



Transcript: Underage Drinking: What's the Big Deal and What Do We Do About It?

Presenter: Traci Toomey
Recorded on September 27, 2022

REBECCA BULLER: Good morning, everyone. As you enter the room, we're going to get started in just one minute. We're going to let a few more folks join us. And we're looking forward to spending some time together this morning.

All right, I want to welcome you again. The bells are chiming in my neighborhood that it is 10:00 and it's time to get started in our Central Time zone. I want to welcome you to "Underage Drinking, What's the Big Deal and what do we do about it?" with Traci Toomey.

This presentation was prepared for the Great Lakes PTTC under a cooperative agreement from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, or SAMHSA. The opinions expressed in this webinar are the views of the speakers and do not reflect the official position of the Department of Health and Human Services, or SAMHSA.

The Great Lakes PTTC believes that words matter and uses affirming language in all activities.

I want to, again, thank you for joining us. And just a few housekeeping items. If you have technical issues, please individually message me, Rebecca Buller, or Jen Winslow, in the chat section at the bottom of your screen and we will be happy to assist you. Questions for the speaker, please put those questions in your Q&A section, not the Chat section, also at the bottom of your screen. This helps us keep track of them and get them to the speaker throughout the presentation.

You will be directed to a link, which is a short survey at the end of the presentation. And we would really appreciate it if you could take the time to fill it out. It's about three minutes, but it helps us continue to provide this kind of training. And we share those results with our SAMHSA supporter. Certificates of attendance will be sent out via email to all who attend the full session. And it can take up to two weeks to receive those certificates.

Get Connected. Yes. If you would like to know more about what we're doing or information on upcoming events, please see our social media pages.

And now, let me introduce our presenter. Traci Toomey is a PhD and a Professor at the School of Public Health and serves as Director of the Alcohol Epidemiology program at the University of Minnesota. Her research focuses



on the prevention of problems related to use of substances including alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana. Much of her research has addressed underage alcohol use and over service of alcohol.

Dr. Toomey earned her PhD in epidemiology from the University of Minnesota. And now I'll turn things over to her.

TRACI TOOMEY: Thanks, Rebecca. I'm really happy to be here again this week to talk with everyone about underage drinking. I'm going to share my screen and pull up the slides and get us going.

So I have been working on underage drinking issues since the very beginning of my career in the early 1990s. And so I've spent a lot of time thinking about, well, why is it an issue and certainly a lot about what we can do about it.

When I began in the field in 1991, just to date myself a bit, the drinking age had increased across the country. And I'll talk a little bit more about that history in a few slides. But we were really struggling to think about what else can we do and how can we really drive down the numbers?

And it wasn't very common for people to be concerned about it, quite truthfully. I mean, there was a movement with the drinking age. And certainly there was some discussion at that time.

But when I would go out into the communities and talk with law enforcement, talk with parents, talk with a lot of different people in the communities about underage drinking, and many would kind of shrug the shoulders and say, well, you know, kids are going to be kids. They're going to drink. What are we going to do about it?

We're more concerned about marijuana. We're more concerned about other illicit drugs. And so there was a real movement to kind of change people's understanding of why should we care about it. And we really saw a movement across many states and communities to address underage drinking. And I'll talk again more about that history.

But we made a difference. And now I think we're in another time in history where we probably again need to say, well, why do we still need to care about underage drinking? So that's going to be what we're going to be talking about today. I want to talk a little bit about the history and where we've come, and then where we are currently, and some things that we can do about it.

So the first thing I want to talk about is how far we've come. So we sometimes, I think, forget to stop and celebrate the successes that we have had. When we're talking about creating changes, public health changes, changing complex behaviors that result in significant harm to the public's health, it takes time.



And as I'll tell my students oftentimes in the classroom, you have to persevere. You have to look at the long-term successes. We often do work and we don't see a change from day-to-day. Sometimes, we don't even see significant changes from year-to-year.

But we stop and we look back five years, 10 years, 20 years, 30 years and then we hope that we see some significant changes. So every year, I review as a consultant the Report to Congress on underage drinking as part of the STOP Act. And so I'm lucky enough to see data updated every year from a variety of different national surveys looking at underage drinking.

And I wanted to share with you-- I got permission to share with you a few of the graphs that were included in the report from last year and from the 2021 report. And this complicated table shows some of the progress that we have made. So this is for 12 to 20-year-olds.

So overall, just to orient you a bit, the years are running across. So this particular table looks at 2004 to 2019. So keeping in mind that the drinking age changes happened in the late '70s to '80s-- mid '80s. So this is kind of well past when the drinking ages were changed across many states.

So 2004 to 2018, if you look at the bottom row on the left side, you see that the very bottom row is for 12 to 20-year-olds. If we look all the way across, I have the red arrows on the two columns I want you to look at. If you look at the very bottom corner on the right side, we had a 35.5% decrease in past month alcohol use among 12 to 20-year-olds for that time period.

That's a very large drop in that time period. And we can look at this very narrow age ranges. So the next row up, 12 to 17-year-olds, a 46.6% decrease in past month alcohol use. Even if we go up to 12 to 13-year-olds, a much lower percentage of them drink so the percentage is going to look different. But 60.5% decrease among the 12 to 13-year-olds.

So we had a significant decrease across all of the specific age groups within that large 12 to 20-year-old range. Now, let's look at binge drinking. And in this case, it's five or more drinks in a row for boys, four-plus drinks in a row for girls or young adults. And this is past month binge drinking. And this is just for the years 2015 to 2019.

And again, we see large decreases. So at the very bottom row again, looking on the left side, 12 to 20-year-olds. Now, look all the way to the right side under the rightmost arrow. And you'll see that for that large age range a 17.2% decrease.

Again, it's a little bit variable across the different specific age groups. But again, consistently a large decrease. And this is since 2015. These graphs, the A, in the upper left hand corner, rates of binge drinking in the past two



weeks among male and female eighth graders, this is from in the future, which has data going back to 1991.

So 1991 to 2018, you see eighth grade males and females. And you'll see they weren't binge drinking at a extremely high rate in 1991. But we still see a decrease going to 2019.

Looking at panel B on the right, you see rates of binge drinking in the past two weeks among male and female 10th graders. And they were binge drinking in 1991 about 25% of 10th grade males and just under 20% of 10th grade females were binge drinking in the past two weeks. And you'll see that it's all the way to 2019 that that's a fairly significant slope going down to just under 10%.

Now if you look at panel C on the left lower corner, you see rates of binge drinking in the past two weeks among male and female 12th graders. And again, you see a really fairly steep drop from 1991 to 2019.

Panel D is an interesting one. It's more complex, because it's male and female college students and male and female non-college students but in the same age bracket. And with the female non-college young adults, the purple line on the bottom you see that we didn't see quite as much of a drop, because they were lower to begin with. But if you look at the blue line, male college students. That's a pretty steep curve. And the same with the green line we see for male non-college young adults.

So this is an age group that for many years we thought was going to be very difficult to change, both college students and non-college students. So when I think about my time in the field and I look at that, those graphs, I think, wow, we made a difference even in this young adult age group, which is really tremendous. So I want to stop for a moment and just say, wow, that's a huge amount of work.

And we should stop and be excited about this change and acknowledge it and congratulate the people that have been working on this issue for many, many years. Some of you maybe in the last few years, some of you for decades. And that's amazing, because we made some of these changes in the early years without having a lot of knowledge about what works and what doesn't work.

And I'll talk more about that too in a few minutes. But we persevered, right? We worked hard. People were working on policy changes and we had success. So I want to just stop and say thank you to all of you that have been working on this issue and helping to make those changes happen.

And I also want to say that as much as we want to celebrate that success, we also have to be careful how we talk about that success, because I do worry that when I say, oh, look at these graphs and how far we've come, that some



people are going to walk away and say, well, great. We're done. We've had success. And so why don't we shift our resources and attention to some other issues?

And so I'm going to talk more in just a minute about why even though we can celebrate that success, we still have more work to do. And we're going to have to talk to other people about why this is still an important issue to address. I'm going to stop my slides for just one moment though, because as I'm walking through this presentation, it would really help to orient me to know how many people participated in the webinar that I did last week talking about alcohol policies in general so that I know kind of what I need to cover or versus how many of you kind of know that baseline knowledge about alcohol policy.

So I'm going to just stop for one second here. And Rebecca, can I get your help with doing the first poll. So did you attend the webinar last week "Affecting Change through Alcohol Control Policies"?

REBECCA BULLER: We're at about 80% of respondents. Do you want me to end?

TRACI TOOMEY: Yes, I think I have a good sense of where the group is at. OK, so should I hit the Share Results button?

REBECCA BULLER: Sorry, I thought I did.

TRACI TOOMEY: Well, maybe. We both can control things. So just to orient everyone, about a third of all of you attended last week. Thank you for coming back this week. And many of you are new.

So along the way I will probably make some points that I made last week. For those that weren't in attendance, there's not a huge overlap. But I just wanted to explain that to those of you who attended last week. Hopefully, it just reinforces some of the messaging from last week if you're hearing it for the second time.

But most of what I'll be presenting today are new. So I wanted to reassure you all of that. OK, I want to go back to sharing my screen. OK, so as I said, we had great success so far.

And let's talk a little bit why I think that we've seen some of that success. If we would be able to go back before 1991, we would see that we had decreases in underage drinking even prior to 1991. So the base of a lot of the changes that we see historically come from the fact that we have an age 21 drinking age.



Now, how did that come about? Well, the history is post-prohibition, the control for alcohol policy was given to the states. And so at that time, the age of majority was 21. So all the states had an age of 21 drinking age.

Then, as we moved into the '60s and '70s when we had the Vietnam War and many young people were going to war, the age of majority for voting and everything, you know, what became adulthood dropped to 18. And so there was a real movement to lower the drinking age in many states. And many states did.

Now, it wasn't a uniform drop. Some stayed age 21. Some changed to 18. Like in Wisconsin, it was 18. And Minnesota, it was 19. And that was true when I was going through school.

So what happened is 18-year-olds drove across to Wisconsin and they could drink in Wisconsin because they couldn't drink here in Minnesota. So it ended up with this really non-uniform drinking age across the country. Where the drinking age dropped, researchers found evidence that when the drinking age dropped consumption went up.

We also saw kind of this border crossing which increased the likelihood of traffic crashes and injuries and deaths resulting from more drinking and more people kind of driving further to get alcohol legally. So along the way, there was a movement to raise the drinking age across many of these states that had lowered the drinking age because of concern primarily around traffic crashes at that time. And so there was a real concern, because traffic crashes were also going up.

So traffic crash deaths and injuries among young people. So some states started to raise their drinking age. And the advocates started making the point that this lack of uniformity across the states was contributing to more problems. So there was a pressure on the federal government to do something. And they couldn't say though, there is going to be a uniform drinking age because the power rested with the states.

What they could do, though, is offer an incentive or pressure to states to change their drinking age. And so they said they were going to take away the state highway dollars to states that did not raise their drinking age back up to 21 by a certain date. So by a date in 1988.

This was signed by President Ronald Reagan, who was a state rights advocate. And so it was a very interesting thing that he did sign this. And so by 1988, all states had raised their drinking age back up to age 21.

Now, all states have an age 21 drinking age. But I'll let you know that it's not still as uniform as it could be. There's exceptions built in to each of these states. Like in Minnesota, you can drink alcohol in your home with your parent or guardians-- presence and permission. I believe in Wisconsin it's still the



case that you can drink in bars in the presence of your adult or legal-aged spouse.

Please, in the chat box, let me know if that has changed in Wisconsin. So each state, you have to know kind of what the exceptions are. And the alcohol policy information system that NIAA funds, APIS-- and I don't have the link in this week's slide, but if you just search APIS and alcohol, the APIS website will come up. And you can look at what are the exceptions in your state to understand what's allowable and what's not.

So setting aside those exceptions, however, and just looking at the age 21 overall policy, researchers found that as the drinking age went up across these states, it was another natural experience. And so they could look at the effects of the increase in the drinking age. And there is significant evidence through very robust research studies that as the drinking age went up, consumption rates went down.

We also saw a decrease in traffic crashes. And there's quite a bit of evidence in that area. And there's also some evidence that as the drinking age went up, we also saw a decrease in suicides, hospital admissions, pedestrian accidents, and things like vandalism. So the drinking age is one of the most well-studied alcohol control policies that we have.

And we have evidence that just the change in the drinking age was effective in changing consumption, as well as problems. So that happened in the years leading up to 1988. So the longest graph that I showed you of the monitoring future data started in 1991. And we continue to see decreases in consumption and things like traffic crashes.

So what else contributed to that success? That ongoing success, those numbers that have continued to decrease over time? And when I started in 1991, as I said, we didn't really have a lot of research evidence to guide us. So I was working on Project Northland and Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol, or CMCA, which are two model programs. They both had community components.

And I was supposed to go out into the community and work with the community leaders and advocates. And they would ask, well, what works? What else should we be doing? We have an age 21 drinking age. What else should we be doing?

And I'm going to share with you the list that I have shared with them. And I also had to say, well, the drinking age is effective. We know that. And we have some other ideas, but we don't have a lot of research to know what works. And so there really was a movement to kind of put into place some of those things that we thought might work.



And my career, after being kind of frustrated that I couldn't answer those questions, much of my career has been driven by the desire to be able to give answers to people to say what works. Now, I still don't have all the answers. We're still learning in the research field. But we know more than we did in 1991. We know more than we did 10 years ago.

And we know that a lot of communities have been doing a lot of different types of work. And we'll talk about some specifics. And it is working to help drive down the numbers around other underage drinking. So some of those things that they're doing has been changing state level policies, as well as local level policies, and working to enforce some of those policies to prevent young people from getting access to alcohol.

I put education with a question mark because I know also that during this time period, there's also been education in the schools, curriculum in the schools. And Project Northland included a school-based component and parent component, and then community component. My dissertation was on Project Northland. And so I helped develop some of the curriculum in the schools. And my dissertation was related to the seventh grade parent component or curriculum.

And so I do believe there can be value in doing that education of parents, education of the students. But the findings are kind of mixed in terms of it's unlikely that we're just going to educate ourselves out of these type of problems, right? That we can educate kids, but then if we put them back into the same environment that encourages them to drink alcohol, it's very unlikely that those education programs are going to have any sustained effects.

So I would argue that we need to change policies in the broader environment. That alone, we have some evidence can reduce underage drinking and related problems. And certainly, we need to change the environment to complement anything that is in the schools or complement anything that we are doing with parents.

The Community Prevention Guide is a systematic review of different types of strategies cutting across different content areas. So one area they reviewed are strategies targeting excessive alcohol use. And the initial review is conducted by trained staff working with a committee that includes researchers, as well as practitioners reviewing the research literature, coming up with recommendations that a task force that, again, includes researchers and practitioners and policymakers who decide whether or not there's sufficient evidence to recommend policies or not to that have been recommended that are specific to underage drinking are to maintain the current minimum legal drinking age.

So we want to make sure we defend that drinking age. And the other is to enhance enforcement of laws prohibiting sales to minors. So I'll be talking more about that.



Some of the other areas we are still developing the body of research-- and I should say that this committee disbanded around excessive alcohol use in 2010, I think, was the last review. And I'm hoping that they will do some updates to give us more recent reviews and recommendations. I will at the end of the presentation have some of the other recommendations that are broader than for just underage drinking.

So we have this drinking age that we know, despite some of the imperfections of the exceptions across states, despite the fact that we pass the minimum drinking age and kids still continue to drink and we had to do more work, but we have this recommendation that we maintain the drinking age. And I think this is really an important recommendation because seems like every year I hear that there are some states that are trying to lower the drinking age. And there's a lot of arguments. And I'm going to talk about some of them that come up about why we should lower the drinking age.

But it's something that if you care about underage drinking, that we need to pay attention to and fight to keep it. Because again, this is the most well-studied alcohol policy that we have. And we know that it is effective. And I have great concerns that if we lower the drinking age again, we're going to repeat history and we're going to see lowering of the drinking age and increases in problems as a result in consumption and problems. So I want to stop my slides again for a moment. And let's have the second poll, Rebecca.

So has there been a recent proposal in your state to lower the minimum legal drinking age?

I see the note from Jennifer. I'd also like to reiterate, if you have questions along the way, please put them in the Q&A box. I'm happy to pause at any point to answer questions.

REBECCA BULLER: We do have a question. So maybe after the poll we can get to that.

TRACI TOOMEY: Great.

REBECCA BULLER: We have about 75% responded. Shall I end it and share?

TRACI TOOMEY: Yes, please. So I see 6% or 5% said that they have had proposals or know of proposals. 46% said they don't know. And 49% said no.

So for those that don't know, it's just something that you should keep an eye out for because it does pop up over the years. Minnesota has had it pop up many times. I'm sure Wisconsin, just because I pay attention because I work with people in Wisconsin. So I'm more aware of Wisconsin than some of the other surrounding states.



But most likely, it's going to come up. And I think we need to have some responses for why we should keep the age 21 drinking age. So I'm going to put my slides back up. And then let's at the same time answer questions that are there.

Oops. Sorry. I think I put up the wrong thing.

REBECCA BULLER: Mary asks, according to our Youth Survey, the number one place our youth are obtaining alcohol is at home with their parents' permission. Can you speak to strategies to address this issue, as it is not really impacted by drinking age and sales to minors?

TRACI TOOMEY: If it's OK, I'm going to hold off on that question. I'm going to try to remember to answer it in just a few slides. And if I don't, please just prompt us again. I just have a better place to answer that as we talk about access or where young adults are getting alcohol. Is there another question?

REBECCA BULLER: No, just that one.

TRACI TOOMEY: OK, so I don't want to leave that one behind. So it's an important question.

REBECCA BULLER: I'm going to keep it-- I'll keep it in the queue until I hear you answer it.

TRACI TOOMEY: OK, that sounds great. One thing that I think is really important as we talk about the drinking age and why we should keep it, as there's proposals that float out there to lower it, or you might be just having conversations with people. Maybe you're doing this kind of presentation. And I thought I saw something in the chat, but I can't see the chat. So I just want everyone to know that, that there's common challenges to the age 21 drinking age that come up routinely.

I used to say if I had \$1 for every time that I've had to answer a question related to the drinking age, I would be wealthier than I am. Much wealthier than I am currently. And I've answered some of the same questions since 1991 when I started in the field.

And I was at the Alcohol Policy Conference, National Conference, a couple of weeks ago. And I was surprised when someone that mostly focuses on illicit drinks, sorry, illicit drugs, raised one of the criticisms. And it was like, oh my gosh, if she raises it, I'm sure that many others still have the same criticism or question. And so it reminded me to make sure that in this presentation today that we talk a little bit about some of those challenges to the drinking age so that all of you are prepared to answer those challenges if you're faced with them.



So what this person at the conference brought up was this concept. Or it's a common statement. These are not accurate statements. These are just things that people say. Europe has a lower drinking age and youth there drink less. And so let's talk about that.

So a lot of people think that, oh, they don't have problems with alcohol because they drink wine with their meals and they don't do the excessive drinking that we do. First of all, Europe is not necessarily homogeneous. There's very different countries. And they have different drinking rates, drinking styles, and different laws around alcohol use and also around things related to drinking and driving.

And so it's hard to compare one country to another. So that's the one cautionary tale. And we also have to make sure that we know the facts and that we understand some of the differences across the states. But the first thing is, do, in fact, young people in European countries drink less than in the US because they have a lower drinking age? Well, this is also something that's in a STOP Act. Sorry, my mouse is very sensitive. It moves very easily to the slides.

This, again, is a graph that's in a STOP Act. This is 15 to 16-year-olds in Europe who reported drinking in heavy episodic drinking in the past 30 days compared with US 10th graders. And so if you look at the very top, that is the United States. The blue bars represent binge drinking. And the yellow part represents 30 day use.

So if you just compare the binge drinking, which is something that we're quite concerned about because that's high-risk drinking, we're at 14.4%, Denmark 59%, Germany 54%, Czech Republic 39%, Austria 49%. Just you can scan down the graph, right? And you can see that even if you go down to Norway at 6%, it's still higher than what we have in the United States.

So in fact, across European countries, both Western and Eastern Europe, we see that the young people in this very narrow age group are binge drinking at higher rates than the youth-- again, very specific age group, 10th graders-- in the United States. The other thing is if we start talking about different types of problems, we have to recognize that in the United States we combine alcohol use a drinking culture with a driving culture. So we are a large country. We have high gas rates at the moment, but still significantly lower expense than what is currently in Europe.

So it costs less to drive here. We have less mass transit options than many of the European countries. And some of the European countries have much stricter laws around drinking and driving. So it's possible that their traffic crash data looks very different than ours. And you can't attribute it to the drinking age. It is most likely attributed to other types of policies and structures.



We need to look at other types of outcomes too. So like if you look at adult drinking, if you look at France, they have higher rates of liver cirrhosis. So the type of drinking that they do there may lead to different types of problems than the problems that are seen in the United States. But going back to this first challenge, number one, that Europe has lowered drinking age, and thus, they have youth that drink less, hopefully you can bring up this slide and just point out that that isn't an accurate statement and point out that it can be a really big challenge as we compare across different countries. Some of the reasons we see differences in rates of problems.

The second challenge that often will come up is if an 18 to 20-year-old can go to war, they should be able to drink. Now, this is a good discussion. I think it's an important one to bring up. And we probably all won't agree on this particular one.

However, I might say that instead of lowering the drinking age, maybe we should raise the age in which people go to war. And so that's one counterargument. The other is that along the way people will say, well, the military supports lowering the drinking age because of the fact that they have 18 to 20-year-olds going to war. Well, I have had interactions with the military.

They have actually great concerns about excessive drinking among the military personnel 18 to 20-year-olds and older, because they put a lot of money into training soldiers and it is not optimal for them when they drink and are injured or killed as a result of alcohol use. They need a military that is ready for duty and alcohol contributes to them not being ready for duty. So the military is actively and historically has worked to try to figure out how to address alcohol use among the military personnel.

Challenge number three, a lower drinking age would result in youth drinking in safer environments, such as bars, rather than unsupervised parties. Now, I'm certainly concerned about parties. That's where a lot of young people get access to alcohol. And there are some things that we can talk about, trying to reduce the number of parties that are in place where they're drinking too much. However, I would argue that bars aren't always safer drinking environments.

We have much evidence that bars and restaurants, other types of establishments, will over serve alcohol, serve individuals until they are intoxicated, and continue to serve them after they are already intoxicated so that they are even more intoxicated. And there have been many stories, like when someone's 21 they go to a bar and 21 shots are put in front of them, which is not safe for anybody. So just because there's other people there doesn't necessarily mean it's a safer environment.

I think we should be focusing on creating safer environments in the bars for everybody and decreasing the availability of alcohol from other types of places, including parties. Challenge number four, it makes alcohol a forbidden



fruit and they will drink more. So we have a long history with the drinking age. We had states that changed their drinking age at different times. So there's research evidence to refute this challenge, that, in fact, as the drinking ages were changed, those young people who aged in states that had the higher drinking age compared to those that had a lower drinking age, when they hit ages 21, 22, 23, those in the higher drinking age states continue to drink at lower rates at 21 and above than those that were consuming alcohol in states that had the lower drinking age.

In challenge number five, a higher drinking age makes you switch to more dangerous substances. So we're always worried about substitution, right? So if we change something over here, it's going to kind of pop out someplace else. So that's something that we always want to make sure that we're checking unintended consequences. And when the drinking age change, and as we tightened access to alcohol, we actually didn't see a huge shift to other substances. And there's some evidence that alcohol and tobacco are this idea of a gateway drug that if people use tobacco and alcohol as young people, they are more likely to use other drugs in addition to alcohol and tobacco.

So if we lower the drinking rates, we also hope to see that maybe we see less use of other drugs as well. Now what's a little tricky is we're also living in a time where marijuana-cannabis policies are changing rapidly across our states. And that's certainly going to affect the use of marijuana in cannabis. But that may be independent of the changes in the alcohol consumption just because those policies are changing in the context of maybe not as much work being done around alcohol currently.

So I just want pause for a second. Are there any questions that come up for anyone around addressing some of these challenges?

REBECCA BULLER: Well, we do have the one question you heard earlier about parents. And then another person said, do you think DORA laws will further exacerbate the issue of underage drinking in states where minors are allowed to drink with their families?

TRACI TOOMEY: The DOAR laws?

REBECCA BULLER: DORA.

TRACI TOOMEY: DORA? Can someone tell me what that is? Sorry, I just--

REBECCA BULLER: Can you type it in the chat. We'll clarify. It was an anonymous question, so I can't ask. Not seeing any. Oh, here we go. Designated outdoor refreshment areas.

TRACI TOOMEY: So I'm guessing that those laws are about putting some restrictions on alcohol use in those areas, is that what those laws are?



REBECCA BULLER: I'm thinking it's drinking outdoor restricted area. It's when we think about festivals and things like that where they have a beer garden, or.

TRACI TOOMEY: Yeah, and certainly that's a concept that I'm familiar within the festival. So what is the beginning part of that question now that I am oriented to the policy?

REBECCA BULLER: Yeah. Do you think that these DORA laws will further exasperate the issue of underage drinking in states where minors are allowed to drink with their families?

TRACI TOOMEY: It's a great question. We always have to kind of think about that, right? So I don't have an answer whether it will do that or not, but it's definitely something where you have those exceptions where young people can consume alcohol with their families, their parents or guardians, or legal aged spouses in public settings. And if we increase kind of a new place that they can consume alcohol, then, yes, I would have some concern that that could increase the amount of consumption.

In general, I'm going to advocate for policies and strategies that kind of tighten the exceptions to the minimum legal drinking age policies and reduce the places and opportunities for people to consume alcohol. And I'm not forgetting the parent question. I'm going to still come back to that one.

REBECCA BULLER: OK, great.

TRACI TOOMEY: And we can talk maybe more about the festivals and other types of settings as well. I just want to with this concept of will young people switch to other substances, this is from, again, the STOP Act Report to Congress 2021, the NSDUH data. And this is from 2019. Just so you know, the 2020 data is really hard to look at because with the pandemic the surveying and stuff really changed and was not as complete. So you'll see this in the upcoming STOP Act Report is that it's very hard to talk about what's happening of during the pandemic years.

So this is from 2019, pre-pandemic. When you look at the 12 to 20-year-old age group, 18.5% reported past month use of alcohol, 12.1% for marijuana, and 9.1% for tobacco, and only 3.2% of illicit drugs other than marijuana. So the drinking age had an effect. We've done a lot of work to drive down the numbers. There's concern around marijuana and illicit drugs. And yet, look at these data suggesting that alcohol is still number one and it's still contributing to a lot of different deaths and problems, including traffic crashes, homicides, suicides, falls due to and resulting in injuries and deaths, drownings, progression to other drug use, assaults, rapes, teen pregnancies, and because in the Midwest, many of our states, we have snowmobiles. I like to include the snowmobile crashes.



So there's many problems that despite the fact that we have had so much success with underage drinking, we still have people drinking at rates that are too high. Young people drinking at too high of a rate. And it's still contributing to many different problems that are killing young people and injuring them and affecting their lives currently and long-term. So we still have to make sure that we don't shift all our resources to some of the other drugs. My group was just talking about this because issues around fentanyl and opioids.

It's kind of horrific what's happening in a lot of places, right? The marijuana laws are changing. So we need to be concerned about that and watch what happens. But yet we know we still have a lot of problems with alcohol, but we don't talk about that as much, right? There's not a lot of funding going into alcohol prevention unlike a few years ago or a decade or two decades ago when the federal government was putting a lot of money into drinking. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation was funding coalitions across the US to address it.

It's not kind of a popular topic currently. And I've been in public health long enough to know that tobacco was really the hot issue. Then weight gain prevention was the hot issue. And so what is kind of the hot, most funded issue changes over time even when we haven't solved the problem that was previously funded. And alcohol is kind of there.

It's kind of pervasive in our communities, but a lot of people think either we've addressed it or they don't care about it. And we have to kind of make sure it's not the hidden substance that people understand that it's a legal substance. However, we still have young people dying from this substance and using it at a rate higher than we would like to see. And we want to prevent these kind of problems. A whole range of problems.

So I've now just presented to you this whole thing about the drinking age and that it's effective and we've done all these things and we've had success, but we still have young people drinking. And so you might say, well, why are they still drinking after all the work that we have done? Why do we still have some that are still drinking and drinking to excess? And this is where we need to, again, talk about the broader environment.

So we're trying to prevent alcohol-related problems, which is this box on the far right. We're trying to do that by changing at the population level rates of excessive alcohol use or past month use for young people-- any drinking for young people. So we're trying to change population level rates of drinking. And we can do this by focusing on individual level factors about their knowledge, their attitudes, a lot of genetic susceptibility. There's a lot of things that at an individual level can affect whether a young person decides to drink or drink too much.

However, these individual level factors are often things like knowledge and attitudes and perceptions are shaped by the broader environment in which



young people live. So again, if we just focus on these individual factors and not the broader environment, which is the legal availability. So that's the age 21 drinking age and enforcing the drinking age. I'm going to skip over a form of social controls, which is kind of tied to enforcement and norms. But economic availability-- how cheap is it for a young person? You know, can they afford to purchase alcohol or purchase alcohol and apply it to other kids?

And just the physical availability-- how easy is it to get alcohol in their communities and states? And this broader environment is influenced by the public policy and institutional policies and structures that are in our communities and state. So we need to change the broader environment because it influences underage drinking behavior. And ultimately, the problems related to underage drinking.

We also know that any young person can drink too much alcohol on one occasion and be killed or injured or experience some type of problem because they drank alcohol too much one time. So the magnitude of the problem is all the people that might drink too much on a given night. That's a big part of the population, right?

So it's hard to reach out to individuals that are at the highest risk because we don't know who's going to be at high risk on any given evening. We can certainly focus on those that are addicted or meet some medical definition of an individual who abuses alcohol or is addicted to alcohol and get help to them. But that's a group that turns over quite frequently, hard to identify. And those that meet that medical definition do not account for the most problems because anyone who drinks too much on a given day can experience a problem.

There's many more of those kind of moderate light drinkers that drink too much occasionally and experience a problem than individuals who meet a medical definition and are really high individual level risk. But they're not the ones contributing to most of the population level of problems. And if we look at the individual-oriented efforts, again, they typically have short-term effects by themselves, because when we try to change individuals, and then again we put them back into that environment, we're getting the same messaging, the same cues then any effects that you might have had in those individual programs. Education programs or treatment programs are not going to be as effective because when they go back out and they continue to hear that alcohol is cool, it's OK to drink if they don't drive, sure, I'm going to buy you a drink, everyone is drinking, I used to buy it for myself, so I'm going to buy it for you-- those messages specific to young people, those are hard to counteract with just an education program in the schools.

So if we look at possible strategies to change the environment around underage drinking, then we have to focus on, I would argue, policy changes, which can happen to some degree at the federal level. Again, alcohol was given to states to control. Some states do almost all the control at the state



level. Some states have given a lot of control to local communities. So we say they are local control states.

So you have to know what's possible in your state and in your local community, whether it's at the city or county level. So what is possible to change. And know that the federal government, they can twist the arms of states through their highway funds and other mechanisms. They did that with the drinking age. They did that, by the way, also to get states to lower the blood alcohol content limit from 0.1 to 0.08. That's why we have 0.08 across all states currently, except for Utah, which dropped to 0.05.

And we can do some work at institutional levels. So in schools, colleges, and universities, work sites. So we can look at policies at every level. We have to figure out what's most feasible, what's going to affect the population that we are most interested in working on and reach with different types of policies. When we talk about policy change, it's also really important that people are aware that the policies exist and have skill sets to comply with the policy that we put in place. And I will say that my least favorite story about lack of awareness was that many years ago Minnesota passed the "Not A Drop" Law. So the Youth BAC Law in Minnesota, which young people could not have any alcohol in their system, or above 0.2.

And I was in a roomful of parents and law enforcement agents. And someone asked the question if they knew what the current law was for underage or for youth around the BAC? And very few people in the room knew what the law was. So if law enforcement, who needs to enforce it was not aware of that policy, or parents who may need to enforce it in their homes are not aware of it, what's the likelihood that policy is going to have as large of an effect as we hope it would?

Similarly, if we don't enforce it-- and enforcement can be law enforcement, it can be licensing agencies, it can be parents enforcing family policy, colleges enforcing their own underage drinking policies. But somebody can apply some consequence for violating a policy that's in place at the institutional, local, state, or federal level. So when we talk about enforcement, we want to make sure people know that there's a likelihood that they're going to face a consequence. So there's some certainty.

That's the most important concept, by the way, from the research literature saying people believing that they're going to get caught and have a penalty is really important. Severity can be important. It has to be a meaningful consequence. But if it's a really, really, really severe consequence, then it's probably not going to be enforced. Because parents are going to be like, oh, that's too severe. Law enforcement or judges are going to say, oh, that's too severe penalty.

So we have to have that balancing act of severe enough that people believe that it matters, combined with the likelihood that it's actually going to be



applied. And we should have consequences that happen fairly quickly after the violation of the policy occurs. If it's in the criminal justice system, if it's two years later, it's going to be less effective than maybe an administrative penalty that happens right after the violation occurs.

So what I just described were the basic components of something called Deterrence Theory, which guides a lot of things around enforcement. And that certainty has come up as people have evaluated those components. And again, certainty, the perceived certainty of getting caught-- I'm going to emphasize that and come back to that concept for some of the policies that I'm going to be talking about in just a minute. When we talk about the environment and we want to talk about preventing or changing that environment, now let's talk about what is in the environment and what might we need to change through those policies?

The first is the type of products that show up. So these are old products, but I just happen to have this slide to make my point, is that this is an ever-changing field. That back a number of years there was something 30-proof shots that were being put out there that were oatmeal cookie flavored. And I would go out and the company that made them said they were targeting 30-year-old men with oatmeal cookie flavored shots.

And if they would have said women, I would have bought it a little bit more because women tend to like sweet flavored drinks more than 30-year-old men. And anyways, it's like who's most likely to consume oatmeal cookie flavored drinks? It's probably going to be a young person that's just starting to drink alcohol.

And so when you go to a liquor store or if other types of products are sold in convenience stores in grocery stores in your state, just look at what is out there. What might appeal to a young person? If a young person had a little container that's like a jell-o shot, like the lower right-hand corner, would you think it's pudding or jell-o and not realize, again, that it's a 30 proof shot built into it. And so these things are easy for young people to hide from adults in their life.

They can be high concentration of alcohol and they can get drunk on them. And they're likely to appeal to youth because they often will start with the sweet flavored beverages and then move on to other drinks. So be aware of these products and maybe advocate for not allowing them in the stores around you.

There's a growing body of research evidence on the effects of marketing, whether it's those products or alcohol in general. This is not my area of expertise. There's still a resource that it's not being updated now, but it's the CAMY, the Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth, still has resources available on that website that I've listed here. And David Jernigan headed CAMY and continues to do research in this area, looking at where



advertisements appear that might expose use to the advertisements and looking at what is included in advertising and the effects of advertising. So there's a growing body of literature suggesting that that is an area of concern in getting young people to drink and drink more.

Much of my career has been focused on preventing access to alcohol. So this idea is that we change policies and sometimes programs when we look at institutional policies to prevent kids from getting hold of alcohol. And my argument is if regardless of their perceptions about drinking, their attitudes, knowledge, regardless of all those individual level things, even if they want to drink, if they can't get it, they're not going to drink. So what can we do to decrease the likelihood that young people are actually going to get alcohol and obtain it?

And so when we talk about strategies, what else can we do, I'd like to talk about what is it that we can do to prevent access. This is a slide going back many years. But we have done some work just looking how easy is it for young people to get alcohol from a variety of different sources. This came from pseudo underage purchase attempts where people who looked underage went out, attempted to purchase alcohol without showing age ID, and were easily able to purchase alcohol. And I'll present some results of that study in just a minute.

But when we talk about access to alcohol, let's talk about the flow of alcohol. This box in the upper left is licensed establishments. It's a privilege to have a license to sell alcohol. Not a right. It's a privilege.

So we say that bars, restaurants, liquor stores, convenience stores, or whoever's got a license to sell alcohol, including community festivals with temporary licenses, they were given the privilege to sell and make money off of alcohol. And they need to comply with the law, whatever your law is in your state and your community. So in most states, it's illegal in general to sell to an underage person.

So there are strategies that we can do to prevent them from selling to an underage person being out of compliance with the law. Then there's a flow where licensed establishments are legally selling alcohol to an individual 21 and over. So they're doing their job. They're selling to someone that's 21 and over.

It can be an underage person's coworker, their friends, their parents, their siblings, or strangers, right, that are approached outside liquor stores. Hey mister, will you buy me a drink? Shoulder tapping.

They become social providers in some circumstances. So they legally purchased alcohol and then they illegally provide alcohol to underage youth. Again, you need to understand in your state what is legal and what's not legal.



So in Minnesota, legal for a parent or guardian in their own home to provide alcohol to kids, but not in other circumstances.

Those minimum legal drinking age exceptions, again, you need to understand what they are in your state so you know what's legal and what's not legal, what's an expansion, what's not an expansion. So once underage youth get alcohol either from an illegal purchase or from a legal, social provision, oftentimes they become providers to other underage youth. So some people say, well, not many young people are buying alcohol from a licensed establishment.

That may be true, but what if one underage person illegally purchases five beer kegs and brings them to a party? They've now provided alcohol to a large number of underage youth. So this access point still may be a concern in your community.

We should also, when we're talking about access, recognize that it's variable across age groups, right? So a really young person might sneak alcohol from the parents without the parent's knowledge. Or parents may give it to them. I want to make the point here about parents that there is a growing body of research that shows that when parents provide alcohol to their own children with their permission, in their presence, that those young people are also more likely to purchase alcohol-- sorry, not purchase.

When they drink with their parents permission in their presence, they're also more likely to drink more in other settings when their parents have not given them permission or are not present. So parents thinking that they're teaching their kids how to drink responsibly may be leading to kids drinking more and maybe irresponsibility when the parents are not present. So parents are an issue.

They need to think about access in the home. What can they do to secure alcohol in the home? One recommendation may be don't have alcohol stored in the home. If you do, lock it up. Monitor it. And maybe we need to make sure that parents are aware. So this may be an educational strategy.

But make sure that they are aware of the potential consequences when they think they're maybe doing the right thing by teaching their kids to drink in their presence that they may also be contributing to their kids drinking elsewhere and being at high risk of problems in this other type of situation. As kids get a little older, they're going to start to go to parties and have social provision from maybe older friends or siblings, or again, other underage youth who get it from a variety of sources. So we need to look at where are those parties happening? How do we prevent the parties from occurring? How do we break up the parties so they don't last as long and kids have less opportunity to drink for long hours at these parties?



I'll bring up a few strategies, but I'll be upfront. This is an area that we continue to need to figure out how to tackle some of these underage drinking parties. And it may depend on the context of where those parties are occurring.

Shoulder tapping. I mentioned that. So we still have young people that just approach adults outside of a liquor store and say here's a \$20. Can you buy some alcohol for me? We did a study looking at that with pseudo underage people going up and then asking them. We did find variability-- younger men were more likely to agree to purchase it.

But you need to understand what the age group-- like if you're worried about 18 to 20-year-olds, maybe they're more likely to do this than if you're focusing on 8th graders. Also, know that it may not be happening at all in your community. But in other communities it may be happening. So you need to think about your age group that you're focusing on, as well as what is happening in your community. Where are young people getting alcohol in your community?

I mentioned that I would give you some data about how easy was it for young people to get alcohol when they looked under 21. So they looked at 18 to 20 with these pseudo underage protocols and they did not present any age identification whatsoever. And these particular studies found about half the time with multiple purchase attempts made in the same establishments they were able to purchase alcohol without showing any ID.

I will tell you that as years went on and work was done to address the likelihood of illegal alcohol sales, we saw the likelihood of those illegal sales dropping in many communities, particularly those that were doing compliance checks, which I'll talk about in just a minute. And my concern however, is that things are changing and the progress that we've made in decreasing the likelihood of those sales to young people, my hope is that we don't lose some of that success in part because of the pandemic and shifting resources.

So I presented a lot of history of things that we had a lot of ideas. We've done more research and moved some of those ideas to practice, which allowed more research. So it's an ongoing increase in research evidence that we have moving from some very specific ideas to understanding more what works. But there's more research that's needed. So when I went years ago and presented lists of things that could be done in the communities as part of CMC and Project Northland, these were some of the lists that were created for trying to prevent illegal alcohol sales.

We talked about compliance checks. And I want to talk more about that in a minute, an administrative penalty. So I'm not going to lose time here. But we also talked about having a minimum age of a seller. How old does someone have to be able to sell alcohol in your state? It's probably variable by



convenience stores and liquor stores and bars and restaurants. At least in Minnesota, there's some variation. But it's good to know.

We know that younger appearing servers and sellers are more likely to sell than people that are older. And that may come from experience, but just imagine being 18 and trying to refuse service to someone that is 20. If they're not trained on how to do that and then backed up by managers, then they're probably more likely going to make that illegal sale. So server training is there to give them some skills and knowledge, not sufficient by itself.

We need to train managers how to back up their staff, how to monitor the staff. The research also suggests that that's not sufficient to prevent underage sales. So I'm going to highlight compliance checks because the research shows that compliance checks have helped to drive down the likelihood of illegal sales to young people. We also know that false IDs are a problem, false age identification. So making sure that our state identification is hard to falsify and that there's penalties in place for that. There's just less research evidence about those particular policies.

Strategies to prevent social provision. Keg registration. Many, many states have keg registration policies. A keg tag is put on it with an ID registered along with information about the purchaser of the keg so that when police come and everyone scatters, they know they can track who purchased the keg and hold that person accountable for a legal provision.

Research literature is still growing in this area but it's a little bit mixed about the effects of keg registration. I have a few reasons why. I'll get to that. Restrictions at community events or community festivals that already came up. Another access point.

When we looked at community festivals, we found about 50% of the time someone that looked underage could purchase alcohol without an ID. I know that a lot of communities have focused on preventing these types of illegal sales, so I don't know what the current likelihood is. But it's an area to look at if you haven't already. Maybe you need to do compliance checks at your community festivals. Maybe need to train those volunteers who are serving the alcohol. Probably some work needs to be done to prevent the likelihood of illegal sales at those events.

Then there's things like restrictions in public places, restricting noisy assembly. Those are just kind of access points to go in and kind of disrupt parties once they do occur. Social host liability policies. A lot of states and a lot of communities have put social host liability policies in place to hold the landowner, or landlord, or person in charge of the property accountable for any parties or underage drinking that's occurring on their property. Again, growing body of research looking at the effects of these policies.



Then there's party patrols. Just going out, trying to find out where the parties are, preventing them from occurring or breaking them up when they do happen. Again, growing body of research looking at what makes a party patrol effective or not. And then we could do shoulder tap campaigns. Not a lot of research on that, but kind of doing compliance checks where we're trying to find those that are willing to provide for an underage person and maybe having them be educated and face some consequence for doing that.

I mentioned I wanted to focus on compliance checks just because they are effective. These are conducted by local law enforcement or maybe your state alcohol beverage control agent in your state. Underage people attempt to purchase alcohol. If there is an alcohol sale, there's potential consequences for the license holder and the server and the clerk.

I will make the pitch that it should not be just a server and clerk because they are sometimes trying to refuse a sale and then their manager will tell them to make the sale. So they are not often always backed up. So the license holder is the one with the privilege to sell alcohol. I believe there should be some type of administrative penalty if there's legal sales at a given establishment.

It could be a warning the first time. And then maybe a fine the next time. And ultimately a suspension or license revocation if there's repeated behavior.

We know from the research that it does reduce the likelihood of sales to underage people at both off-premise establishments-- liquor stores, community grocery stores-- and on-premises establishments-- bars and restaurants. But the effects are short-term. Can't just do them once a year and then they're done. And everyone knows they're done because the likelihood of sales will increase again unless there are regular compliance checks.

I have proposed, and this is not based on study, it's just based on kind of practice and theory and kind of my work in the field, there is evidence to suggest that we have to check all establishments, not just a subset of establishments. We should conduct more than one or two checks per year, because again, the effects of a given check would decay over time within about three months. And we should conduct follow-up checks within three months. So if they fail once, go back in within three months and check them again. And again, consequences for the license holder.

And we do the re-checks multiple times because many communities and states say that to get to a suspension or a license revocation, if it's a bad establishment, those three or four failures to comply need to be detected within a 12-month period or an 18-month period. So if they're only checked once per year, they're never going to get to the point where it's a suspension or revocation even if it's a very bad establishment.

Just some results from a 2010 survey. Just because I'm running out of time, I'm going to just jump to the conclusion here that these optimal compliance



check campaigns, when we did a national survey on law enforcement agencies, about 4% were meeting the criteria of optimal compliance check campaigns. And at the state level, 6% met the optimal. Six states at that time did no checks by the BACs and had fewer than 40% of local agencies conducting checks.

So 2010, even though we had a lot of communities and states doing compliance checks, they weren't doing them maybe as effectively as they could. And there were many state and local agencies that could do more. 42% of the agencies in 2010 reported doing some type of enforcement activities that target adults who provide illegally to minors. And we looked at active enforcement strategies. So like shoulder tap campaigns, parking lot observations, party patrols, incident complaint follow-up versus non-active enforcement. So law enforcement doing education, sticker campaigns, cops and shops, and other strategies. And we found that 12% were doing active enforcement strategies, only 12% versus 30% doing non-active enforcement.

So you might be wondering, well, that's 2010. A long time ago. What's more current information? Well, we repeated our law enforcement survey in 2018. We had a better response rate in 2018, but it wasn't too different than 2010. Went back to some of the same agencies and looked at changes over time and we found that if you look at compliance checks, which is the second row, percent of agencies-- this is local law enforcement-- in 2010, 41.9% reported doing compliance checks. 2019, only 36.4%.

Looking at enforcement of adult provision of alcohol to underage youth, 48.5% reported doing something in 2010. 2019, only about a third were doing that type of enforcement. Enforcing underage alcohol possession and consumption. In 2010, 84% reported doing this type of enforcement. And in 2018, 66.5% was doing this type of enforcement.

So more work is needed. We've come a long ways. We have more research evidence. We've had the success. But we know that young people are still drinking and experiencing problems related to drinking.

So part of the work that we need to do together is to make sure that all of the limited resources aren't shifted to other substance uses or other problems. That we continue to have resources to address underage drinking. We need to continue to educate policymakers and community leaders about underage drinking and why we still need to pay attention to it and advocate for strong policies and enforcement, ensure policies and enforcement are equitable. That's something in this field that we need to do more work to make sure that as we make recommendations around enforcement that it does not lead into even more inequities than we already have and that we can't rely just on law enforcement.

We need to make sure that licensing departments, health departments, schools, universities, that we need to all continue to work together across



sectors to do this work. I would use some caution as we're picking strategies. What has happened historically is there's kind of the flavor of the month policies. Oh, they're doing keg registration. So we should do keg registration. Maybe you should. Maybe you shouldn't. You should first look at where are young people getting alcohol in your communities and states? And pick the strategies most likely to affect that source of alcohol.

Don't focus on strategies just because others are doing it. But we can learn from the work of others. You know, what have others tried and found effective for the source of alcohol that our communities need to focus on? We do know that it's going to take multiple strategies. We've already implemented multiple strategies. We need to continue to implement more.

There are large research trials that show multiple strategies can be effective. And these are just a few that are listed. We have to make sure we fully implement policies. So with keg registration, for example, I don't know how many law enforcement agencies know that there's a keg registration policy and know what to do if they find a keg and there's been underage drinking and everyone's dispersed and there's an ID on the keg. Does law enforcement or whoever is finding the keg know what to do with that ID, how to track it, and then hold the adults accountable. And if there's no penalty in place for taking the tag off, how effective is that policy going to be?

Social host. I talked about the perceived certainty of getting caught, right? If no one knows that the social host policies exist and what those penalties are or if anyone is following through and enforcing those social host penalties, if the people don't know about it or don't believe that anyone cares about that policy, that perceived certainty of facing some penalty is decreased. And thus, I might decide, oh, it's OK to serve an underage person or have an underage drinking party on my property because I'm not going to face any consequence for doing so.

So how do we fully implement any type of policy that's currently on the books or that you advocate to get put into place in your communities and state? And then I'm running out of time so I'm just going to make this quick point that these are specific underage drinking strategies that we've been talking about. But again, underage drinking occurs in the broader context of the broader environment in adults in our community. And so policies that affect adult drinking also affect youth drinking.

So if we talk about the excise tax on alcohol or minimum price of alcohol in our communities and state, they're directly affected by the fact that it's cheaper for them if there's not controls in place. So they're more likely to be able to purchase it or afford to give it to others. But it also means that the adults in the communities are probably drinking more as well. And their role modeling heavier alcohol use and then the alcohol is also just flowing more to young people.



So we need to also pay attention to general alcohol control policies to affect underage drinking. And we have to remember that many adults are experiencing and contributing to alcohol-related problems in our communities, not just underage drinkers. And so with adults, we also talk about decreasing availability of alcohol through putting some types of controls in place through legal, economic, physical availability-- this is some stuff that I covered in the presentation last week-- and the recommendations from the Prevention Guide.

Some other recommendations for the general populations are increase alcohol tax, regulate density of alcohol establishments, maintain limits on days, hours of sale, implement or maintain dramshop liability and don't privatize retail systems. Sorry, I'm talking faster because I'm running out of time. Finally, someone asked about resources last week. I failed to mention that we have a new Center for Advancing Alcohol Science to Practice funded by the Centers for Disease Control. And this slide provides some information about the types of assistance, technical assistance, that they can provide to all of you. And they're eager to hear from all of you. So please connect with them.

And that is it. My website is listed here. We're updating it, but we do try to provide some resources and summaries of research on our website as well. And with that, I'm going to stop by slides. Thanks, everyone.

REBECCA BULLER: Well, thank you so much. I think we had just a couple of questions that were left. Let's take just a minute to review. I think, do you feel good about the family question? The first one that we heard-- according to the Youth Survey, the number one place of our youth obtaining alcohol is at home with their parents. Can we speak to strategies? I think you covered that.

There's I see many of the studies are older prior to updated licenses. Have you seen any links to decreases in sales to minors?

TRACI TOOMEY: Rebecca, can you read the beginning part of that question? Sorry, I just got distracted by the chat.

REBECCA BULLER: Sure. I see many of the studies are older prior to updated-- sorry, prior to updated licenses. Have you seen any links to decreases in sales to minors with the new look IDs?

TRACI TOOMEY: I don't have information about the new look IDs. It's a great question. And I'm not sure, there might be some research on it. I'm just not aware of any looking at that specifically.

REBECCA BULLER: OK, great. Well, I want to take just a minute and share my screen and a few upcoming things that we want to let you know. One of the things that I want to mention is that I will follow up with an email to everyone on the webinar today with links to the slides, the recording, and that



kind of thing, and some of this information. So don't worry about getting this all down.

But we've got some upcoming events. There's the next and third offering in this Alcohol Policy Series on October 4. We are offering a Foundations and Prevention Intensive Training Course in October. We're going to be having registration open soon for Putting the Engage Back in Engagement, and also Harnessing the Power of Humor in Facilitation. And we're going to do a Data series in November and December.

So watch for that information, check out our events page. The different topics there for data services will be Developing Capacity, Overcoming Mistrust, and whoops, I went to fast. All of these things can be found by continuing to link in with our social media pages. So if you can Like Us, if you could Follow Us on Facebook, that would be helpful to both you and us.

And finally, this is the survey that you'll be redirected to. But in case you're not, here is the URL and the QR code. You can scan it and do it or you can wait and be redirected. And I'll also include it in the email in case you need to run off here because you have another appointment.

So that is it. And I just want to say again thanks to Traci for sharing her wisdom and information. And thank you to all of you for participating with us today. We look forward to seeing you again soon. With that, I'll say goodbye. Have a great day.