**Major Evidence-Based Interventions for Underage Drinking**

|  |
| --- |
| **Social Availability** |
| **Nuisance Party Patrols** | Citation given to host(s) of large, noisy parties. Aim is to reduce number of such parties or for host to keep them small and quiet. | • Especially welcome if nearby neighbors are complaining• Covers teens and young adults• Citation and adjudication are quick | • In some cases, officers may feel they need a complaint in order to approach a party.• If participants are young parents may have to be called |   |
| **Social Host Ordinances** | Citation given to owner of property where underage youth are drinking | More directly targets underage drinking than nuisance party ordinances | Often unenforced  | Often used to prosecute host following an alcohol-related crash of an underage person  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Reduce Retail Availability** |
| **Minor Decoy Operations (Compliance Checks)**[Reducing Underage Alcohol Sales](http://resources.prev.org/topics_reducingsales.asp) | Server is cited if he or she sells alcohol to an underage youth working with law enforcement. Licensee is also penalized | Standard operating procedures are very well developed | Requires team of enforcement officers and recruiting youths | Very effective when done relatively frequently |
| **Purchase Surveys**[Reducing Underage Alcohol Sales](http://resources.prev.org/topics_reducingsales.asp) | Young-looking but legal-age people attempt to buy alcohol to see if they are asked for ID. Can also be a “Reward and Reminder” program: If yes, a small reward is given, if no, a reminder is given. | • No legal consequences, so seen more favorably by some• Does not require enforcement professionals, so more places can be visited more often• Can provide local data on retailer compliance | • Volunteers need to be recruited• May be less effective than enforcement option | • No reason that this can’t be used together with Decoy operation.• Rewards should not be “permanent” (e.g., stickers on windows) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Retail Serving Practices (onsite and off-site licenses)** |
| **Responsible Beverage Service Training** | Gives servers training on serving laws and some skills to identify and refuse service to minors and intoxicated patrons | • On-line training is cost-effective and easily obtained• Usually supported by retailers and community. | Training alone is unlikely to be effective (but could be an important part of a larger effort) | • Can be offered with relatively low effort• Can include standards beyond meeting state law. |
| **Responsible Beverage Service Enforcement** | To enforce state laws prohibiting service to minors and/or intoxicated patrons. | Visible enforcement is more likely to change server/seller behavior than training alone | • ABC has limited enforcement capabilities• Local enforcement may lack resources to implement• Specific training required | Most effective when supplemented by local alcohol control measures |

|  |
| --- |
| **Drinking & Driving** |
| **Roadside DUI Checkpoints** | Drivers are selected at random along major arteries and screened and breath tested where indicated | Very effective deterrence | • Full-size Checkpoints can be labor-intensive• Requires publicity | • Can create synergy when combined with RBS interventions• Small-scale version is a good alternative |
| **DUI Saturation Patrols** | Dedicated team(s) patrol streets looking for DUI | • Less labor-intensive• Often favored since team can be pulled away easily | • Team may be pulled away easily• Far less visible to public than roadside checkpoints | High visibility of saturation patrols *may*increase deterrent effect especially as part of a larger DUI  |