Substance Abuse Prevention

Environmental Prevention
Needs Assessment
Workbook
SFY2014

Part 1
National, State, & County Data

POWDER RIVER COUNTY

Version 1
August 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS – Part 1

Data Sources **3**

INTRODUCTION **4**

PROBLEMS **8**
- **A. Consequences** **9**
- **B. Consumption** **14**
- **C. Risk Factors** **19**

CAUSAL AREAS **23**
- **A. Retail Availability** **25**
- **B. Social Availability** **27**
- **D. Medical Field Information** **29**

Data Sources – PART 2

In Table 1, below, list all the data sources used in this workbook as well as a description of the data and where it came from. If available, data collection instruments and a summary of the data set should be labeled with the corresponding number from the table below and placed in Appendix E. You may add additional rows to the table if needed.

Table 1: List of Data Sources

Data Source	Data Description	Location & Date(s) of Data
State of Montana Department of Transportation	Alcohol/Drug Injuries and Fatalities	http://www.mdt.mt.gov/publications/datastats.shtml#crash SFY2007-SFY2012
State of Montana Department of Commerce &	County Populations	www.ceic.mt.gov SFY2007-SFY2013
State of Montana Office of Public Instruction	Youth Risk Behavior Survey	http://www.opi.mt.gov/Reports&Data/YRBS.html SFY2007-2013
State of Montana Department of Health & Human Services	Prevention Needs Assessment	http://prevention.mt.gov/pna/ SFY2008-2012
Centers For Disease Control and Prevention	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System	http://www.cdc.gov/brfss/ SFY2008-2012
State of Montana Department of Revenue	Retail Availability/ Liquor Licenses	http://revenue.mt.gov/default.mcpx http://www.revenue.mt.gov/forbusinesses/alcohol_beverage_control/default.mcpx SFY2012
Montana Prescription Drug Registry Donna Peterson, Program Manager Phone: 406-841-2240 Fax: 841-2344	Drug Registry Provider Analysis	dlibsdmpdr@mt.gov www.mdprinfo.mt.gov www.mpdr.mt.gov SFY2013
State of Montana Board of Crime Control	Alcohol/Drug Related Crimes	http://www.mbcc.mt.gov/ SFY2012

INTRODUCTION

Montana's overarching substance abuse prevention strategy is based on the public health approach to reducing substance use by focusing on preventing health problems and promoting healthy living for whole populations.

Montana utilizes a State Epidemiological Workgroup (SEW) to collect and review state-wide data and prioritize areas most in need for prevention efforts. Based on this data, specific recommendations have been made to support the importance of planning to ensure substance abuse and targeted mental and behavioral health prevention goals are met. Based on the comprehensive data collected by the SEW, the identified substance abuse prevention priorities are:

1. Underage Drinking
2. Binge Drinking
3. Drinking and Driving
4. Riding with a Driver who is Drinking
5. Prescription Drug Misuse and Abuse

The public health approach identifies trends in a population as they relate to substance use and abuse thereby targeting prevention activities at an environmental level verses an individual or person-centered level. Therefore, a key element in this process is the use of epidemiological data to describe the extent and consequences of substance use within and across populations.

Montana uses the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) process (Figure 1) in order to **answer the public health questions** and **determine what environmental interventions will be most effective** for addressing the specific problems in a community.

Figure 1: Five Steps of the Strategic Prevention Framework Process



To complete the SPF step one, **Assessment**, a local needs assessment will need to be completed at the county level. This will involve gathering data to illuminate the problem(s) and the causal area(s) that contribute to the problems. This is achieved by answering a series of questions. Most of the data you gather will exist in various data sources, but you will also have to do some original research. Data gathering activities will include:

- Compiling existing survey results
- Original data collection
- Interviews with key partners and stakeholders

Outcome-Based Prevention (Logic Model)

The foundation of the Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF) process is illustrated by the outcome-based prevention model, seen in Figure 2.

Figure 2: Outcome-Based Prevention Model (Logic Model)

In this model, a community details its substance-related consumption and consequence data, researches the causal areas that may impact these problems and chooses evidence-based policies, practices and programs to address the identified causal areas.

Purpose

The purpose of this workbook is to help Montana communities go through the outcome-based prevention model. The first step is to complete a comprehensive local needs assessment in each county or reservation. This will help communities accurately assess local alcohol-related and prescription drug-related problems using epidemiological and other relevant data and understand the environmental factors that influence these problems. To be effective, one person in a community should not complete this workbook. Instead, community partners should work together to complete the workbook. The data collect will address the following problems;

Problems to be addressed

1. Underage drinking ages 12- 21.
2. Binge drinking with an emphasis on youth under age 21.
3. Drinking and driving with an emphasis on youth under age 21.
4. Riding with a driver who is drinking with an emphasis on youth under age 21.
5. Misuse and Abuse of Prescription Drugs with an emphasis on ages 12-25.

The environmental factors contributing to the problems may vary from community to community and, therefore, require differing responses (environmental solutions). Part 3 of this workbook (Analysis and Recommendations) will provide a foundation for determining which environmental solutions are best suited to meet the unique needs of your community.

Tasks that follow reflect the outcome-based prevention model and recent research detailing the causal areas of substance abuse problems. There are four major sections (problems, causes, prioritization and resource assessment). Within each there are data to collect and questions to answer. The following model has been expanded to reflect solutions that are evidence-based and environmental, as illustrated in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Outcome-Based Prevention Model



Each county or reservation should complete the following tasks in order to better understand the problems and influences surrounding prescription drug use, drinking, and drinking and driving in their community. This will lead to focused mobilization and capacity building, as well as aid in the prioritization of evidence-based ***environmental*** strategies within the community's strategic plan.

*Binge drinking refers to having five or more drinks within approximately two hours for men and four or more drinks within approximately two hours for women (NIAAA).

Collection of Existing Survey Results

Upon completion of gathering the local data (Part 2-Local Data), each county will receive census data, recently published survey data, and archival data for their individual county (Part 1 – National, State, County Data). Using Part 1 and Part 2 of the Data Workbook, communities will complete Part 3 (Analysis and Recommendations) to develop work plans for multiple funding sources. The data workbook will be updated in the spring of each year.

In addition to the existing data sources that are specifically outlined in Part 1 of the Data Workbook, local data (Part 2) unique to your community can be used enhance your community's understanding of the problems and aid in identifying environmental strategies. For instance, many community colleges may have results from the National College Health Assessment (NCHA). In addition, your community may have already gathered survey results from businesses, local law enforcement or youth that may help in the needs assessment.

Interviews with Law Enforcement Officials and Medical Personnel

You will need to interview key officials from law enforcement and the medical field that serves your community to get a better picture of the problems associated with prescription drug use, drinking, and drinking and driving in your community. Information and tools for conducting these interviews is provided in the Appendices.

Collection of Original Data

In several areas of this workbook you will be asked to compile very specific information. This data collection will include such things as counting the number of buildings which advertise alcohol, or counting the number of events where alcohol companies or distributors are sponsors. The point of this data collection is to gather information directly from your community by observation or library research. In all cases, the original data collection process is explained in detail. You will also need to collect data from local hospital, pharmacies and medical prescribers along with school officials. A list of the requested data needed is provided in the appropriate sections.

Problems



Task One:
Explore Consequence and Consumption Data in Your Community in Order to Identify What Problems are of Greatest Concern

CONSEQUENCES - PART 1

Alcohol or substance-related consequences are defined as the social, economic and health problems associated with binge drinking or the abuse of prescription drugs. This first section looks at the several pieces of data and will help you understand the impact or consequence substance abuse has on your community. While it is recognized that not all communities will experience exactly the same impact, the consequence this project is focused on reducing is motor vehicle crashes.

Motor Vehicle Crashes

One of the major consequences of drinking alcohol is motor vehicle crashes resulting in injury and death. Drinking and driving have significant negative consequences for Montana's population. The data was calculated in the following manner:

For Montana's rate per 100,000, the calculations would look like this:

$$Alcohol-related\ crash\ w/injuries\ rate\,(2008-2012) = \frac{\#of\ crashes\ w/injuries\ in\ MT}{MT\ Population\ \ for\ the\ time\ period} * 100{,}000$$

$$= \frac{8{,}548}{4{,}633{,}264} * 100{,}000$$

$$= 184.49$$

Table 2: Alcohol-Related Crashes with Injuries for All Races

Year	Number of Alcohol-Related Crashes	County Population	Rate per 100,000 Population	MT Number of Alcohol-Related Crashes	MT Rate per 100,000 Population	Rate Comparison
2008	0	1756	0.00	1661	170.11	0.00
2009	2	1738	115.07	1361	138.32	1.20
2010	2	1737	115.14	1358	137.04	1.19
2011	2	1761	113.57	1274	127.28	1.12
2012	0	1782	0.00	1457	144.13	0.00
2008-2012	6	8774	68.38	7111	119.96	1.75

Motor Vehicle Crashes (continued)

Table 3: Alcohol-Related Crashes with Fatalities for All Races

Year	Number of Alcohol-Related Crashes	County Population	Rate per 100,000 Population	MT Number of Alcohol-Related Crashes	MT Rate per 100,000 Population	Rate Comparison
2008	0	1756	0.00	97	9.93	0.00
2009	0	1738	0.00	104	10.57	0.00
2010	0	1737	0.00	94	9.49	0.00
2011	0	1761	0.00	92	9.19	0.00
2012	1	1782	56.12	123	12.17	0.22
2008-2012	1	8774	11.40	510	8.60	0.75

Table 4: Alcohol-Related Crashes with Fatalities for American Indians

Year	Number of Alcohol-Related Crashes	County Population	Rate per 100,000 Population	MT Number of Alcohol-Related Crashes	MT Rate per 100,000 Population	Rate Comparison
2007	0	1761	0.00	9	0.92	0.00
2008	0	1756	0.00	3	0.30	0.00
2009	0	1738	0.00	3	0.30	0.00
2010	0	1737	0.00	6	0.60	0.00
2011	0	1761	0.00	1	0.10	0.00
2007-2011	0	8753	0.00	22	0.37	0.00

Underage Drinking and Driving

Table 5: Percentage of Students Who Drove a Vehicle When They Had Been Drinking Alcohol During the Past 30 Days for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	3.7	3.7	4.2	2.9	6.3	2.8
10th	20.3	13.2	16.3	8.5	18.8	8.6
12th	34.2	25.3	22.4	18.1	17.5	16.6
Total	19.4	14.1	14.3	9.8	14.2	9.3

Table 6: Percentage of Students Who Drove a Vehicle When They Had Been Drinking Alcohol During the Past 30 Days for All Races (2007-2013 YRBS)



Table 7: Percentage of Students Who Drove a Vehicle When They Had Been Drinking Alcohol During the Past 30 Days for American Indians (2009-2013 YRBS)

American Indians Located In	2009 Data	2011 Data	2013 Data
Urban Areas	17.5	15.8	16.6
Reservations	17.5	15.7	16.6
State Total	13.5	10.6	12.6

High School Students Riding in Vehicle Driven by Someone Who Has Been Drinking

Table 8: Percentage of Students Who Rode in Vehicle Driven By Someone Who Had Been Drinking Alcohol During the Past 30 Days for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	31.8	29.5	29.6	26.5	22.5	24.3
10th	38.2	32.6	34.7	28.5	26.6	25.7
12th		37.1	29.9	29.9	23.8	25.9
Total	40.5	33.1	31.4	28.3	24.3	25.3

Table 9: Percentage of Students Who Rode in Vehicle Driven By Someone Who Had Been Drinking Alcohol During the Past 30 Days for All Races (2007-2013 YRBS)



Table 10: Percentage of Students Who Rode in a Other Vehicle Driven By Someone Who Had Been Drinking Alcohol During the Past 30 Days for American Indians (2009-2013 YRBS)

American Indians Located In	2009 Data	2011 Data	2013 Data
Urban Areas	34.7	30.4	27.2
Reservations	41.9	37.4	31.9
State Total	28.8	26.1	24.5

Consequences of Prescription Drug Abuse

One of the major consequences of prescription drug abuse is the potential for medical impairment, such as; overdose, pulmonary complications, central nervous system impairment, respiratory complications depressed breathing, suicide attempts or completions. Other areas include driving related problems, such as; impairment, injuries, and deaths.

Consequence Data for Prescription Drugs will be presented in Part 2 of the Data Workbook.

CONSUMPTION – PART 1

This section looks at consumption data and will help you identify which alcohol-related and prescription drug-related consumption problems are greatest in your community. Consumption data includes underage drinking, binge drinking, and 30-day use. While it is recognized that not all communities will experience exactly the same problems, the specific focus areas are binge drinking, underage drinking, and prescription drug abuse among youth.

Underage Binge Drinking

Table 11: Percentage of Students Binge Drinking in Past Two Weeks for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	10.3	11.0	15.7	10.9	12.3	10.0
10th	31.1	25.7	19.6	21.0	23.3	21.7
12th		36.9	32.8	32.4	29.8	31.8
Total	42.7	24.5	22.7	21.4	21.8	21.2

Table 12: Percentage of Students Binge Drinking in Past Two Weeks for American Indians (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	20.0	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
10th	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	25.0	0.0
12th	33.3	0.0	7.1	0.0	40.0	0.0
Total	17.8	0.0	14.0	0.0	21.7	0.0

Table 13: Percentage of Students Binge Drinking in Past 30 Days for All Races (2007-2013 YRBS)



Table 14: Percentage of Students Binge Drinking in Past 30 Days for American Indians (2009-2013 YRBS)

American Indians Located In	2009 Data	2011 Data	2013 Data
Urban Areas	34.6	32.3	30.1
Reservations	38.3	31.0	25.2
State Total	30.1	29.4	23.5

Adult Binge Drinking

Information on adult binge drinking is limited. Currently, Montana only collects this information through the **Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BFRSS).** This data is released at the state level and at the five health planning region levels. It has been shown that the differences in the data between the health planning regions are not statistically significant, therefore Table 16 provides only the state percentages.

Table 15: Percentage of Respondents 18 and Older Binge Drinking in Past 30 days for All Races (2008-2012 BRFSS)

	2008 Data	2009 Data	2010 Data	2011 Data	2012 Data
State Total	17.7	17.3	17	20.8	21.8

Table 16: Percentage of Respondents 18 and Older Binge Drinking in Past 30 days for American Indians (2008-2011 BRFSS)

	2008 Data	2009 Data	2010 Data	2011 Data	2012 Data
American Indians	17.3	21.2	17.3	21.6	27.5

Underage Drinking (30 Day Use for Alcohol)

Table 17: Percentage of Students Drinking in Past 30 Days for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	25.9	21.0	31.9	20.0	18.4	18.8
10th	46.3	41.2	34.7	35.8	42.9	36.9
12th	50.0	53.1	44.8	49.2	41.3	49.5
Total	40.7	38.4	37.1	35.0	34.2	35.1

Table 18: Percentage of Students Drinking in Past 30 Days for All Races (2007-2013 YRBS)



Table 19: Percentage of Students Drinking in Past 30 Days for American Indians (2009-2013 YRBS)

American Indians Located in	2009 Data	2011 Data	2013 Data
Urban Areas	45.9	43.6	39.7
Reservations	38.3	39.9	36.0
State Total	42.8	38.3	37.1

Prescription Drug Use among Youth (30 Day Use)

Table 20: Percentage of Students Using Prescription Drugs in Past 30 Days for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	4.6	0.0	6.3	1.9	5.4	1.8
10th	5.6	0.0	10.2	4.6	4.8	3.8
12th	8.2	0.0	6.0	5.5	12.7	5.0
Total	6.1	0.0	7.5	4.0	7.6	3.5

Table 21: Percentage of Students Using Prescription Drugs in Past 30 Days for All Races (2011-2013 YRBS)



Table 22: Percentage of Students Using Prescription Drugs in Past 30 Days for American Indians (2009-2013 YRBS)

American Indians Located in	2011 Data	2013 Data
Urban Areas	34.4	25.2
Reservations	26.6	21.3
State Total	16.2	18.4

RISK FACTORS - PART 1

Assessing risk factors will assist you in selecting the causal factors to focus your prevention efforts to address your community's resources and capacity.

Perception of Parental Disapproval/Attitude

Table 23: Percentage of Students Perceive Parental Disapproval towards Alcohol/Drug Use for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	92.9		Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	92.3	89.5	92.0	91.1	89.2	90.9
10th	77.9	81.9	74.5	82.2	78.0	84.1
12th	76.1	69.4	70.7	72.1	67.7	70.4
Total	82.1	80.3	79.1	81.8	78.3	81.8

Perception of Peer Disapproval/Attitude

Table 24: Percentage of Students Perceive Peer Disapproval towards Alcohol/Drug Use for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	59.8	81.9	56.7	81.1	66.3	83.3
10th	58.5	57.5	57.7	62.1	59.4	63.5
12th	68.8	28.0	58.3	50.0	59.4	53.3
Total	62.4	55.8	57.6	64.4	61.7	66.7

Perceived Risk/Harm of Use

The pervasiveness of alcohol intertwining with other public health issues showed that 23 of the 56 counties (including 7 of the 7 reservations) are ranked as very high or high risk. Fifty-five percent of Montanan's live in these 23 counties. The 2012 NDSUH ranked Montana as number one in the rate of alcohol use among youth, third in the nation for teen abuse of prescription pain relievers, tenth in parental approval of alcohol use, and is consistently higher than national rates as seen below.

Family Communication around Alcohol/Drug Use

Table 25: Percentage of Students Who Have Talked with a Parent About the Dangers of Alcohol or Drug Use During Past 12 Months for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	39.4	66.6	44.0	60.8	86.4	63.0
10th	41.2	62.0	73.5	62.8	76.6	62.4
12th	40.2	57.9	64.2	55.8	76.5	57.5
Total	40.3	62.1	60.6	59.8	79.8	61.0

Table 26: Percentage of Students Who Believe it is Wrong to Drink Alcohol for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	73.1	80.8	74.6	77.3	76.3	76.9
10th	53.6	68.6	56.7	66.9	57.8	68.9
12th	51.8	59.2	50.0	58.5	56.2	69.0
Total	59.5	87.9	60.4	67.6	63.4	71.6

Table 27: Percentage of Students Who Believe it is Cool to Drink Alcohol Regularly for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	12.6	12.7	12.7	12.8	11.4	11.1
10th	38.5	32.2	31.6	27.9	27.9	29.0
12th	38.4	38.9	42.7	35.4	23.7	30.3
Total	29.8	27.9	29.0	25.4	21.0	23.5

Table 28: Percentage of Students Who Perceive Risk of Harm if Having 1-2 Alcoholic Drinks Every Day for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	63.8	62.6	54.2	64.1	58.1	64.0
10th	52.8	62.1	63.3	66.6	53.2	65.6
12th	63.6	58.9	64.2	62.6	63.6	62.7
Total	60.1	61.2	60.6	64.4	58.3	64.1

Table 29: Percentage of Students Who Perceive Risk of Harm if Having 5+ Alcoholic Drinks Every Weekend for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	75.7	78.5	75.9	79.0	71.6	78.3
10th	66.1	74.3	67.3	76.7	92.0	77.3
12th	77.3	69.0	72.4	71.9	77.2	72.5
Total	73.0	73.9	71.9	75.9	80.3	76.0

Table 30: Percentage of Students Who Perceive Neighbors Think it is Wrong for Students to Drink Alcohol for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	73.6	87.8	65.2	77.3	74.6	79.6
10th	58.1	68.8	56.1	66.9	57.1	68.9
12th	53.6	59.2	52.6	58.5	46.9	58.8
Total	61.8	71.9	58.0	67.6	59.5	69.1

Table 31: Percentage of Students Who Believe that Alcohol is Causing Problems in Areas related to Financial, Legal, Emotional, etc. for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	2.1	7.0	4.8	6.1	0.0	6.0
10th	6.5	11.7	7.5	9.6	0.0	10.6
12th	3.7	11.9	6.7	10.2	6.1	10.1
Total	4.1	10.2	6.3	8.6	2.0	8.9

Causal Areas



Task Two:
Gather Data on Four Causal Areas

Environmental Causal Area

In this section you will conduct an environmental assessment of your community by collecting data related to environmental factors known to impact underage drinking, binge drinking, drinking and driving within communities and prescription drug misuse/abuse. It will be necessary to collect data from several sources, including a review of your local media over a defined period and through face-to-face interviews with your local law enforcement agencies. It will be necessary to collect data related to four casual areas:

- Retail Availability and Accessibility of Alcohol
- Criminal Justice System, including Law Enforcement
- Social Availability of Alcohol
- Promotion of Alcohol

In addition to collecting the defined information, communities may also identify other relevant data unique to their community for inclusion in this process. Because some of the data collection in this section is based on personal perception, it is very important that multiple individuals contribute to the data collection process to ensure the results are reasonably representative of the community.

When you have completed this section you will have a thorough understanding of the environmental factors influencing binge drinking, underage drinking, drinking/driving and riding with a driver who is drinking and prescription drug misuse/abuse by youth within your community. The information collected in this section will have two purposes:

1. Support selection of evidence-based environmental prevention strategies that will produce the greatest impact on binge drinking, underage drinking, drinking and driving/riding with a driver who is drinking and prescription drug misuse/abuse by youth in your community.

2. Provide necessary input to the environmental prevention implementation plan for your community.

RETAIL AVAILABILITY– PART 1

Liquor Licenses Per Capita

The most fundamental way to understand retail availability is the number of opportunities people have to buy alcohol. Consider the following table which lists the number of liquor licenses issued in each county. Counties are ordered based on their rates of liquor licenses per 100,000 people over the age of 14. The population of those 14 years and older is used to be consistent with research done by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism regarding sales per gallon of ethanol. To compare individual counties to Montana as a whole, Montana has been included in the table and is shaded. Anything above this shaded line has rates that are higher than the state average and anything below this shaded line have rates that are lower than the state average. This table includes all liquor license types except special event and malt beverage licenses. The included license types are:

- Retail liquor licenses
- Restaurant liquor licenses
- Limited liquor licenses
- Microbrewery permits
- Winery permits

Table 32: Liquor Licenses Per 100,000 Population (2012 Montana Liquor Control Division)

County	# of Liquor Licenses	Population (2012 Projections)	Rate per 100,000 Population
Beaverhead	27	9,346	288.89
Big Horn	8	13,061	61.25
Blaine	12	6,683	179.56
Broadwater	8	5,756	138.99
Butte/Silver Bow	81	34,403	235.44
Carbon	32	10,127	315.99
Carter	2	1,177	169.92
Cascade	109	81,723	133.38
Choteau	16	5,904	271.00
Custer	21	11,888	176.65
Daniels	10	1,786	559.91
Dawson	16	9,249	172.99
Deer Lodge/Anaconda	30	9,227	325.13
Fallon	7	3,024	231.48
Fergus	27	11,435	236.12
Flathead	113	91,633	123.32
Gallatin	103	92,614	111.21
Garfield	2	1,261	158.60
Glacier	23	13,711	167.75
Golden Valley	3	839	357.57
Granite	9	3,109	289.48
Hill	29	16,366	177.20
Jefferson	18	11,401	157.88
Judith Basin	7	2,024	345.85
Lake	38	28,986	131.10
Lewis & Clark	75	64,876	115.61
Liberty	5	2,392	209.03
Lincoln	37	19,491	189.83
Madison	24	7,733	310.36
McCone	7	1,701	411.52
Meagher	10	1,924	519.75
Mineral	16	4,167	383.97
Missoula	102	110,977	91.91
Musselshell	11	4,665	235.80
Park	38	15,567	244.11
Petroleum	2	511	391.39
Phillips	14	4,128	339.15
Pondera	10	6,165	162.21
Powder River	3	1,763	170.16
Powell	14	7,096	197.29
Prairie	2	1,157	172.86
Ravalli	45	40,617	110.79
Richland	17	10,810	157.26
Roosevelt	19	10,927	173.88
Rosebud	20	9,396	212.86
Sanders	22	11,408	192.85
Sheridan	12	3,580	335.20
Stillwater	13	9,195	141.38
Sweet Grass	5	3,605	138.70
Teton	14	6,053	231.29
Toole	17	5,220	325.67
Treasure	2	736	271.74
Valley	21	7,505	279.81
Wheatland	8	2,104	380.23
Wibaux	3	1,057	283.82
Yellowstone	131	151,882	86.25
TOTAL	**1305**	**841,857**	231.85

SOCIAL AVAILABILITY – PART 1

Social availability includes the obtaining of alcohol and/or prescription drugs from friends, associates and family members, but it also refers to the availability of alcohol and/or prescription drugs at gatherings such as parties and other social events where the alcohol is provided as part of the event.

Table 33: Percentage of Students Who Believe if They Wanted to Get Alcohol It Would Be Easy for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	62.5	54.1	58.3	52.0	63.1	48.2
10th	84.4	77.4	72.4	73.2	73.3	71.3
12th	83.6	83.4	79.7	81.3	82.5	80.4
Total	76.8	71.6	70.1	68.8	73.0	66.6

Table 34: Percentage of Students Who Believe if They Wanted to Get Drugs It Would Be Easy for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	8.6	9.4	7.2	9.4	10.8	8.6
10th	15.7	21.5	18.4	19.9	13.3	20.0
12th	17.3	23.8	12.8	21.4	20.6	25.4
Total	13.9	18.2	12.8	16.9	14.9	18.0

Table 35: Percentage of Students Who Thought He/She Would Be Caught by the Police If They Drank Beer, Wine or Hard Liquor for All Races (2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	35.3	30.6	31.4	31.6	27.7	34.5
10th	19.0	19.6	50.5	20.2	25.8	23.8
12th	22.7	19.5	24.1	19.6	17.2	20.2
Total	25.7	23.2	35.3	23.8	23.6	26.2

Table 36: Percentage of Students Who Thought He/She Would Be Caught by Their Parents If They Drank Beer, Wine or Hard Liquor Without their Permission for All Races(2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	57.0	67.3	56.6	67.3	64.6	68.6
10th	51.2	46.6	49.5	47.8	56.3	49.9
12th	54.6	37.2	36.1	36.2	45.3	37.8
Total	54.3	50.4	47.4	50.4	55.4	52.1

Table 37: Percentage of Students who Perceive Family Has Clear Rules about Alcohol and Drug Use for All Races(2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	82.0	87.9	89.0	87.5	92.1	86.8
10th	85.2	85.0	79.4	84.1	78.1	85.1
12th	92.7	80.9	82.0	81.7	79.4	80.6
Total	86.6	84.6	83.5	84.4	83.2	84.2

Table 38: Percentage of Students who Perceive Parents Give a Clear Message About Drugs for All Races(2008-2012 PNA)

Grade	2008 Data		2010 Data		2012 Data	
	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data	Judicial	MT Data
8th	50.0	64.4	53.2	63.2	41.4	62.2
10th	34.4	55.3	35.8	55.6	35.7	55.3
12th	37.0	53.2	35.0	53.0	16.2	51.5
Total	40.5	57.6	41.3	57.3	31.1	56.3

MEDICAL FIELD INFORMATION – PART 1

Medical Provider Information:

Prescribers in Montana are defined as "Physician, Podiatrists, Physician Assistants, Optometrists, Naturopathic Physicians, Dentists, Advanced Practice Registered Nurses, Physician Assistants, Ambulance Services, Veterinarians, Euthanasia Technicians. Registered Pharmacists are allowed to fill prescription and dispense medications.

Montana Prescription Drug Registry (MPDR) Provider Analysis

August 21, 2013

County	Pharmacies		Prescribers			Pharmacists		
	# Eligible	# Registered *	# Eligible	# Registered	% Registered	# Eligible	# Registered	% Registered
Beaverhead	3	3	34	13	38.2%	10	2	20.0%
Big Horn	4	4	26	12	46.2%	6	4	66.7%
Blaine	3	3	7	2	28.6%	7	4	57.1%
Broadwater	1	1	8	3	37.5%	3	2	66.7%
Carbon	1	1	29	7	24.1%	8	3	37.5%
Carter	0	0	1	1	100.0%	0	0	0.0%
Cascade	23	23	398	76	19.1%	100	30	30.0%
Choteau	2	2	9	3	33.3%	8	0	0.0%
Custer	3	3	49	7	14.3%	18	3	16.7%
Daniels	1	1	5	3	60.0%	2	1	50.0%
Dawson	3	3	30	7	23.3%	9	5	55.6%
Deer Lodge	3	3	35	8	22.9%	8	4	50.0%
Fallon	1	1	6	1	16.7%	2	1	50.0%
Fergus	3	3	44	9	20.5%	14	2	14.3%
Flathead	25	25	529	113	21.4%	110	51	46.4%
Gallatin	31	31	495	97	19.6%	87	42	48.3%
Garfield	0	0	1	1	100.0%	0	0	0.0%
Glacier	3	3	27	7	25.9%	6	5	83.3%
Golden Valley	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Granite	1	1	7	1	14.3%	0	0	0.0%
Hill	5	5	54	8	14.8%	23	11	47.8%
Jefferson	2	2	59	14	23.7%	16	8	50.0%
Judith Basin	1	1	1	1	100.0%	3	1	33.3%
Lake	11	11	77	28	36.4%	31	13	41.9%
Lewis & Clark	18	18	353	74	21.0%	89	45	50.6%
Liberty	2	2	5	4	80.0%	2	0	0.0%
Lincoln	5	5	51	24	47.1%	19	9	47.4%
McCone	0	0	2	1	50.0%	0	0	0.0%
Madison	2	2	24	7	29.2%	4	4	100.0%
Meagher	1	1	2	1	50.0%	1	1	100.0%
Mineral	1	1	12	6	50.0%	4	1	25.0%
Missoula	40	40	696	165	23.7%	190	87	45.8%
Musselshell	1	1	8	1	12.5%	1	1	100.0%
Park	6	6	52	12	23.1%	15	7	46.7%
Petroleum	0	0	0	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Phillips	1	1	6	1	16.7%	4	2	50.0%
Pondera	3	3	15	9	60.0%	5	3	60.0%
Powder River	1	1	2	1	50.0%	2	0	0.0%
Powell	2	2	18	6	33.3%	6	1	16.7%
Prairie	0	0	3	2	66.7%	0	0	0.0%
Ravalli	14	14	132	41	31.1%	37	27	73.0%
Richland	3	3	31	7	22.6%	10	6	60.0%
Roosevelt	5	5	19	8	42.1%	5	5	100.0%
Rosebud	3	3	15	13	86.7%	4	1	25.0%
Sanders	2	2	27	12	44.4%	4	3	75.0%
Sheridan	1	1	6	1	16.7%	6	2	33.3%
Silver Bow	12	12	144	36	25.0%	59	29	49.2%
Stillwater	0	0	16	5	31.3%	7	1	14.3%
Sweet Grass	1	1	9	2	22.2%	2	1	50.0%
Teton	2	2	19	11	57.9%	7	3	42.9%
Toole	2	2	12	3	25.0%	7	4	57.1%
Treasure	0	0	1	0	0.0%	0	0	0.0%
Valley	3	3	27	6	22.2%	9	7	77.8%
Wheatland	2	2	2	1	50.0%	0	0	0.0%
Wibaux	0	0	0	0	0.0%	1	1	100.0%
Yellowstone	40	40	970	187	19.3%	213	94	44.1%
County Unknown	0	0	16	4	25.0%	4	2	50.0%
Montana Totals:	**303**	**303**	**4626**	**1073**	**23.2%**	**1188**	**539**	**45.4%**
Other States	428	428	2491	80	3.2%	695	30	4.3%
Other Countries	0	0	0	0	0.0%	4	0	0.0%
Grand Totals:	**731**	**731**	**7117**	**1153**	**16.2%**	**1887**	**569**	**30.2%**

Total Eligible Prescribers & Pharmacists: 9004
Total Registered Prescribers & Pharmacists: 1722
Percent Registered: 19.1%

*** All pharmacies have registered to report except a few newly-licensed facilities.**