4658	4583	1.3	−1.6
Alcohol-Related Drivers	2501	2270	2294	2000	2210	1939	−22.5	−12.3
Percent	55.3	53.4	50.7	46.7	47.4	42.3	−23.4	−10.8
Driver BAC .10% or Greater	1953	1742	1712	1440	1571	1357	−30.5	−13.6
Percent	43.2	41.0	37.8	33.6	33.7	29.6	−31.4	−12.2
IV. Youth Fatalities Involving Young Drivers								
Total Fatalities	723	6296	6614	6175	6966	6737	0.2	−3.3
Alcohol-Related Fatalities	3753	3372	3416	2938	3338	2968	−20.9	−11.1
Percent	55.8	53.6	51.6	47.6	47.9	44.1	−21.1	−8.1
Driver BAC .10% or Greater	2763	2483	2403	2041	2248	1931	−30.1	−14.1
Percent	41.1	39.4	36.3	33.1	32.3	28.7	−30.3	−11.2

For further information or additional copies of this report contact:

National Commission Against Drunk Driving
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Suite 804
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 452-0130

U.S. Department
of Transportation

**National Highway
Traffic Safety
Administration**

400 Seventh St., S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20590

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use $300

Postage and Fees Paid
National Highway
Traffic Safety
Administration
DOT 517

DOT HS 807 347
December 1988