CHAPTER 4.3

Policy Summaries

This document is excerpted from:

The June 2015 Report to Congress on the Prevention and Reduction of Underage Drinking

Laws Addressing Minors in Possession of Alcohol

Underage Possession, Consumption, and Internal Possession

Policy Description

As of January 1, 2013, all U.S. states and the District of Columbia prohibit possession of alcoholic beverages (with certain exceptions) by those under age 21. In addition, most but not all jurisdictions have statutes that specifically prohibit consumption of alcoholic beverages by those under age 21.

In recent years, a number of jurisdictions have enacted laws prohibiting "internal possession" of alcohol by persons less than 21 years old. These provisions typically require evidence of alcohol in the minor's body, but they do not require any specific evidence of possession or consumption. Internal possession laws are especially useful to law enforcement in making arrests or issuing citations when breaking up underage drinking parties. Internal possession laws allow officers to bring charges against underage individuals who are neither holding nor drinking alcoholic beverages in the presence of law enforcement officers. As with laws prohibiting underage possession and consumption, jurisdictions that prohibit internal possession may apply various statutory exceptions to these provisions.

Although all jurisdictions prohibit possession of alcohol by minors, some jurisdictions do not specifically prohibit underage alcohol consumption. In addition, some jurisdictions that do prohibit underage consumption allow for different exceptions for consumption than those that apply to underage possession. Jurisdictions that may prohibit underage possession and/or consumption may or may not address the issue of internal possession.

Some jurisdictions allow exceptions to possession, consumption, or internal possession prohibitions when a family member consents and/or is present. Jurisdictions vary widely in terms of which relatives may consent or must be present for this exception to apply and in what circumstances the exception applies. Sometimes a reference is made simply to "family" or "family member" without further elaboration.

Some jurisdictions allow exceptions to possession, consumption, or internal possession prohibitions on private property. Jurisdictions vary in the extent of the private property exception, which may extend to all private locations, private residences only, or in the home of a parent or guardian only. In some, a location exception is conditional on the presence and/or consent of a parent, legal guardian, or spouse.

With respect specifically to consumption laws, some jurisdictions prohibit underage consumption only on licensed premises.

Status of Underage Possession Policies

As of January 1, 2013, all 50 states and the District of Columbia prohibit possession of alcoholic beverages by those under age 21. Twenty-six jurisdictions have some type of family exception, 21 have some type of location exception, and 19 have neither (see Exhibit 4.3.1).

Exhibit 4.3.1: Exceptions to Minimum Age of 21 for Possession of Alcohol as of January 1, 2013



Four of these limit the location to the parent/guardian's residence, eight pertain to any private residence, and nine concern any private location.

Trends in Underage Possession Policies

During the period between 1998 and 2013, the number of jurisdictions with family exceptions rose from 23 to 26, the number with location exceptions rose from 20 to 21, and the number of jurisdictions with neither exception decreased from 21 to 19 (see Exhibit 4.3.2).

Status of Underage Consumption Policies

As of January 1, 2013, 35 jurisdictions prohibit consumption of alcoholic beverages by those under age 21. Of those, 17 permit family exceptions to the law, 13 permit location exceptions, and 15 permit neither type of exception (see Exhibit 4.3.3). Seven states (Montana, Ohio, South Dakota, Texas, Washington, Wisconsin, and Wyoming) permit only family exceptions; three states (Hawaii, New Jersey, and Nebraska) permit only location exceptions. Ten states had both types of exceptions, with nine of the states permitting underage consumption only if both family and location criteria are met.

Exhibit 4.3.2: Number of States with Family and Location Exceptions to Minimum Age of 21 for Possession of Alcohol, January 1, 1998, through January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.3: Exceptions to Minimum Age of 21 for Consumption of Alcohol as of January 1, 2013



Trends in Underage Consumption Policies

As Exhibit 4.3.4 illustrates, during the period between 1998 and 2013, the number of jurisdictions that did not prohibit underage consumption decreased from 24 to 17. Location exceptions rose from 9 to 13; family exceptions rose from 13 to 17; and the number of jurisdictions with neither type of exception rose from 13 to 14.

Status of Underage Internal Possession Policies

As of January 1, 2013, nine states prohibit internal possession of alcoholic beverages for anyone under age 21 (see Exhibit 4.3.5). Of the nine states that prohibit internal possession, six do not make any exceptions. In contrast, Colorado has exceptions for situations in which parents or guardians are present and give consent and the possession occurs in any private location. South Carolina's law makes an exception for internal possession in the homes only of parents or guardians. Wyoming makes exceptions for situations in which parents, guardians and spouses are present.

Trends in Underage Internal Possession Policies

As Exhibit 4.3.6 illustrates, during the period between 1998 and 2013, the number of states that prohibit underage internal possession grew steadily from two to nine. The most recent state to enact a prohibition on internal possession was Wyoming.

Exhibit 4.3.4: Number of States with Family and Location Exceptions to Minimum Age of 21 for Consumption of Alcohol, January 1, 1998, through January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.5: Prohibition of Internal Possession of Alcohol by Persons Under Age 21 as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.6: Distribution of States with Laws Prohibiting Internal Possession of Alcohol by Persons Under Age 21, January 1, 1998, through January 1, 2013



References and Further Information

All data for Underage Possession, Consumption, and Internal Possession policy topics were obtained at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov from the Alcohol Policy Information System (APIS). Follow links to the policy titled "Underage Possession/Consumption/Internal Possession of Alcohol." APIS provides further descriptions of this set of policies and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

Hingson, R.W. (2009). The legal drinking age and underage drinking in the United States. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine, 163(7),* 598–600.

Miller, T.R., Levy, D.T., Spicer, R.S., & Taylor, D.M. (2006). Societal costs of underage drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 67(4),* 519–528.

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Norberg, K.E., Bierut, L.J., & Richard, A.G. (2009). Long-term effects of minimum drinking age laws on past-year alcohol and drug use disorders. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 33(12),* 2180–2190.

Song, E.Y., Smiler, A.P., Wagoner, K.G., & Wolfson, M. (2012). Everyone says it's OK: Adolescents' perceptions of peer, parent, and community alcohol norms, alcohol consumption, and alcohol-related consequences. *Substance Use & Misuse, 47(1),* 86–98. doi:10.3109/10826084.2011.629704

Toomey, T.L., & Lenk, K.M. (2011). A review of environmental-based community interventions. *Alcohol Research & Health, 34(2),* 163–166.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2007). *Surgeon General's Call to Action to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking*. Rockville, MD: Office of the Surgeon General. Retrieved from http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/topics/underagedrinking

Wagenaar, A.C., Lenk, K.M., & Toomey, T.L. (2005). Policies to reduce underage drinking: A review of the recent literature. In M. Galanter (Ed.), *Recent developments in alcoholism: Alcohol problems in adolescents and young adults* (Vol. 17, pp. 277–297). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Underage Purchase and Attempted Purchase

Policy Description

Most states, but not all, prohibit minors from purchasing or attempting to purchase alcoholic beverages. A minor purchasing alcoholic beverages can be prosecuted for possession because, arguably, a sale cannot be completed until there is possession on the part of the purchaser. Purchase and possession are nevertheless separate offenses. A minor who purchases alcoholic beverages is potentially liable for two offenses in states that have both prohibitions. See the "Underage Possession/Internal Possession/Consumption" section of this report for further discussion.[40] A significant minority of youths purchase or attempt to purchase alcohol for themselves, sometimes using falsified identification (see the "False Identification" section of this report).

Such purchases increase the availability of alcohol to underage persons, which, in turn, increases underage consumption. Prohibitions and associated sanctions on alcohol purchases by underage persons can be expected to depress rates of purchase and attempted purchase by raising the monetary and social costs of this behavior. Such laws provide a primary deterrent (preventing attempted purchases) and a secondary deterrent (reducing the probability that persons sanctioned under these laws will attempt to purchase in the future).

In some states, a person under age 21 is allowed to purchase alcoholic beverages as part of a law enforcement action. Most commonly, these actions are checks on merchant compliance or stings to identify merchants who illegally sell alcoholic beverages to minors. This allowance for purchase in the law enforcement context may exist even though a state does not have a law specifically prohibiting underage purchase.

Status of Underage Purchasing Policies

As of January 1, 2013, 46 states and the District of Columbia prohibit underage purchase or attempted purchase of alcohol; the remaining 4 states (Delaware, Indiana, New York, and Vermont) do not (see Exhibit 4.3.7). Underage persons are allowed to purchase alcohol for law enforcement purposes in 23 states including Indiana, even though Indiana does not have an underage purchase statute. The three other states without underage purchase statutes have no allowances for such purchases made for law enforcement purposes.

Trends in Underage Purchasing Policies

Since 1998, the number of jurisdictions prohibiting underage purchase of alcohol has remained the same (47). During that period, the number of states with allowances for underage purchase for enforcement purposes has steadily increased, from 9 in 1998 to 22 in 2013 (Exhibit 4.3.8).

[40] Some states have laws that specifically prohibit both underage purchase and attempted purchase of alcohol. An attempted purchase occurs when a minor takes concrete steps toward committing the offense of purchasing whether or not the purchase is consummated. It is likely that courts in states that include only the purchase prohibition in their statutes would treat attempted purchase as a lesser included offense. It can, therefore, be assumed that all states that prohibit purchase also prohibit attempted purchases. The two offenses are therefore not treated separately in this report.

Exhibit 4.3.7: Underage Purchase of Alcohol for Law Enforcement Purposes as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.8: Underage Purchase of Alcohol for Law Enforcement Purposes, January 1, 1998, through January 1, 2013



References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policy titled "Underage Purchase of Alcohol." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. For definitions for the variables in this policy, go to Appendix B.

Fagan, A.A., Hawkins, J.D., & Catalano, R.F. (2011). Engaging communities to prevent underage drinking. *Alcohol Research & Health, 34(2),* 167–174.

Gruenewald, P.J. (2011). Regulating availability: How access to alcohol affects drinking and problems in youth and adults. *Alcohol Research & Health, 34(2),* 248–256.

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Norberg, K.E., Bierut, L.J., & Richard, A.G. (2009). Long-term effects of minimum drinking age laws on past-year alcohol and drug use disorders. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 33(12),* 2180–2190.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2007). *Surgeon General's Call to Action to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking*. Rockville, MD: Office of the Surgeon General. Retrieved from http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/topics/underagedrinking

Williams, R.S., & Ribisl, K.M. (2012). Internet alcohol sales to minors. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 166(9),* 808–813. doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2012.265

False Identification ("false ID")

Policy Description

Alcohol retailers are responsible for ensuring that sales of alcoholic beverages are made only to individuals who are legally permitted to purchase alcohol. Inspecting government-issued identification (driver's license, nondriver identification card, passport, and military identification) is one major mechanism for ensuring that buyers meet minimum age requirements. In attempting to circumvent these safeguards, minors may obtain and use apparently valid ID that falsely states their age as 21 or over. Age may be falsified by altering the birthdate on a valid ID, obtaining an invalid ID card that appears to be valid, or using someone else's ID.

Compliance check studies suggest that underage drinkers may have little need to use false ID because retailers often make sales without any ID inspection. However, concerns about false ID remain high among educators, law enforcement officials, retailers, and government officials. Current technology, including high-quality color copiers and printers, has made false ID easier to fabricate, and the internet provides ready access to a large number of false ID vendors.

All states prohibit use of false identification by minors to obtain alcohol. In addition to the basic prohibitions, states have adopted a variety of legal provisions pertaining to false ID for obtaining alcohol. These provisions can be divided into three basic categories:

- Provisions that target minors who possess and use false identification to obtain alcohol
- Provisions that target those who supply minors with false identification, either through lending of a valid ID or the production of invalid ("fake") IDs
- Provisions that assist retailers in avoiding sales to potential buyers who present false IDs

Government-issued IDs are used for a number of age-related purposes other than the purchase of alcohol: registering to vote, enlisting in the military, entering certain entertainment venues, and so on. APIS confines its analysis to statutes and regulations relating to the use of false identification for the purpose of obtaining alcohol.

For further discussion of policies pertaining to the purchase of alcohol by minors, see the "Underage Purchase and Attempted Purchase" section of this report; for policies that mandate training of servers to detect false identification, see the "Responsible Beverage Service" section of this report; and for policies on license suspension or revocation, see the "Loss of Driving Privileges for Alcohol Violations by Minors" section of this report.

Status of False ID Policies

Provisions That Target Minors

As of January 1, 2013, all states and the District of Columbia prohibit minors from using false IDs to obtain alcohol (see Exhibit 4.3.9). All but eight states (Delaware, Kansas, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming) authorize suspension of minors' driver's licenses for using a false ID in the purchase of alcohol. In all but four states (Alaska, Illinois, Ohio, and West Virginia) the suspension is through judicial proceedings. Two states (Arizona and Iowa) allow for both judicial and administrative proceedings for license sanctions.

Exhibit 4.3.9: Procedure for Imposing License Sanction for Use of False ID as of January 1, 2013



Provisions That Target Suppliers

As of January 1, 2013, 25 states have laws that target suppliers of false IDs; 24 prohibit lending, transferring, or selling false IDs to minors for the purpose of purchasing alcohol; and 13 prohibit manufacturing such licenses.

Retailer Support Provisions

Retailer support provisions vary widely across the states. In prosecution involving an illegal underage alcohol sale, 44 states and the District of Columbia provide for some type of affirmative defense (the retailer shows that he/she reached a good faith or reasonable conclusion that the false ID was valid); 43 states have laws requiring distinctive licenses for persons under age 21; 11 states permit retailers to seize apparently false IDs; 11 states provide incentives for the use of scanners; 4 states (Arkansas, Colorado, South Dakota, and Utah) allow retailers to detain minors; and 4 states (Alaska, Oregon, New Hampshire, and Utah) permit retailers to sue minors for damages.

Trends in False ID State Policies

State false ID policies that target minors and suppliers have been relatively stable for the last 12 years. During this period, Hawaii, Maine, Mississippi, and South Dakota implemented judicial license revocation, and Missouri enacted a law making it illegal to lend, transfer, or sell false IDs

to minors. By contrast, states have been actively enacting four of the retailer support provisions. All 11 scanner provisions were enacted over the last 12 years (see Exhibit 4.3.10). Two of the specific affirmative defense laws (Arizona and Vermont), two of the right to detain minors laws (Arkansas and South Dakota), and three of the right to sue minors laws (Alaska, New Hampshire, and Utah) were enacted during this time period. Idaho is an exception to the general trend; in 2007, it rescinded its law permitting retailers to seize apparently false IDs.

References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policy entitled "False Identification for Obtaining Alcohol." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. Variables are defined in Appendix B.

Martinez, J.A., & Sher, K.J. (2010). Methods of "fake ID" obtainment and use in underage college students. *Addictive Behaviors, 35(7),* 738–740.

Morleo, M., Cook, P.A., Bellis, M.A., & Smallthwaite, L. (2010). Use of fake identification to purchase alcohol amongst 15-16 year olds: A cross-sectional survey examining alcohol access, consumption and harm. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy, 5, 12.* doi:10.1186/1747-597X-5-12

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2006). *Young adult drinking*. Alcohol Alert No. 68. Retrieved from http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/aa68/aa68.htm

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Nguyen, N., Walters, S.T., Rinker, D.V., Wyatt, T.M., & DeJong, W. (2011). Fake ID ownership in a U.S. sample of incoming first-year college students. *Addictive Behaviors, 36(7),* 759–761.

Exhibit 4.3.10: Number of States with Scanner Provisions in False ID Laws, January 1, 1998, through January 1, 2013



Laws Targeting Underage Drinking and Driving

Youth Blood Alcohol Concentration Limits (underage operators of noncommercial motor vehicles)

Policy Description

Blood alcohol concentration (BAC) limits policies establish the maximum amount of alcohol a minor can have in his/her bloodstream when operating a motor vehicle. BAC is commonly expressed as a percentage. For instance, a BAC of 0.08 percent means that a person has 8 parts alcohol per 10,000 parts blood in the body. State laws generally specify BAC levels in terms of grams of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood (often abbreviated as grams per deciliter, or g/dL). BAC levels can be detected by breath, blood, or urine tests. The laws of each jurisdiction specify the preferred or required types of tests used for measurement.

There is strong scientific evidence that, as BAC increases, the cognitive and motor skills needed to operate a motor vehicle are increasingly impaired. BAC statutes establish criteria for determining when the operator of a vehicle is sufficiently impaired to constitute a threat to public safety and is, therefore, violating the law. Currently, all states and the District of Columbia mandate a BAC limit of 0.08 g/dL for adult drivers.

Owing to differences between young people and adults (e.g., body mass, physiological development, driving experience), young people's ability to safely operate a motor vehicle is impaired at a lower BAC than for adults. Partly as a result of financial incentives established by the federal government, all jurisdictions in the United States have enacted low BAC limits for underage drivers. Laws establishing very low legal BAC limits of 0.02 g/dL or less for drivers under the legal drinking age of 21 are widely referred to as zero-tolerance laws.

A per se BAC statute stipulates that if the operator has a BAC level at or above the per se limit, a violation has occurred without regard to other evidence of intoxication or sobriety (e.g., how well or poorly the individual is driving). In other words, exceeding the BAC limit established in a per se statute is itself a violation.

Status of Youth BAC Limit Policies

As of January 1, 2013, all states have per se youth BAC statutes (see Exhibit 4.3.11). Thirty-four states set the driving BAC limit for underage persons at 0.02 g/dL. The District of Columbia and 14 states consider any underage alcohol consumption while driving to be a violation of the law and have set the limit to 0.00 g/dL. Two states (California and New Jersey) have set the underage BAC limit to 0.01 g/dL.

Trends in Youth BAC Limit Policies

Since 1998, all states have had zero tolerance (0.02 g/dL or lower) youth BAC limit laws (see Exhibit 4.3.12). In the period between 1999 and 2013, the number of states mandating specific BAC limits for underage drivers remained constant with the exception of one state (Maryland), which lowered its underage BAC limit from 0.02 to 0.00 g/dL. Prior to 1998, three states (South Carolina, South Dakota, and Wyoming) had no youth BAC limits and one (Mississippi) set the limit to 0.08 g/dL.

Exhibit 4.3.11: Youth Operators Blood Alcohol Concentration Limit Laws as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.12: Distribution of Youth (Underage Operators of Noncommercial Motor Vehicles) BAC Limit Laws, January 1, 1998, through January 1, 2013



References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policy entitled "Blood Alcohol Concentration Limits: Youth (Underage Operators of Noncommercial Motor Vehicles)." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

Fell, J.C., Fisher, D.A., Voas, R.B., Blackman, K., & Tippetts, A.S. (2009). The impact of underage drinking laws on alcohol-related fatal crashes of young drivers. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 33(7),* 1208–1219.

Lovenheim, M.F., & Slemrod, J. (2010). The fatal toll of driving to drink: The effect of minimum legal drinking age evasion on traffic fatalities. *Journal of Health Economics, 29(1),* 62–77.

Maldonado-Molina, M.M., Reingle, J.M., Delcher, C., & Branchini, J. (2011). The role of parental alcohol consumption on driving under the influence of alcohol: Results from a longitudinal, nationally representative sample. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 43(6),* 2182–2187.

McCartt, A.T., Hellinga, L.A., & Kirley, B.B. (2010). The effects of minimum legal drinking age 21 laws on alcohol-related driving in the United States. *Journal of Safety Research, 41(2),* 173–181.

Norberg, K.E., Bierut, L.J., & Richard, A.G. (2009). Long-term effects of minimum drinking age laws on past-year alcohol and drug use disorders. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 33(12),* 2180–2190.

Peck, R.C., Gebers, M.A., Voas, R.B., & Romano, E. (2008). The relationship between blood alcohol concentration (BAC), age, and crash risk. *Journal of Safety Research, 39(3),* 311–319.

Roudsari, B., & Ramisetty-Mikler, S. (2008). Exceptions to the "National Minimum Drinking Age Act" and underage drunk driver death in the US: A state-level comparison. *Annals of Epidemiology, 18(9),* 714.

Voas, R.B., Tippetts, A.S., & Fell, J. (2003). Assessing the effectiveness of minimum legal drinking age and zero tolerance laws in the United States. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 35(4),* 579–587.

Loss of Driving Privileges for Alcohol Violations by Minors ("use/lose" laws)

Policy Description

Use/lose laws authorize suspension or revocation of driving privileges as a penalty for underage purchase, possession, or consumption of alcoholic beverages. States began enacting these statutes in the mid-1980s to deter underage drinking by imposing a punishment that young people would consider significant: the loss of a driver's license. In most states, use/lose laws make it mandatory to impose driver's license sanctions in response to underage alcohol violations. State laws vary as to the type of violation (purchase, possession, or consumption of alcohol) that leads to these sanctions and how long suspensions or revocations stay in effect.

State laws specific to minors (purchase, possession, and consumption of alcoholic beverages) are described in the "Underage Purchase and Attempted Purchase," "Underage Possession," "Underage Consumption," and "Internal Possession by Minors" sections of this report.

Status of Loss of Driving Privileges Policies

Upper Age Limit

Twenty-six states and the District of Columbia set age 21 as the upper limit for which use/lose laws apply. Fourteen states set the upper limit at age 18, and one state (Wyoming) sets the limit at age 19. In four states (Arkansas, Hawaii, Tennessee, and Virginia), some sanction conditions vary depending on whether the violator is under age 18 or under age 21.

Authority To Impose License Sanction

The vast majority of jurisdictions (35 states and the District of Columbia) have made license suspension or revocation mandatory in cases of underage alcohol violations (see Exhibit 4.3.13). Nine states have made this a discretionary penalty for such violations, and 10 states have no use/lose law. One state (Hawaii) makes this a discretionary penalty for minors below age 18, but mandatory for violators ages 18 through 20. (The total of states is greater than 51 because some have both mandatory and discretionary laws.)

Trends in Loss of Driving Privileges Policies

Between 1998 and 2013, the number of jurisdictions that made license suspension or revocation mandatory in cases of underage alcohol violations increased from 25 to 33 (see Exhibit 4.3.14). During this same time period, the number of jurisdictions with no use/lose laws decreased from 17 to 10, and the number with discretionary authority to impose use/lose sanctions dropped from 10 to 8.

Exhibit 4.3.13: License Suspension/Revocation for Alcohol Violations by Minors as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.14: Distribution of License Suspension/Revocation Procedures for Alcohol Violations by Minors, January 1, 1998, through January 1, 2013



References and Further Information

Data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policy entitled "Loss of Driving Privileges for Alcohol Violations by Minors ("Use/Lose" Laws)." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

Carpenter, C. (2004). How do zero tolerance drunk driving laws work? *Journal of Health Economics, 23(1),* 61–83.

Cavazos-Rehg, P.A., Krauss, M.J., Spitznagel, E.L., Chaloupka, F.J., Schootman, M., Grucza, R.A., & Bierut, L.J. (2012). Associations between selected state laws and teenagers' drinking and driving behaviors. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 36(9),* 1647–1652. doi:10.1111/j.1530-0277.2012.01764.x

Chang, K., Wu, C.C., & Ying, Y.H. (2012). The effectiveness of alcohol control policies on alcohol-related traffic fatalities in the United States. *Accident Analysis and Prevention, 45,* 406–415.

Fell, J.C., Fisher, D.A., Voas, R.B., Blackman, K., & Tippetts, A.S. (2008). The relationship of underage drinking laws to reductions in drinking drivers in fatal crashes in the United States. *Accident Analysis & Prevention, 40(4),* 1430–1440.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2006). *Young adult drinking*. Alcohol Alert No. 68. Retrieved from http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/aa68/aa68.htm

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Voas, R.B., Tippetts, A.S., & Fell, J. (2003). Assessing the effectiveness of minimum legal drinking age and zero tolerance laws in the United States. *Accident Analysis & Prevention, 35(4),* 579–587.

Graduated Driver's Licenses

Policy Description

Graduated driver licensing (GDL) is a system designed to delay full licensure for teenage automobile drivers, thus allowing beginning drivers to gain experience under less risky conditions. Teenagers are targeted because they are at the highest risk for motor vehicle crashes, including alcohol-related crashes. By imposing restrictions on driving privileges, GDL reduces the chances of teenagers driving while intoxicated.

A fully developed GDL system has three stages: a minimum supervised learner's period, an intermediate license (once the driving test is passed) that limits unsupervised driving in high-risk situations, and a full-privilege driver's license available after completion of the first two stages. Beginners must remain in each of the first two stages for set minimum time periods.

The learner's stage has three components:

- Minimum age at which drivers can operate vehicles in the presence of parents, guardians, or other adults
- Minimum holding periods during which learner's permits must be held before drivers advance to the intermediate stage of the licensing process
- Minimum age at which drivers become eligible to drive without adult supervision

The intermediate stage of GDL law has five components:

- Minimum age at which drivers become eligible to drive without adult supervision
- Unsupervised night-driving prohibitions
- Primary enforcement of night-driving provisions
- Passenger restrictions, which set the total number of passengers allowed in vehicles driven by intermediate-stage drivers
- Primary enforcement of passenger restrictions

"Primary enforcement" refers to the authority given to law enforcement officers to stop drivers for the sole purpose of investigating potential violations of night-driving or passenger restrictions. Law enforcement officers in states without primary enforcement can investigate potential violations of these provisions only as part of an investigation of some other offense. Primary enforcement greatly increases the chance that violators will be detected. The single component for the license stage of GDL is the minimum age at which full licensure occurs and both passenger and night-driving restrictions are lifted.

Status of Graduated Driver Licensing Policies

All 51 jurisdictions have some form of GDL policy and all states have full three-stage criteria (see Exhibit 4.3.15). The minimum ages for each stage and the extent to which the other restrictions are imposed vary across jurisdictions. An important GDL provision related to traffic safety is the minimum age for full licensure. Fourteen jurisdictions allow full licensure on the 18th birthday; three jurisdictions permit it at age above 17 but under 18; and 18 permit it on the 17th birthday. The remaining 16 jurisdictions permit full licensure to those who are under 17 but at least 16 years old. All but one jurisdiction has night-driving restrictions; the hours during

Exhibit 4.3.15: Minimum Age of Full Driving Privileges Laws as of January 1, 2013



which these restrictions apply vary widely among jurisdictions, but fall largely between 6 p.m. and 1 a.m. Thirty-eight jurisdictions have primary enforcement of night-driving restrictions. Forty-six jurisdictions place passenger restrictions on drivers with less than full licensure, and 31 of those have primary enforcement of these restrictions.

Trends in Graduated Driver Licensing Policies

Since the mid-1990s, states enacting three-stage GDL laws have steadily increased (see Exhibit 4.3.16). On January 1, 1996, only one state (Maryland) had such a law, but by 2000, 23 jurisdictions had enacted three-stage GDL laws, and by 2012, that number had risen to 51.

References and Further Information

Legal research for this topic is planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. Historical data for the years 1996 through 2004 were obtained from "Graduated Driver Licensing Programs and Fatal Crashes of 16 year old Drivers: A National Evaluation" (Baker, S.P., Chen, L.-H., & Li, G. (2006), National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, DOT HS 810 614). Data from January 1, 2005, until December 31, 2008, were obtained from the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (http://www.iihs.org/laws/pdf/us_licensing_systems.pdf). Data through January 1, 2013, were collected by SAMHSA. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

Exhibit 4.3.16: Number of States (and District of Columbia) with Three-Stage Graduated Driver Licensing Policies, July 1, 1996, through January 1, 2013



Laws Targeting Alcohol Suppliers

Furnishing Alcohol to Minors

Policy Description

All states prohibit furnishing alcoholic beverages to minors by both commercial servers (bars, restaurants, retail sales outlets) and noncommercial servers. However, examination of case law would be required to determine with certainty that the prohibition applies to both commercial and noncommercial servers in all states. Additionally, most states include some type of exception to their furnishing laws of the types listed below.

Most underage persons obtain alcohol from adults including parents, older siblings and peers, or strangers solicited to purchase alcohol for the minor. Fewer youths purchase alcohol for themselves from merchants who fail to comply with laws prohibiting sale to minors or by using false identification (see the "False Identification" section of this report). These sources increase the availability of alcohol to underage persons, which, in turn, increases underage consumption. Prohibitions and associated sanctions on furnishing to underage persons can be expected to depress rates of furnishing by raising the monetary and social costs of this behavior. Such laws provide a primary deterrent (preventing furnishing) and a secondary deterrent (reducing the chances of persons sanctioned under these laws furnishing in the future).

Two types of exceptions to underage furnishing laws are discussed in this analysis:

- Family exceptions permit parents, guardians, or spouses to furnish alcohol to minors; some states specify that the spouse must be of legal age and others do not.
- Location exceptions permit furnishing alcohol in specified locations and may limit the extent to which family members can furnish to minors. No state has an exception for furnishing on private property by anyone other than a family member.

Some states provide sellers and licensees with one or more defenses against a charge of furnishing alcoholic beverages to a minor. Under these provisions, a retailer who provides alcohol to a minor will not be found in violation of the furnishing law if he or she can establish one of these defenses. This policy topic tracks one such defense: some states require that the minor who initiated a transaction be charged for possessing or purchasing the alcohol before the retailer can be found in violation of the furnishing law. (Defenses associated with minors using false ID can be found in the "False Identification" section of this report.) Many states also have provisions that mitigate or reduce the penalties imposed on retailers if they have participated in responsible beverage service (RBS) programs; see the Responsible Beverage Service" section of this report for further discussion.

In some states, furnishing laws are closely associated with laws that prohibit hosting underage drinking parties. These laws target hosts who allow underage drinking on property they own, lease, or otherwise control. (See the "Hosting Underage Drinking Parties" section of this report for further discussion.) Hosts of underage drinking parties who also supply the alcohol consumed or possessed by minors may be in violation of two distinct laws: furnishing alcohol to minors, and allowing underage drinking to occur on property they control.

Also addressed in this report are social host liability laws, which impose civil liability on hosts for injuries caused by their underage guests. Although related to party hosting laws, social host liability laws are distinct. They do not establish criminal or civil offenses, but instead allow injured parties to recover damages by suing social hosts of events during which minors consumed alcohol and later were responsible for injuries. The commercial analog to social host liability laws is dram shop laws, which prohibit commercial establishments—bars, restaurants, and retail sales outlets—from furnishing alcoholic beverages to minors. See the "Social Host Liability" and "Dram Shop Liability" portions of this report for further discussion.

Status of Underage Furnishing Policies

Exceptions to Furnishing Prohibitions

As of January 1, 2013, all states prohibit the furnishing of alcoholic beverages to minors (see Exhibit 4.3.17). Nineteen states and the District of Columbia have no family or location exceptions to this prohibition. The remaining 31 states permit parents, guardians, and/or spouses to furnish alcohol to their underage children and/or spouses. Of these, 12 states limit the exception to certain locations (3 states, any private location; 7 states, any private residence; 2 states, parents' or guardians' homes only).

Exhibit 4.3.17: Exceptions to Prohibitions on Furnishing Alcohol to Persons Under Age 21 as of January 1, 2013



Affirmative Defense for Sellers and Licensees

As of January 1, 2013, the underage furnishing laws of two states (Michigan and South Carolina) include provisions requiring that the seller/licensee be exonerated of charges of furnishing alcohol to a minor unless the minor involved is charged.

Trends in Underage Furnishing Policies

State policies prohibiting the furnishing of alcohol to minors have remained stable over the last 12 years. As of January 1, 1998, all states prohibited underage furnishing (see Exhibit 4.3.18).

Exhibit 4.3.18: Number of States with Family and Location Exceptions to Prohibition on Furnishing Alcohol to Persons under Age 21, January 1, 1998, through January 1, 2013



References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. See the policy entitled "Furnishing Alcohol to Minors." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

Fagan, A.A., Hawkins, J.D., & Catalano, R.F. (2011). Engaging communities to prevent underage drinking. *Alcohol Research & Health, 34(2),* 167–174.

Gosselt, J.F., Van Hoof, J.J., & De Jong, M.D. (2012). Why should I comply? Sellers' accounts for (non-)compliance with legal age limits for alcohol sales. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy, 7,* 5. doi:10.1186/1747-597X-7-5

Paschall, M.J., Grube, J.W., Black, C., & Ringwalt, C.L. (2007). Is commercial alcohol availability related to adolescent alcohol sources and alcohol use? Findings from a multi-level study. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41(2),* 168–174.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2007). *Surgeon General's Call to Action to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking*. Rockville, MD: Office of the Surgeon General. Retrieved from http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/topics/underagedrinking

Ward, L.M., & Snow, P.C. (2011). Factors affecting parental supply of alcohol to underage adolescents. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 30(4),* 338–343.

Compliance Check Protocols

Policy Description

Compliance checks involve an underage operative (a "decoy") working with either law enforcement officials or agents from the state alcoholic beverage control (ABC) agency, who enters an alcohol retail establishment and attempts to purchase an alcoholic beverage from a server, bartender, or clerk. The protocols for these checks vary from state to state, but in general follow a similar outline. An underage person (allowable ages vary by state) serves as a decoy in the compliance check. Decoys are generally instructed to act and dress in an age-appropriate manner. The decoy enters an alcohol retail outlet to attempt to purchase a predetermined alcohol product (e.g., a six-pack of beer at an off-sale establishment or a mixed drink at an on-sales establishment). Typically, the decoy is observed by an undercover enforcement officer from a local police department or the state ABC agency. Audio and video recording equipment may also be used or required. State rules vary regarding a decoy's use of legitimate identification cards (driver's licenses, etc.), although a few states allow decoys to verbally exaggerate their age. If a purchase is made successfully, the establishment and/or the clerk or server may be subject to an administrative or criminal penalty.

Most, but not all, states permit law enforcement agencies to conduct compliance checks on a random basis. A few states permit them only when there is a basis for suspecting that a particular licensee has sold alcohol to a minor in the past. To ensure that state and local law enforcement agencies are following uniform procedures, most states have issued formal compliance check protocols or guidelines. If the protocols are not adhered to, then the administrative action against the licensee may be dismissed. The protocols are therefore designed to ensure that law enforcement actions are fair and reasonable and to provide guidelines to licensees for avoiding prosecution.

Compliance checks of off- and on-premise licensed alcohol retailers are an important community tool for reducing illegal alcohol sales to minors and promoting community normative change. The Institute of Medicine (IOM) 2003 report, *Reducing Underage Drinking: A Collective Responsibility*, calls for (a) regular, random compliance checks; (b) administrative penalties, including fines and license suspensions that increase with each offense; (c) enhanced media coverage for the purposes and results of compliance checks; and (d) training for alcohol retailers regarding their legal responsibility to avoid selling alcohol to underage youths.

Compliance checks have both educational and behavior change goals:

- Change or reinforce social norms that underage drinking is not acceptable by publicizing noncompliant retailers.
- Educate the community, including parents, educators, and policymakers, about the ready availability of alcohol to youth, which may not be considered a major issue.
- Increase alcohol retailers' perception that violation of sales to minors laws will be detected and punished, creating a deterrent effect.

Status of Compliance Check Protocols

Data for this policy were coded from formal compliance check protocols or guidelines. A total of 33 states have formal, written protocols; the remaining states either do not have them or do not have them readily available to the public. Compliance check protocols are generally issued by

the state police or the state ABC agency. These guidelines vary somewhat in specificity and detail, possibly reflecting differences in the purposes of the checks and the evidentiary standards in each jurisdiction.

The maximum age of the decoy varies from 18 to 20, with the majority of states requiring that the maximum age of the decoy be 19 or 20 (see Exhibit 4.3.19). The minimum age of the decoy ranges from 16 to 18, with the majority of the states requiring the minimum age of the decoy to be 17 or 18. Thirty-three jurisdictions have guidelines for the decoys' appearance (e.g., no facial hair on males, no makeup on females). These requirements vary widely by state. At least one state uses an age panel to ensure that the decoys appear underage. Six states allow decoys to verbally exaggerate their age. Decoy training is mandatory in 18 states. About one half of the states (18) require decoys to have valid identification in their possession at the time of the check.

References and Further Information

Legal research and data collection for this topic are planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. To see variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For further information and background, see:

Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation. (2007). *Reducing alcohol sales to underage purchasers: A practical guide to compliance investigations*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Exhibit 4.3.19: Maximum Age of Compliance Check Decoys in 2013



Penalty Guidelines for Sales/Service to Minors

Policy Description

In the majority of states, ABC agencies are responsible for adjudicating administrative charges against licensees, including violations for sales or service to those under age 21. Alcohol law enforcement seeks to increase compliance with laws by increasing the level of perceived risk of detection and sanctions. Such deterrence involves three key components: perceived likelihood that a violation will lead to apprehension and sanction, swiftness with which the sanction is imposed, and severity of the sanction (Ross, 1992). As stated in the 2003 IOM report, *Reducing Underage Drinking: A Collective Responsibility*, the effectiveness of alcohol control policies depends heavily on the "intensity of implementation and enforcement and on the degree to which the intended targets are aware of both the policy and its enforcement." The report recommends, "Enforcement agencies should issue citations for violations of underage sales laws, with substantial fines and temporary suspension of license for first offenses and increasingly stronger penalties thereafter, leading to permanent revocation of license after three offenses."

States typically include administrative penalties in their statutory scheme prohibiting sales to minors. The penalty provisions are usually very broad, allowing for severe penalties but delegating responsibility for determining actual penalties in particular cases to the ABC agencies. Penalties may include warning letters, fines, licence suspensions, a combination of fines and suspensions, or license revocation. The agencies may consider both mitigating and aggravating circumstances as well the number of violations within a given time period, with repeat offenders usually receiving more severe sanctions.

Many ABC agencies issue penalty guidelines to alert licensees to the sanctions that will be imposed for first, second, and subsequent offenses, providing a time period for determining repeat offenses. The agency may treat the guidelines as establishing a set penalty or range of penalties or may treat them as providing guidance, allowing for deviation at the agency's discretion.

Penalty guidelines that establish firm, relatively severe penalties (particularly for repeat offenders) can increase the deterrent effect of the policy and its enforcement and can increase licensees' awareness of the risks associated with violations.

Status of Penalty Guidelines for Sales/Service to Minors

At least 31 jurisdictions have defined administrative penalty guidelines for licensees who sell alcohol to an underage youth (see Exhibit 4.3.20). The remaining 20 states either do not have penalty guidelines or do not make them readily available to the public. The guidelines may be based on statute, regulations, and/or internal policies developed by the agency.

The guidelines vary widely across states. For example, one state issues warning letters for first offenses if there are no aggravating circumstances. Other states impose fines and/or suspensions. Minimum fines for a first offense range from $250 to $5,000, with most states in the $500 to $1,000 range. Fines are typically in lieu of suspensions for first offenses, with some states allowing licensees to choose between the two sanctions. Oklahoma has the strictest first offense guidelines: it revokes the license if the licensee is found selling alcohol to minors, while Mississippi revokes a license after the second offense. Three states (California, Florida, and

Exhibit 4.3.20: States with Penalty Guidelines as of January 1, 2013



New Mexico) have adopted the IOM recommendation that licenses should be revoked after three offenses, and an additional nine states revoke licenses for a fourth offense. The time periods for defining repeat offenses range from 1 to 5 years. Pennsylvania can impose a maximum $5,000 fine, license suspension, or license revocation for a first offense. Fines increase to as much as $25,000 for subsequent offenses (in Utah), with license suspension days increasing to as many as 180 days for subsequent violations (Idaho).

States also vary in the specificity of their guidelines. Many states list a set penalty or a relatively limited range of penalties. Arizona's guideline, on the other hand, provides for penalties ranging from a $1,000–$2,000 fine to 30-day suspension for first offenses. See Chapter 4.4, the Cross-State Survey Report, for a review of penalties actually imposed by states for selling to and serving minors.

References and Further Information

Legal research and data collection for this topic are planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For further information and background, see:

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility.* Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Ross, H.L. (1992). *Confronting drunk driving: Social policy for saving lives.* Binghamton, NY: Vail-Ballou Press.

Responsible Beverage Service

Policy Description

Responsible beverage service (RBS) training policies set requirements or incentives for retail alcohol outlet participation in programs that (a) develop and implement policies and procedures for preventing alcohol sale and service to minors and intoxicated persons, and (b) train licensees, managers, and servers/sellers to implement RBS policies and procedures effectively.

Server/seller training focuses on serving and selling procedures, recognizing signs of intoxication, methods for checking age identification, and techniques for intervening with intoxicated patrons. Manager training includes server/seller training, policy and procedures development, and staff supervision. RBS programs typically have distinct training curricula for on- and off-sale establishments because of the differing characteristics of these retail environments. All RBS programs focus on preventing sale and furnishing to minors.

Responsible beverage service training can be mandatory or voluntary. A program is considered mandatory if state provisions require at least one specified category of individual (e.g., servers/ sellers, managers, or licensees) to attend training. States may have either mandatory programs, voluntary programs, or both. For example, a state may make training for new licenses mandatory while also offering voluntary programs for existing licensees. Alternatively, a state may have a basic mandatory program while also offering a more intensive voluntary program that provides additional benefits for licensees choosing to participate in both.

States with voluntary programs usually provide incentives for retailers to participate in RBS training but do not impose penalties for those who decline involvement. Incentives vary by state and include (a) a defense in dram shop liability lawsuits (cases filed by injured persons against retail establishments that provided alcohol to minors or intoxicated persons who later caused injuries to themselves or third parties); (b) discounts for dram shop liability insurance; (c) mitigation of fines or other administrative penalties for sales to minors or sales to intoxicated persons; and (d) protection against license revocation for sales to minors or intoxicated persons.

See the "Dram Shop Liability" section of this report for further discussion of this policy. The "Furnishing of Alcohol to Minors" section has additional information regarding prevention of alcohol sales to minors, and the "False Identification" section includes materials related to age identification policies.

Status of Responsible Beverage Service Training Policies

As of January 1, 2013, 37 states and the District of Columbia have some type of RBS training provision (see Exhibit 4.3.21). Out of these, 18 states and the District of Columbia have some form of mandatory provision, and 25 states provide for voluntary training. Of the 18 mandatory states, 14 states and the District of Columbia apply their RBS training provisions to both on- and off-sale establishments; 3 states (Michigan, Rhode Island, and Tennessee) apply them to on-premises establishments only; and New Jersey limits its provisions to off-sale establishments. Thirteen of the mandatory states and the District of Columbia apply their provisions to both new and existing establishments, while four states (Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Wisconsin) apply them to new establishments only.

Exhibit 4.3.21: Responsible Beverage Service as of January 1, 2013



Six states (Michigan, New Hampshire, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Washington) have both mandatory and voluntary provisions:

- Michigan: The mandatory provisions apply to new on-premises establishments; the voluntary provisions apply to existing on-premises establishments.
- New Hampshire: The mandatory provisions apply to new on- and off-premises establishments; the voluntary provisions provide incentives available to both types of establishments.
- Oregon: Both the voluntary and mandatory provisions apply to both types of establishments, with the voluntary provisions offering incentives for participation in both.
- Rhode Island: The mandatory provisions apply to existing on-premises establishments. The voluntary provisions offer dram shop liability defense incentives and do not specify which type of establishment may participate.
- Tennessee: The mandatory provisions apply to new and existing on-premises establishments. The voluntary provisions offer incentives available to off-premises establishments, but do not specify whether the incentives are available to new and/or existing establishments.
- Washington: The mandatory provisions are applicable to new and existing on and off-premises establishments. The voluntary provisions are applicable to new, off-premises establishments.

Trends in Responsible Beverage Service Policies

Between 2003 and 2013, the number of states with mandatory policies increased from 15 to 19, and the number of states with voluntary policies rose from 17 to 25 (see Exhibit 4.3.22). The number of states with no RBS training policy decreased from 22 to 13.

References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policy titled "Beverage Service Training and Related Practices." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

Chinman, M., Burkhart, Q., Ebener, P., Fan, C.C., Imm, P., Osilla, K.C., . . .Wright, A. (2011). The premises is the premise: Understanding off- and on-premises alcohol sales outlets to improve environmental alcohol prevention strategies. *Prevention Science, 12(2),* 181–191.

Dresser, J., Starling, R., Woodall, W.G., Stanghetta, P., & May, P.A. (2011). Field trial of alcohol-server training for prevention of fetal alcohol syndrome. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 72(3),* 490–496.

Gosselt, J.F., Van Hoof, J.J., & De Jong, M.D. (2012). Why should I comply? Sellers' accounts for (non-)compliance with legal age limits for alcohol sales. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy, 7,* 5. doi:10.1186/1747-597X-7-5

Exhibit 4.3.22: Number of States with Responsible Beverage Service, January 1, 2003, through January 1, 2013



Rammohan, V., Hahn, R.A., Elder, R., Brewer, R., Fielding, J., Naimi, T.S., . . .Task Force on Community Preventive Services. (2011). Effects of dram shop liability and enhanced overservice law enforcement initiatives on excessive alcohol consumption and related harms: Two Community Guide systematic reviews. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 41(3),* 334–343. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2011.06.027

Saltz, R.F. (2011). Enlisting bars and restaurants in the prevention of intoxication and subsequent harms: Why it matters. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 41(3),* 353–354.

Toomey, T.L., Erickson, D.J., Lenk, K.M., Kilian, G.R., Perry, C.L., & Wagenaar, A.C. (2008). A randomized trial to evaluate a management training program to prevent illegal alcohol sales. *Addiction, 103(3),* 405–413.

Minimum Ages for Off-Premises Sellers

Policy Description

Most states have laws that specify a minimum age for employees who sell alcoholic beverages in off-premises establishments such as liquor stores. A small number require sellers to be at least 21 years old, but most states permit sellers to be younger. Some states allow any person to sell alcohol regardless of age. Other variations across states include minimum age requirements for conducting sales transactions with customers and allowing younger employees to stock coolers with alcohol or bag purchased alcohol. Age restrictions may also vary based on the type of off-premises establishment or type of alcohol being sold. For example, younger persons may be allowed to sell beer but not wine or distilled spirits. Younger persons may also be allowed to sell alcohol in grocery or convenience stores rather than liquor stores. Some states permit younger minimum selling ages only if a manager or supervisor is present.

State laws specifying minimum ages for employees who sell alcoholic beverages for on-premises consumption are described in the "Minimum Ages for On-Premises Servers and Bartenders" section of this report.

Status of Age of Seller Policies

Minimum Age of Sellers and Types of Beverages

Most jurisdictions specify the same minimum age for sellers of all types of alcoholic beverages (see Exhibit 4.3.23). As of January 1, 2013, 10 states specify that off-premises sellers must be 21 years or older. Three states (Idaho, Indiana, and Nebraska) require off-premise sellers to be 19 years or older; 16 states and the District of Columbia have set the minimum age at 18. Four states (Arizona, Maine, Nevada, and New Hampshire) set the minimum age between 16 and 17 years. Four states (California, Georgia, Louisiana, and Virginia) do not specify any minimum age for sellers.

Minimum age requirements in the remaining 14 states vary by type of alcohol, with age requirements generally higher for the sale of distilled spirits and lower for beer. Florida, New York, and North Carolina set a minimum age of 18 for the sale of spirits and have no age minimum for beer or wine. Alabama and South Carolina have a minimum age of 21 for the sale of spirits but no minimum for beer and wine. Vermont sets a minimum age for selling beer and wine (16), but does not specify a minimum age for selling spirits.

Manager or Supervisor Presence

Thirteen states require that a supervisor or manager be present when an underage seller conducts an alcoholic beverage transaction.

Trends in Age of Seller Policies

There were no changes in age of seller policies across states between 2003 and 2013 (see Exhibit 4.3.24).

Exhibit 4.3.23: Minimum Age To Sell Beer for Off-Premises Consumption as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.24: Distribution of Minimum Ages for Off-Premises Sellers of Beer, January 1, 2003, through January 1, 2013



References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policy entitled "Minimum Ages for Off-Premises Sellers." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2006). *Young adult drinking*. Alcohol Alert No. 68. Retrieved from http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/aa68/aa68.htm

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Reboussin, B.A., Song, E.Y., & Wolfson, M. (2011). The impact of alcohol outlet density on the geographic clustering of underage drinking behaviors within census tracts. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 35(8),* 1541–1549.

Wagenaar, A.C., Toomey, T.L., & Erickson, D.J. (2005). Complying with the minimum drinking age: Effects of enforcement and training interventions. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 29(2),* 255–262.

Minimum Ages for On-Premises Servers and Bartenders

Policy Description

All states specify a minimum age for employees who serve or dispense alcoholic beverages. Generally, the term "servers" refers to waitpersons, and "bartenders" refers to individuals who dispense alcoholic beverages. These restrictions recognize that underage employees, particularly those who are unsupervised, may lack the maturity and experience to conduct adequate checks of age identification and resist pressure from underage peers to complete illegal sales.

States vary widely in terms of minimum age requirements for servers and bartenders. In some states, the minimum age for both types of employee is 21, but others set lower minimum ages, particularly for servers. No state permits underage bartenders while prohibiting underage servers. Some states permit servers or bartenders younger than 21 to work only in certain types of on-premises establishments, such as restaurants, or to serve only certain beverage types, such as beer or wine. Underage servers and bartenders may be allowed only if legal-age managers or supervisors are present when underage persons are serving alcoholic beverages or tending bar. State laws setting a minimum age for employees who sell alcohol at off-premises establishments are described in the "Minimum Ages for Off-Premises Sellers" section of this report.

Status of Age of Server Policies

Age of Servers

As of January 1, 2013, Alaska, Nevada, and Utah specify that on-premises alcohol servers of beer, wine, or distilled spirits must be age 21 or older (see Exhibit 4.3.25). Only one state (Maine) allows 17-year-olds to be servers. Ten states specify that servers be at least 19 or 20 years old, and the remaining 36 states and the District of Columbia allow 18-year-old servers.

Age of Bartenders

Minimum ages for bartenders are generally higher than for servers across the states. Nineteen states and the District of Columbia limit bartending to persons age 21 or older. Five states (Arizona, Idaho, Kentucky, Nebraska, and Ohio) specify that bartenders be at least 19 or at least 20. Twenty-five states allow 18-year-olds to bartend, while only one state (Maine) allows 17-year-olds to be bartenders. Minimum ages for serving beer, wine, and distilled spirits are identical in all but three states: Maryland, North Carolina, and Ohio. Maryland and North Carolina require bartenders to be 21 to serve spirits, but permit 18-year-olds to dispense beer and wine; Ohio requires bartenders to be 21 to serve wine and distilled spirits, but those ages 19 and older are allowed to dispense beer.

Trends in Age of Server Policies

Manager or Supervisor Presence

Ten states require that a supervisor or manager be present when an underage seller conducts an alcoholic beverage transaction. State policies for ages of servers and bartenders in on-premises establishments have been generally stable over the last decade (see Exhibit 4.3.26). Between 2003 and 2013, Arkansas lowered its minimum age for servers from 21 to 19, and North Dakota lowered its age for servers from 19 to 18.

Exhibit 4.3.25: Minimum Ages for On-Premises Servers (Beer) as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.26: Distribution of Minimum Ages for On-Premises Servers of Beer, January 1, 2003, through January 1, 2013



References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policy titled "Minimum Ages for On-Premises Servers and Bartenders." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

Stout, E., Sloan, A., Liang, L., & Davies, H. (2000). Reducing harmful alcohol-related behaviors: Effective regulatory methods. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 61,* 402–412.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2006). *Young adult drinking*. Alcohol Alert No. 68. Retrieved from http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/aa68/aa68.htm

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Wagenaar, A.C., Toomey, T.L., & Erickson, D.J. (2005). Complying with the minimum drinking age: Effects of enforcement and training interventions. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 29(2),* 255–262.

Distance Limitations Applied to New Alcohol Outlets Near Universities, Colleges, and Primary and Secondary Schools

Policy Description

Policies that limit the placement of retail alcohol outlets near colleges and schools are designed to make alcohol less accessible to children and youths by keeping alcohol sales physically distant from locations where underage people congregate. In addition, such policies aim to reduce the social availability of alcohol by limiting youth exposure to alcohol consumption.

Outlets Near Colleges and Universities

Alcohol outlet density in general is linked to excessive alcohol consumption and related harms, according to research collected and evaluated by the Community Preventive Services Task Force and presented in the *Community Guide* (Task Force on Community Preventive Services, 2009; Campbell et al., 2009). The *Community Guide* recommends the use of regulatory authority, for example through zoning and licensing, to reduce alcohol outlet density.

Limiting the location of retail outlets near colleges and universities, and their high concentrations of underage drinkers, is one way to implement this recommendation in a high-risk setting. The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) publication, *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges*, includes limiting alcohol outlet density as an evidence-based, recommended strategy for reducing college drinking (NIAAA, 2002a).

Research shows a correlation between underage drinking and retail outlet density near college and university campuses. Outlet density was correlated with heavy and frequent drinking among college students, including underage students, in a study of eight universities (Weitzman, Folkman, Folkman, & Wechsler, 2003). Another study found that both on- and off-premises alcohol outlet densities were associated with campus rape offense rates; the effect of on-campus densities was reduced when student drinking levels were considered (Scribner et al., 2010). A third study examined "secondhand" effects of drinking on residential neighborhoods near college campuses, and concluded that limiting the number of outlets near colleges, particularly those colleges with high rates of binge drinking, could mitigate the secondhand effects (Wechsler, Lee, Hall, Wagenaar, & Lee, 2002). A 1996 study found higher rates of drinking and binge drinking among college students when there were higher numbers of alcohol outlets within 1 mile of campus (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996).

Outlets Near Primary and Secondary Schools

Limiting outlets near primary and secondary schools is another way to reduce alcohol outlet density in a high-risk setting of underage drinking, although there is no research comparable to that for universities that focuses specifically on the relationship between drinking by K–12 students and the proximity of alcohol outlets to their schools.

Types of Outlet Density Restrictions

Outlet density restrictions typically require that alcohol outlets be located a certain distance from a school. Such restrictions may regulate the location of retail outlets near colleges and universities, near primary and secondary schools, or near both categories of schools.

Some restrictions limit the sale of alcohol directly on university campuses. Outlet density restrictions may apply to off-premises retailers, on-premises retailers, or both types of retailers. Restrictions may also apply to the sale of beer, wine, spirits, or some combination of the three.

Distance requirements vary widely, from 100 feet (the distance a primary or secondary school in Illinois must be from an off-premises outlet) to 1.5 miles (the distance a university in California must be from an outlet selling wine or spirits). Restrictions that mandate greater distances are more likely to promote the goals of keeping alcohol away from underage drinkers and reducing their exposure to alcohol marketing.

Distance restrictions apply to the issuance of new licenses, and retail alcohol outlets that were in business prior to the enactment of the restriction may still be allowed to operate within the restricted zone. In these cases, the distance restriction would prevent increased alcohol outlet density without necessarily reducing density or eliminating the presence of retail establishments in the restricted zone.

Status of Outlet Density Restrictions

Colleges and Universities

Thirteen states have some type of restriction on outlet density near colleges and universities, while 38 have no restrictions. Of the 13 states with restrictions, 11 have restrictions that apply to both on-premises and off-premises outlets. Kansas's restriction applies only to off-premises outlets and West Virginia's applies only to on-premises outlets.

Nearly all of the restrictions apply to beer, wine, and spirits. California's and Mississippi's restrictions apply only to wine and spirits, North Carolina's restriction applies to beer and wine, and West Virginia's applies only to beer. Exhibit 4.3.27 shows the states with restrictions on colleges and universities and shows whether the restrictions apply to off- or on-premises outlets.

Primary and Secondary Schools

Many more states have laws restricting outlet location near primary and secondary schools: 32 states have some restriction, while 19 states have none. Out of the 32 states restricting outlet location, 23 apply restrictions to both off- and on-premises locations. The restrictions apply only to on-premises locations in seven states: California, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, and West Virginia. Arkansas and Kansas restrict only off-premises locations.

Most of the restrictions apply to beer, wine, and spirits. New York's, Mississippi's, and Wisconsin's restrictions apply to wine and spirits; North Carolina's restrictions apply only to beer and wine, and West Virginia's restrictions apply only to beer. Exhibit 4.3.28 shows the states with restrictions on primary and secondary schools and shows whether the restrictions apply to off-premises or on-premises outlets.

Exhibit 4.3.27: States with Restrictions on Placement of Retail Outlets Near Colleges and Universities



References and Further Information

Legal research and data collection for this topic are planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For further information and background see:

Campbell, C.A.., Hahn, R.A., Elder, R., Brewer, R., Chattopadhyay, S., Fielding, J., . . . Task Force on Community Preventive Services. (2009). The effectiveness of limiting alcohol outlet density as a means of reducing excessive alcohol consumption and alcohol-related harms. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 37,* 556–569.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Community Preventive Services Task Force. (2009). Guide to Community Preventive Services. Preventing excessive alcohol consumption: Regulation of alcohol outlet density. Retrieved from http://www.thecommunityguide.org/alcohol/outletdensity.html.

Chaloupka, F.J., & Wechsler, H. (1996). Binge drinking in college: The impact of price, availability, and alcohol control policies. *Contemporary Economic Policy, 14(4),* 112–124.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2002). *A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U.S. Colleges*. Retrieved from http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov/media/TaskForceReport.pdf

Exhibit 4.3.28: States with Restrictions on Placement of Retail Outlets Near Primary and Secondary Schools



Scribner, R., Mason, K., Simonsen, N., Theall, K., Chotalia, J., Johnson, S., . . . Dejong, W. (2010). An ecological analysis of alcohol-outlet density and campus-reported violence at 32 U.S. colleges. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 71*, 184–191.

Task Force on Community Preventive Services. (2009). Recommendations for reducing excessive alcohol consumption and alcohol-related harms by limiting alcohol outlet density. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 6*, 570–571.

Wechsler, H., Lee, J.E., Hall, A., Wagenaar, A., & Lee, H. (2002). Secondhand effects of student alcohol use reported by neighbors of colleges: The role of alcohol outlets. *Social Science & Medicine, 55*, 425–435.

Weitzman, E., Folkman, A., Folkman, K.L., & Wechsler, H. (2003). The relationship of alcohol outlet density to heavy and frequent drinking and drinking-related problems among college students at eight universities. *Health & Place, 9*, 1–6.

Dram Shop Liability

Policy Description

Dram shop liability refers to the civil liability faced by commercial alcohol providers for injuries or damages caused by their intoxicated or underage drinking patrons. The analysis in this report is limited to alcohol service to minors.[41] The typical factual scenario in legal cases arising from dram shop liability is a licensed retail alcohol outlet that furnishes alcohol to a minor who, in turn, causes an alcohol-related motor vehicle crash that injures a third party. In states with dram shop liability, the injured third party ("plaintiff") may be able to sue the retailer (as well as the minor who caused the crash) for monetary damages. Liability comes into play only if an injured private citizen files a lawsuit. The state's role is to provide a forum for such a lawsuit; the state does not impose a dram shop–related penalty directly. (This distinguishes dram shop liability from the underage furnishing policy, which results in criminal liability imposed by the state.)

Dram shop liability is closely related to the policy on furnishing alcohol to minors, but the two topics are distinct. Retailers who furnish alcohol to minors may face fines or other punishment imposed by the state as well as dram shop liability lawsuits filed by parties injured as a result of the same incident. Dram shop liability and social host liability (presented elsewhere in this report) are identical, except that the former involves lawsuits filed against commercial alcohol retailers and the latter involves lawsuits filed against noncommercial alcohol providers.

Dram shop liability serves two purposes: (a) it creates a disincentive for retailers to furnish to minors because of the risk of litigation leading to substantial monetary losses, and (b) it allows parties injured as a result of an illegal sale to a minor to gain compensation from those responsible for the injury. The minor causing the injury is the primary and most likely party to be sued. Typically, the retailer is sued through a dram shop claim when the minor does not have the resources to fully compensate the injured party.

Dram shop liability is established by statute or by a state court through "common law." Common law is the authority of state courts to establish rules by which an injured party can seek redress against the person or entity that negligently or intentionally caused injury. Courts can establish these rules only when the state legislature has not enacted its own statutes, in which case the courts must follow the legislative dictates (unless found to be unconstitutional). Thus, dram shop statutes normally take precedence over dram shop common law court decisions. This analysis includes both statutory and common law dram shop liability for each state.

A common law liability designation signifies that the state allows lawsuits by injured third parties against alcohol retailers for the negligent service or provision of alcohol to a minor. Common law liability assumes the following procedural and substantive rules:

- A negligence standard applies (i.e., the defendant did not act as a reasonable person would be expected to act in like circumstances). Plaintiffs need not show that the defendant acted intentionally, willfully, or with actual knowledge of the minor's underage status.

[41] "Dram shop liability" is a legal term that originated in the 19th century. Dram shops were retail establishments that sold distilled spirits by the "dram," a liquid measure that equals 1 ounce. This form of liability is also known as "commercial host liability."

- Damages are not arbitrarily limited. If negligence is established, the plaintiff receives actual damages and can seek punitive damages.
- Plaintiffs can pursue claims against defendants without regard for the age of the person who furnished the alcohol and the age of the underage person furnished with the alcohol.
- Plaintiffs must establish only that minors were furnished alcohol and that the furnishing contributed to the injury without regard to the minor's intoxicated state at the time of sale.
- Plaintiffs must establish key elements of the lawsuit via "preponderance of the evidence" rather than a more rigorous standard (e.g., "beyond a reasonable doubt").

A statutory liability designation indicates that the state has a dram shop statute. Statutory provisions can alter the common law rules listed above, restricting an injured party's ability to make successful claims. This report includes three of the most important statutory limitations:

1. Limitations on damages: Statutes may impose statutory caps on the total dollar amount that plaintiffs may recover through dram shop lawsuits.
2. Limitations on who may be sued: Potential defendants may be limited to only certain types of retail establishments (e.g., on-premises but not off-premises licensees), or certain types of servers (e.g., servers above a certain age).
3. Limitations on elements or standards of proof: Statutes may require plaintiffs to prove additional facts or meet a more rigorous standard of proof than would normally apply in common law. The statutory provisions may require plaintiff to:
   - Establish that the retailer knew the minor was underage or that the retailer intentionally or willfully served the minor.
   - Establish that the minor was intoxicated at the time of sale or service.
   - Provide clear and convincing evidence or evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the allegations are true.

These limitations can restrict the circumstances that can give rise to liability or greatly diminish a plaintiff's chances of prevailing in a dram shop liability lawsuit, thus reducing the likelihood of a lawsuit being filed. Other restrictions may also apply. For example, many states do not allow "first-party claims"—cases brought by the person who was furnished alcohol for his or her own injuries. This report does not track these additional limitations.

Some states have enacted responsible beverage service affirmative defenses. In these states, a defendant can avoid liability if it can establish that its retail establishment had implemented a Responsible Beverage Service (RBS) program and was adhering to RBS practices at the time of the service to a minor. Texas has enacted a more sweeping RBS defense. A defendant licensee can avoid liability if it establishes that (a) it did not encourage the illegal sale and (b) it required its staff, including the server in question, to attend RBS training. Proof that RBS practices were being adhered to at the time of service is not required. See the "RBS Training" policy topic in this report for more information.

Status of Dram Shop Liability

As of January 1, 2013, 45 jurisdictions imposed dram shop liability as a result of statutory or common law or both (see Exhibit 4.3.29). The District of Columbia and 28 states have either common law liability or statutory liability or both with no identified limitation. The remaining 16 states impose one or more limits on statutory dram shop liability: 7 states limit the damages that may be recovered, 4 states limit who may be sued, and 12 states require stricter standards for proof of wrongdoing than for usual negligence. Seven states provide an RBS defense for alcohol outlets (see Exhibit 4.3.30). Six states provide an affirmative RBS defense, and one state provides a complete RBS defense.

Trends in Dram Shop Liability for Furnishing Alcohol to a Minor

Between 2009 and 2013, the number of jurisdictions that permit dram shop liability remained constant and three states (Colorado, Illinois, and Maine) increased the dollar limits on damages.

Exhibit 4.3.29: Common Law/Statutory Dram Shop Liability and Limitations as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.30: Responsible Beverage Service Program Defenses Against Dram Shop Liability Across the United States as of January 1, 2013



References and Further Information

Legal research and data collection for this topic are planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For further information and background see:

Holder, H., Janes, K., Mosher, J., Saltz, R., Spurr, S., & Wagenaar, A. (1992). Final report: Evaluation of dram shop liability and the reduction of alcohol-related traffic problems. National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, DTNH22-87-R-07254.

Holder, H., Janes, K., Mosher, J., Saltz, R., Spurr, S., & Wagenaar, A. (1993). Alcoholic beverage server liability and the reduction of alcohol-involved problems. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 54,* 23–36.

Mosher, J., et al. (2011). *Liquor liability law.* Newark, NJ: LexisNexis.

Mosher, J.F., Cohen, E.N., & Jernigan, D.H. (2013). Commercial host (dram shop) liability: Current status and trends. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 45,* 347–353.

Rammohan, V, Hahn, R.A., Elder, R., Brewer, R., Fielding, J., Naimi, T.S., . . . Zometa, C. (2011). Effects of dram shop liability and enhanced overservice law enforcement initiatives on excessive alcohol consumption and related harms: Two community guide systematic reviews. Am*erican* J*ournal of* Prev*entive* Medicine*, 41(3),* 334–343. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2011.06.027

Social Host Liability

Policy Description

Social host liability refers to the civil liability faced by noncommercial alcohol providers for injuries or damages caused by their intoxicated or underage drinking guests. The analysis in this report does not address social host liability for serving adult guests. The typical factual scenario in legal cases arising from social host liability involves an underage drinking party at which the party host furnishes alcohol to a minor who, in turn, injures a third party in an alcohol-related incident (often a motor vehicle crash). In states with social host liability, injured third parties ("plaintiffs") may be able to sue social hosts (as well as the minor who caused the crash) for monetary damages. Liability comes into play only if injured private citizens file lawsuits. The state's role is to provide a forum for such lawsuits; the state does not impose social host–related penalties directly. (As discussed below, this distinguishes social host liability from underage furnishing and host party policies, which can result in criminal liability imposed by the state.)

Social host liability is closely related to the furnishing alcohol to a minor and host party policy topics, but the three topics are distinct. Social hosts who furnish alcohol to minors or allow underage drinking parties on their property may face fines or other punishment imposed by the state as well as social host liability lawsuits filed by injured parties stemming from the same incident. Social host liability and dram shop liability (presented elsewhere in this report) are identical policies except that the former involves lawsuits brought against noncommercial alcohol retailers, and the latter involves lawsuits filed against commercial alcohol providers.

Social host liability serves two purposes: (a) it creates disincentives for social hosts to furnish to minors due to the risk of litigation and potentially substantial monetary losses and (b) it allows those injured as a result of illegal furnishing of alcohol to minors to gain compensation from the person(s) responsible for their injuries. Minors causing injuries are the primary and most likely parties to be sued. Typically, social hosts are sued through social host liability claims when minors do not have the resources to fully compensate the injured parties.

Social host liability is established by statute or by a state court through "common law." Common law refers to the authority of state courts to establish rules by which injured parties can seek redress against persons or entities that negligently or intentionally caused injuries. Courts have the authority to establish these rules only when state legislatures have not enacted their own statutes, in which case, the courts must follow legislative dictates (unless found to be unconstitutional). Thus, social host statutes normally take precedence over social host common law court decisions.

Many states require evidence that social hosts furnished alcohol to the underage guest, although others permit liability if social hosts allowed underage guests to drink on the hosts' property, even if the hosts did not furnish the alcohol. This analysis does not report the states that have adopted this more permissive standard. The analysis includes both statutory and common law social host liability for each state. A common law liability designation signifies that the state allows lawsuits by injured third parties against social hosts for the negligent service or provision of alcohol to minors in noncommercial settings. Common law liability assumes the following procedural and substantive rules:

- A negligence standard applies (i.e., defendants did not act as reasonable persons would be expected to act in similar circumstances). Plaintiffs need not show that defendants acted intentionally, willfully, or with actual knowledge of minors' underage status.
- Damages are not arbitrarily limited. If successful in establishing negligence, plaintiffs receive actual damages and have the possibility of seeking punitive damages.
- Plaintiffs can pursue claims against defendants without regard for the age of the person who furnished the alcohol and the age of the underage person furnished with the alcohol.
- Plaintiffs must establish only that minors were furnished with alcohol and that the furnishing contributed to injuries without regard to the minors' intoxicated state at the time of the party.
- Plaintiffs must establish the key elements of lawsuits by "preponderance of the evidence" rather than a more rigorous standard (such as "beyond a reasonable doubt").

A statutory liability designation indicates that a state has a social host liability statute. Statutory provisions can alter the common law rules listed above, restricting an injured party's ability to make successful claims. This report includes three of the most important statutory limitations:

1. Limitations on damages: Statutes may impose statutory caps on the total dollar amount that plaintiffs may recover through social host lawsuits.
2. Limitations on who may be sued: Potential defendants may be limited to persons above a certain age.
3. Limitations on elements or standards of proof: Statutes may require plaintiffs to prove additional facts or meet a more rigorous standard of proof than would normally apply in common law. The statutory provisions may require the plaintiff to:
   - Establish that hosts had knowledge that minors were underage or proof that social hosts intentionally or willfully served minors.
   - Establish that the minors were intoxicated at the time of service.
   - Provide clear and convincing evidence or evidence beyond a reasonable doubt that the allegations are true.

These limitations can limit the circumstances that can give rise to liability or greatly diminish plaintiffs' chances of prevailing in a social host liability lawsuit, thus reducing the likelihood of a lawsuit being filed. Additional restrictions may also apply. For example, many states do not allow "first-party claims," cases brought by the person who was furnished alcohol for his or her own injuries. This report does not track these additional limitations.

Status of Social Host Liability

As of January 1, 2013, 33 states impose social host liability through statute or common law; 15 states and the District of Columbia do not impose social host liability. In two states, there is no statutory liability and common law liability is unclear (see Exhibit 4.3.31). Eighteen states have either common law liability or statutory social host liability with no identified limitations. Eleven states impose one limit on statutory social host liability, and four states impose two limitations. The count for limitations is as follows: 4 states limit the damages that may be recovered, 4 states limit who may be sued, and 11 states require standards of proof of wrongdoing that are stricter than usual negligence standards.

Exhibit 4.3.31: Common Law/Statutory Social Host Liability as of January 1, 2013



Trends in Social Host Liability for Furnishing Alcohol to a Minor

In the years between 2009 and 2013, the number of states that permit social host liability increased by one. California requires standards of proof of wrongdoing that are stricter than usual negligence standards. One state (Utah) increased the dollar limits on damages.

References and Further Information

Legal research and data collection for this topic are planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract with The CDM Group, Inc. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For additional information and background, see:

Dills, A.K. (2010). Social host liability for minors and underage drunk-driving accidents. *Journal of Health Economics, 29(2),* 241–249.

Mosher, J., et al. (2011). *Liquor liability law.* Newark, NJ: LexisNexis.

Stout, E., Sloan, A., Liang, L., & Davies, H. (2000). Reducing harmful alcohol-related behaviors: Effective regulatory methods. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 61,* 402–412.

Wagoner, K.G., Sparks, M., Francisco, V.T., Wyrick, D., Nichols, T., & Wolfson, M. (2013). Social host policies and underage drinking parties. *Substance Use & Misuse, 48(1–2),* 41–53. doi:10.3109/10826084.2012.722158

Hosting Underage Drinking Parties

Policy Description

Host party laws establish state-imposed liability against individuals (social hosts) responsible for underage drinking events on property they own, lease, or otherwise control. The primary purpose of these laws is to deter underage drinking parties by raising the legal risk for individuals who allow underage drinking events on property they own, lease, or otherwise control. Underage drinking parties pose significant public health risks. They are high-risk settings for binge drinking and associated alcohol problems including impaired driving. Young drinkers are often introduced to heavy drinking behaviors at these events. Law enforcement officials report that, in many cases, underage drinking parties occur on private property, but the adult responsible for the property is not present or cannot be shown to have furnished the alcohol. Host party laws address this issue by providing a legal basis for holding persons responsible for parties on their property whether or not they provided alcohol to minors.

Host party laws often are closely linked to laws prohibiting the furnishing of alcohol to minors (analyzed elsewhere in this report), although laws that prohibit the hosting of underage drinking parties may apply without regard to who furnishes the alcohol. Hosts who allow underage drinking on their property and also supply the alcohol consumed or possessed by the minors may be in violation of two distinct laws: furnishing alcohol to a minor and allowing underage drinking to occur on property they control.

Two general types of liability may apply to those who host underage drinking parties. The first, analyzed here, concerns state-imposed liability. State-imposed liability involves a statutory prohibition that is enforced by the state, generally through criminal proceedings that can lead to sanctions such as fines or imprisonment. The second, social host liability (analyzed elsewhere in this report), involves an action by a private party seeking monetary damages for injuries that result from permitting underage drinking on the host's premises.

Although related, these two forms of liability are distinct. For example, an individual may allow a minor to drink alcohol, after which the minor causes a motor vehicle crash that injures an innocent third party. In this situation, the social host may be prosecuted by the state under a criminal statute and face a fine or imprisonment for the criminal violation. In a state that provides for social host civil liability, the injured third party could also sue the host for monetary damages associated with the motor vehicle crash.

State host party laws differ across multiple dimensions, including the following:

- They may limit their application specifically to underage drinking parties (e.g., by requiring a certain number of minors to be present for the law to take effect) or may prohibit hosts from allowing underage drinking on their property generally, without reference to hosting a party.
- Underage drinking on any of the host's properties may be included, or the laws may restrict their application to residences, out-buildings, and/or outdoor areas.
- The laws may apply only when hosts make overt acts to encourage the party, or they may require only that hosts knew about the party or were negligent in not realizing that parties were occurring (i.e., should have known based on the facts available).

- A defense may be available for hosts who take specific preventive steps to end parties (e.g., contacting police) once they become aware that parties are occurring.
- The laws may require differing types of behavior on the part of the minors at the party (possession, consumption, intent to possess or consume) before a violation occurs.
- Jurisdictions have varying exceptions in their statutes for family members or others, or for other uses or settings involving the handling of alcoholic beverages.

Status of Host Party Laws

As of January 1, 2013, 19 jurisdictions have general host party laws, 8 have specific host party laws, and 23 have no laws of either sort (see Exhibit 4.3.32). Of the jurisdictions with host party laws, 23 apply to both residential and outdoor property and 4 apply to residential property but not outdoor property. Twenty-six jurisdictions apply their law to other types of property (e.g., motels, hotels, campgrounds, out-buildings). Seven jurisdictions permit negation of violations when the host takes preventive action; 21 require knowledge standards to trigger liability; 3 rely on a negligence standard; 1 relies on criminal negligence; 4 require an overt act on the part of the host to trigger liability; and 1 requires recklessness. Finally, 19 jurisdictions have family exceptions and 5 have resident exceptions.

Trends in Host Party Law Policies

Between 1998 and 2013, the number of jurisdictions that enacted specific host party laws rose from 5 to 9, and the number that enacted general host party laws rose from 11 to 19. In 1998, there were 16 host party laws of both types; in 2013 there are 28 (see Exhibit 4.3.33).

Exhibit 4.3.32: Prohibitions against Hosting Underage Drinking Parties as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.33: Number of States with Prohibitions Against Hosting Underage Drinking Parties, January 1, 1998, through January 1, 2013



References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policy titled "Prohibitions against Hosting Underage Drinking Parties." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

Buettner, C.K., Khurana, A., & Slesnick, N. (2011). Drinking at college parties: Examining the influence of student host-status and party-location. *Addictive Behaviors, 36(12),* 1365–1368.

Dills, A.K. (2010). Social host liability for minors and underage drunk-driving accidents. *Journal of Health Economics, 29,* 241–249.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2006). *Young adult drinking*. Alcohol Alert No. 68. Retrieved from http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/aa68/aa68.htm

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Stout, E., Sloan, A., Liang, L., & Davies, H. (2000). Reducing harmful alcohol-related behaviors: Effective regulatory methods. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 61,* 402–412.

Wagoner, K.G., Sparks, M., Francisco, V.T., Wyrick, D., Nichols, T., & Wolfson, M. (2013). Social host policies and underage drinking parties. *Substance Use & Misuse, 48(1–2),* 41–53. doi:10.3109/10826084.2012.722158

Retailer Interstate Shipments of Alcohol

Policy Description

This policy addresses state laws that prohibit or permit retailers to ship alcohol directly to consumers located across state lines, usually by ordering alcohol over the internet. It is related to, but distinct from, both the Direct Shipment policy, which addresses alcohol shipments to consumers by alcohol producers, and the Home Delivery policy, which involves retailer deliveries to consumers within the same state.

Retailer interstate shipments may be an important source of alcohol for underage drinkers. In a North Carolina study (Williams & Ribisl, 2012), a group of 8 18- to 20-year-old research assistants placed 100 orders for alcoholic beverages using internet sites hosted by out-of-state retailers. Forty-five percent of the orders were successfully completed and 39 percent were rejected as a result of age verification. The remaining 16 percent of orders failed for reasons believed to be unrelated to age verification (e.g., technical and communications problems with vendors).

Most vendors (59 percent) used weak, if any, age verification at the point of order, and, of the 45 successful orders, 23 (51 percent) had no age verification at all. Age verification at delivery was also inconsistently applied.

The North Carolina study reported that there are more than 5,000 internet alcohol retailers, and that the retailers make conflicting claims regarding the legality of shipping alcohol across state lines to consumers. For example, one internet alcohol retailer says on its website that only four states (Massachusetts, Nevada, Texas, and West Virginia) do not allow internet alcohol retailers to ship directly to individual consumers. Other internet alcohol retailers list different states or imply that all shipments are legal.

There were also conflicting claims regarding the role of common carriers. The North Carolina study reported that all deliveries were made by such companies, and many internet alcohol retailers list well-known common carriers on their websites. Yet carriers contacted by the North Carolina researchers stated that they do not deliver packages of alcohol except with direct shipping permits. This suggests confusion regarding state laws addressing interstate retail shipments. North Carolina, where the study took place, prohibits such shipments, which means that at least 43 percent of the retailers in the study appeared to have violated the state law.

The National Research Council/Institute of Medicine report on reducing underage drinking recognized the potential for young people to obtain alcohol over the internet. It recommended that states either ban such sales or require alcohol labeling on packages and signature verification at the point of delivery (National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2004).

There are several potential barriers to implementing and enforcing bans on retailer interstate alcohol sales, including:

1. States will have difficulty securing jurisdiction over out-of-state alcohol retailers.
2. States may have little incentive to use limited enforcement resources to crack down on in-state alcohol retailers that are shipping out of state because they are not violating state law, taxes are being collected, and any problems occur out of state.
3. Enforcing bans on retailer interstate shipments may prompt online retailers to locate outside the country (many already are foreign based), creating additional jurisdictional and enforcement problems.

Types of Restrictions on Interstate Internet Sales

The restrictions addressed in this policy vary by beverage type (beer, wine, distilled spirits). Interstate shipments may be prohibited for one beverage type, more than one beverage type, or all three beverage types. Some states place restrictions on interstate internet sales including requiring a direct shipping permit and/or limiting the amount of beverage that may be shipped.

Current Status of Interstate Internet Sales

As shown in Exhibit 4.3.34, 33 states prohibit retailer interstate sales of all 3 beverage types, 8 prohibit sales of 2 beverage types, and 3 prohibit sales of 1 beverage type. Spirits are the most commonly prohibited beverage (43 states), followed by beer (39 states) and wine (33 states). In nine states, retailer interstate sales laws were deemed uncodable for at least one beverage type (beer, wine, liquor). For the purposes of this summary, these states are treated as *not* expressly prohibiting interstate internet sales for the uncodable beverage types.

Exhibit 4.3.34: Number of Beverage Types for which Interstate Internet Sales Are Expressly Prohibited



References and Further Information

Legal research and data collection for this topic are planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For further information and background see:

"Drink Up New York: The web's best source for fine wine, spirits, sake & more!" (No date). Retrieved from http://www.drinkupny.com

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

N.C.Gen. Stat. § 18B-102.1; N.C.Gen. Stat. § 18B-109.

Williams, R.S., & Ribisl, K.M. (2012). Internet alcohol sales to minors. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 166(9),* 808–813. doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2012.265

Direct Sales/Shipments from Producers to Consumers

Policy Description

State proscriptions against direct sales and shipments of alcohol from producers to consumers date back to the repeal of Prohibition. The initial reason for the proscription was to ensure that the pre-Prohibition-era "tied house system" (under which producers owned and/or controlled retail outlets directly) did not continue after repeal. Opponents of the tied house system argued that producers who controlled retail outlets permitted unsafe retail practices and failed to respond to community concerns. The alternative that emerged was a three-tier production and distribution system with separate production, wholesaling, and retail elements. Thus, producers must distribute products through wholesalers rather than sell directly to retailers or consumers; wholesalers must purchase from producers; and consumers must purchase from retailers.

Modern marketing practices, particularly internet sales that link producers directly to consumers, have led many states to create laws with exceptions to general mandates that alcohol producers distribute their products only through wholesalers. Some states permit producers to ship alcohol to consumers using a delivery service (usually a common carrier). In some cases, these exceptions are responses to legal challenges by producers or retailers arguing that state law unfairly discriminates between in-state and out-of-state producers. The U.S. Supreme Court has held that state laws permitting in-state producers to ship directly to consumers while barring out-of-state producers from doing so violate the U.S. Constitution's Interstate Commerce Clause, and that this discrimination is neither authorized nor permitted by the 21st Amendment.[42]

One central concern emerging from this controversy is the possibility that direct sales/shipments (either through internet sales or sales made by telephone or other remote communication) will increase alcohol availability to underage persons. Young people may attempt to purchase alcohol through direct sales instead of face-to-face sales at retail outlets, because they perceive that detection of their underage status is less likely. These concerns were validated by a study that found that internet alcohol vendors use weak, if any, age verification, thereby allowing minors to successfully purchase alcohol online (Williams & Ribisl, 2012). In response to these concerns, several jurisdictions that permit direct sales/shipments have included provisions to deter youth access. These may include requirements that:

- Consumers have face-to-face transactions at producers' places of business (and show valid age identification) before any future shipments to consumers can be made.[43]
- Producers/shippers and deliverers verify recipient age, usually by checking recipients' identification.
- Producers/shippers and deliverers obtain permits or licenses or be approved by the state.
- Producers/shippers and deliverers maintain records that must either be reported to state officials or be open for inspection to verify recipients of shipments.
- Direct shipment package labels include statements that the package contains alcohol and/or that the recipient must be at least 21 years old.

---

[42] See, e.g., *Granholm v. Heald*, 544 U.S. 460, 125 S.Ct. 1885 (2005).
[43] Laws that require face-to-face transactions for all sales prior to delivery are treated as prohibitions on direct sales/shipments.

State laws also vary on the types of alcoholic beverages (beer, wine, distilled spirits) that producers may sell directly and ship to consumers. These and other restrictions may apply to all direct shipments. This report includes only those requirements related to preventing underage sales.[44]

Status of Direct Sales/Shipment Policies

As of January 1, 2013, 41 states permit direct sales/shipments from producers to consumers, and 10 prohibit such transactions (see Exhibit 4.3.35). One state (Indiana) requires face-to-face transactions at producers' places of business (and verification of valid age identification) before shipments to the consumer can be made. Thirty-eight states require producers to obtain a shipper's permit or state approval prior to shipping. Of the 41 states permitting direct sales or shipments, 8 require shippers to verify purchaser age, 21 require deliverers to verify recipient age, 5 require age verification by both shippers and deliverers, and 1 requires verification at

Exhibit 4.3.35: Direct Sales/Shipment Policies and Age Verification Requirements as of January 1, 2013



[44] These include caps on amount that can be shipped; laws that permit only small producers to sell directly to consumers; reporting and taxation provisions unrelated to identifying potential underage recipients; and brand registration requirements. In some cases, exceptions are so limited that a state is coded as not permitting direct sales (e.g., shipments are allowed only by boutique historical distilled spirits producers).

some point before delivery. Sixteen states and the District of Columbia do not require any age verification. Thirty-three states require a label stating that the package can only be received by a person over age 21, 33 states require a label stating that the package contains alcohol, and 4 states have no labeling requirements related to underage drinking.

Trends in Direct Sales/Shipments Policies

Between January 1, 2009, and January 1, 2013, four states added more regulation to their policies. Six other states (Kansas, Maine, Maryland, New Jersey, New Mexico, and Tennessee) adopted permit systems for allowing the direct shipment of wine from producers to purchasers. Previously, New Mexico had allowed direct shipping by wineries only in those states that offered it reciprocal privileges. Alaska adopted label requirements stating that the recipients of wine shipments must be over 21 and that the package contains alcohol. Iowa adopted age verification requirements at the point of delivery. New Hampshire adopted a provision regarding collecting purchasers' names. In 2011, Ohio expanded direct shipping privileges to include beer.

References and Further Information

Legal research and data collection for this topic are planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. To see variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For further information and background, see:

Jurkiewicz, C., & Painter, M. (Eds.). (2008). Social and economic control of alcohol: The 21st Amendment in the 21st century. New York: CRC Press.

Moramarto, M. (2008). The Twenty-First Amendment, Granholm, and the future of the three-tier system. Working Paper, Social Science Research Network, December 13, 2008. Retrieved from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1340198

Norton, E. (2006). The Twenty-First Amendment in the twenty-first century: Reconsidering state liquor controls in light of Granholm v. Heald. *Ohio State Law Journal, 67,* 1465–1494.

Williams, R.S., & Ribisl, K.M. (2012). Internet alcohol sales to minors. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 166(9),* 808–813. doi:10.1001/archpediatrics.2012.265

Keg Registration

Policy Description

Keg registration laws (also called keg tagging laws) require wholesalers or retailers to attach tags, stickers, or engravings with an identification number to kegs exceeding a specified capacity. These laws discourage purchasers from serving underage persons from the keg by allowing law enforcement officers to trace the keg to the purchaser even if he or she is not present at the location where the keg is consumed.

At purchase, retailers are required to record identifying information about the purchaser (e.g., name, address, telephone number, driver's license). In some states, keg laws specifically prohibit destroying or altering the ID tags and provide penalties for doing so. Other states make it a crime to possess unregistered or unlabeled kegs.

Refundable deposits may also be collected for the kegs themselves, the tapper mechanisms used to serve the beer, or both. Deposits are refunded when the kegs and/or tappers are returned with identification numbers intact. These deposits create an incentive for the purchaser to keep track of the whereabouts of the keg, as a financial penalty is imposed if the keg is not returned.

Some jurisdictions collect information (e.g., location where the keg is to be consumed, tag number of the vehicle transporting the keg) to aid law enforcement efforts, further raising the chances that illegal furnishing to minors will be detected. Some jurisdictions also require retailers to provide warning information at the time of purchase about laws prohibiting service to minors and/or other laws related to the purchase or possession of the keg.

Disposable kegs complicate keg registration laws. Some of these containers meet the capacity definition for a keg but cannot be easily tagged or traced, as they are meant to be disposed of when empty. Most states do not differentiate disposable from nondisposable kegs, although some have modified keg registration provisions to accommodate this container type.

Status of Keg Registration Policies

Keg Registration Laws

As of January 1, 2013, the District of Columbia and 30 states require keg registration, and 19 states do not require that kegs be registered. Minimum keg sizes subject to keg registration requirements range from 2 to 7.75 gallons with the exception of South Dakota, where the requirements are 8 or 16 gallons. Utah alone prohibits keg sales altogether, making a keg registration law irrelevant.

Prohibited Acts

Ten states prohibit both the possession of unregistered kegs and the destruction of keg labels. Six states prohibit only the possession of unregistered kegs, 8 prohibit only the destruction of keg labels, and 25 states and the District of Columbia prohibit neither act.

Purchaser Information Collected

All 31 jurisdictions with keg registration laws require retailers to collect some form of purchaser information. Of these, 27 require purchasers to provide a driver's license or other government-

issued identification. Six jurisdictions (District of Columbia, Georgia, North Carolina, Oregon, Virginia, and Washington) require purchasers to provide the address at which the keg will be consumed.

Warning Information to Purchaser

Of the 31 jurisdictions with keg registration laws, 23 states and the District of Columbia require that some kind of warning information be presented to purchasers about the violation of any laws related to keg registration (see Exhibit 4.3.36). Fourteen states and the District of Columbia specify "active" warnings (requiring an action on the part of the purchaser, such as signing a document), and nine states specify "passive" warnings (requiring no action on the part of the purchaser). Seven states do not require that any warning information be given to purchasers.

Trends in Keg Registration Policies

The number of states enacting keg registration laws rose steadily between 2003 and 2008, with an increase from 20 to 31 jurisdictions (see Exhibit 4.3.37).

References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policy titled "Keg Registration." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2006). *Young adult drinking*. Alcohol Alert No. 68. Retrieved from http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/aa68/aa68.htm

Ringwalt, C.L., & Paschall, M.J. (2011). The utility of keg registration laws: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 48(1),* 106–108.

Wagenaar, A.C., Harwood, E.M., Silianoff, C., & Toomey, T.L. (2005). Measuring public policy: The case of beer keg registration laws. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 28(4),* 359–367.

Exhibit 4.3.36: Keg Registration Laws as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.37: Number of States with Keg Registration Laws, January 1, 2003, through January 1, 2013



Home Delivery

Policy Description

Home delivery restrictions prohibit or limit the ability of alcohol retailers to deliver alcoholic beverages to customers who are not present at their retail outlet. The University of Minnesota Alcohol Epidemiology Program notes that home delivery of alcohol may increase alcohol availability to youth by increasing opportunities for underage persons to subvert minimum age purchase requirements. Ordering by phone, fax, or e-mail may facilitate deception. Delivery persons may have less incentive to check purchasers' age identification when they are away from the licensed establishment and cannot be watched by a surveillance camera, the liquor store's management, or other customers.

Research on home delivery of alcohol is limited. One study examined the use of home delivery by adult men. The authors report that regular drinkers without a history of alcohol problems were significantly less likely to have had alcohol delivered than problem drinkers. Another study found similar results for underage drinkers. Ten percent of 12th graders and 7 percent of 18- to 20-year-olds in 15 Midwestern communities reported they obtained alcohol through delivery services in the last year. Use of delivery services was more prevalent among young men and among more frequent, heavier drinkers.

A state home delivery law may:

- Specifically prohibit or permit the delivery of beer, wine, and/or spirits to residential addresses, hotel rooms, conference centers, etc.
- Permit home delivery, but with restrictions, including:
  - Limits on the quantity that may be delivered.
  - Limits on the time of day or days of the week when deliveries may occur.
  - A requirement that the retail merchant obtain a special license or permit.

In some states that allow home delivery, local ordinances may restrict or ban home delivery in specific sub-state jurisdictions.

Status of Home Delivery Policies

Exhibit 4.3.38 shows the number of states that permit, prohibit, or have no law regarding home delivery of beer, wine, and spirits. As the exhibit shows, 18 states permit home delivery of all three beverages, 9 prohibit delivery of all three, and 15 have no law for any beverage. Nine states have different laws for different beverages: Four states (New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oregon and Virginia.) permit delivery of beer and wine but have no law regarding spirits. Michigan permits beer and wine delivery but prohibits spirits, and Kentucky prohibits delivery of wine and spirits but has no law regarding beer. Louisiana and West Virginia permit home delivery of wine but have no law regarding beer and spirits.

Of the 24 states that permit home delivery of *beer and wine*, 11 place at least one restriction on retailers. Of the 18 states that permit home delivery of *spirits*, eight place at least one restriction on retailers. Of the two states that permit delivery of wine only, both impose retailer restrictions. Exhibit 4.3.39 shows the distribution of those restrictions imposed by two or more states on home delivery laws: (a) a state permit is required (Colorado, Texas, Virginia, and West

Exhibit 4.3.38: Home Delivery of Beer, Wine, and Spirits



Exhibit 4.3.39: Restrictions Imposed by Two or More States on Delivery of Beer, Wine, and Spirits



Virginia); (b) volumes that can be delivered are restricted (Indiana, Louisiana, New York, Virginia, and West Virginia); and (c) the delivery vehicle must be clearly marked (New Jersey, New York, and Texas). Three additional states that permit delivery of beer, wine, and spirits place a single, unique restriction on retailers: (a) orders must be in writing (Alaska); (b) written information on fetal alcohol syndrome must accompany the delivered product (Alaska); and (c) a local permit is required to deliver to the retailer's county or city (Maryland). One state (Washington) that permits delivery of beer and wine requires a special license only for internet orders. Massachusetts requires that each vehicle used for transportation and delivery have a state-issued permit. Oregon requires "for hire" carriers to be approved by the state.

Exhibits 4.3.40 through 4.3.42 summarize the status of home delivery for beer, wine, and spirits as of January 1, 2013.

Exhibit 4.3.40: Beer



Exhibit 4.3.41: Wine



Exhibit 4.3.42: Spirits



Trends in Home Delivery Policies

Between 2010 and 2013, Louisiana changed its home delivery policies by permitting wine retailers to deliver to consumers in 2011. Washington changed its home delivery policies by permitting spirit retailers to deliver to consumers in 2012.

References and Further Information

Legal research and data collection for this topic are planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For further information and background, see http://www.epi.umn.edu/alcohol/policy/homdeliv.shtm.

Fletcher, L.A., Nugent, S.M., Ahern, S.M., & Willenbring, M.L. (1996). Brief report. The use of alcohol home delivery services by male problem drinkers: A preliminary report. *Journal of Substance Abuse, 8(2),* 251–261.

Fletcher, L.A., Toomey, T.L., Wagenaar, A.C., Short, B., & Willenbring, M.L. (2000). Alcohol home delivery services: A source of alcohol for underage drinkers. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 61,* 81–84.

Alcohol Pricing Policies

Alcohol Taxes

Policy Description

There is ample evidence that the "economic availability" of alcoholic beverages (i.e., retail price) impacts underage drinking and a wide variety of related consequences. The *Surgeon General's Call to Action* includes economic availability as a strategy in the context of increasing the cost of underage drinking. Taxes are a major way that alcohol prices are manipulated by policymakers.

The effects of price on reducing underage drinking, college drinking, and binge drinking (including drinking among youth who show signs of alcohol use disorders) are considerable. There are also significant effects on youth traffic crashes, violence on college campuses, and crime among people under 21. Although alcohol taxes are an imperfect index of retail prices, tax rates are relatively easy to measure and provide a useful proxy for economic availability. Based on this and other research, the 2004 National Research Council/IOM Report, *Reducing Underage Drinking: A Collective Responsibility*, made the following recommendation: "[S]tate legislatures should raise excise taxes to reduce underage consumption and to raise additional revenues for this purpose."

This policy addresses beer, wine, and distilled spirits taxes. Although some states have separate tax rates for other alcoholic products (e.g., sparkling wine and flavored alcohol beverages), these account for a small market share and are not addressed.

Status of Alcohol Taxation

As of January 1, 2013, all license states have a specific excise tax for beer, wine, and spirits. The federal government also levies a specific excise tax of $0.58/gallon for beer, $1.07/gallon for wine, and $13.50/gallon for spirits.

Like the federal-specific excise tax, state-specific excise taxes are generally highest for spirits and lowest for beer, roughly tracking the alcohol content of these beverages. Beer-specific excise taxes range from $0.02 to $1.07/gallon, wine-specific excise taxes range from $0.11 to $2.50/gallon, and spirits-specific excise taxes range from $1.50 to $12.80/gallon. The states with the highest excise tax for one beverage may not be the states with the highest excise taxes for other beverages. States may control for one, two, or three categories (beer, wine, and spirits).

Exhibits 4.3.44 through 4.3.46 show the levels of excise taxes for beer, wine, and spirits across the 50 states and the District of Columbia. Exhibit 4.3.47 shows the ad valorem excise tax or sales tax adjusted ad valorem excise tax rates[45] for license states that have ad valorem excise taxes. These may be levied at on- or off-sale outlets and may be for beer, wine, and/or spirits. Beer ad valorem excise tax rates range from 1 to 17 percent for on- and/or off-premises sales. Wine rates range from 1.7 to 15 percent for on- and/or off-premises sales. Distilled spirit rates range from 2 to 31 percent for on- and/or off-premises sales.

[45] The retail ad valorem excise tax minus the sales tax. Applicable only to states in which sales tax does not apply to alcoholic beverages in order to reflect the actual taxation rate.

Exhibit 4.3.43: Number and Percentage of States that Levy an Ad Valorem Excise Tax but Do Not Apply General Sales Tax

Beverage type	Type of ad valorem excise tax	Number of states that levy this ad valorem excise tax	Number of states that do not apply general sales tax when the ad valorem excise tax is levied	Percentage of states that do not apply general sales tax when the ad valorem excise tax is levied
Beer	Ad valorem excise tax: onsite	9	6	66
	Ad valorem excise tax: offsite	8	4	50
Wine	Ad valorem excise tax: onsite	9	5	55
	Ad valorem excise tax: offsite	8	4	50
Spirits	Ad valorem excise tax: onsite	13	5	39
	Ad valorem excise tax: offsite	9	5	56

Additionally, in 2011, voters in Washington approved Initiative Measure 1183, privatizing all aspects of the wholesale distribution and retail sale of beer, wine, and distilled spirits. The Initiative added a new section to the state's statutes on alcohol sales, which includes permitting retail licensees to sell spirits in original containers to consumers for off-premises consumption, and to licensees to sell spirits for on-premises consumption. It ended government involvement in beer and wine distribution and sales. Thus, Washington is no longer a control state.

Trends in Alcohol Taxes

Alcohol taxes have remained relatively constant for several decades. As can been seen in Exhibit 4.3.48, there have been limited tax increases or decreases in beer, wine, or spirits excise taxes since 2003. During this period there have been 28 tax rate increases across all jurisdictions. Eight of these increases occurred from 2011 to 2012, indicating that the rate of increases may be accelerating. Tax rate decreases across all jurisdictions remained stable from 2011 to 2012 (no additional decreases in 2012 were noted).

Exhibit 4.3.44: Specific Excise Tax per Gallon on Beer as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.45: Specific Excise Tax per Gallon on Wine as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.46: Specific Excise Tax per Gallon on Distilled Spirits as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.47: Sales Tax Adjusted Retail Ad Valorem Excise Tax Rates in License States as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.48: Alcohol Tax Changes 2003–2013

		Beer		Wine		Spirits		
		Specific excise tax	Ad valorem excise tax	Specific excise tax	Ad valorem excise tax	Specific excise tax	Ad valorem excise tax	Total
Number of jurisdictions that:	Increased rates	7	2	8	3	6	3	29
	Decreased rates	1	2	1	1	0	1	6

References and Further Information

All data for this policy were obtained from APIS at http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov. Follow links to the policies titled "Alcohol Beverage Taxes – Beer," "Alcohol Beverage Taxes – Wine," and "Alcohol Beverage Taxes – Distilled Spirits." APIS provides further descriptions of this policy and its variables, details regarding state policies, and a review of the limitations associated with the reported data. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B.

Babor, T., Caetano, R., Casswell, S., Edwards, G., Geisbrecht, N., Graham, K., Grube, J., . . . Rossow, I. (2010). *Alcohol: No ordinary commodity: Research and public policy* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Chaloupka F. (2004). The effects of price on alcohol use, abuse, and their consequences. In *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility* (pp. 541–564). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Cook P. (2007). *Paying the tab: The costs and benefits of alcohol control*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Daley, J.I., Stahre, M.A., Chaloupka, F.J., & Naimi, T.S. (2012). The impact of a 25-cent-per-drink alcohol tax increase. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 42(4),* 382–389.

Elder, R.W., Lawrence, B., Ferguson, A., Naimi, T.S., Brewer, R.D., Chattopadhyay, S.K., . . . Task Force on Community Preventive Services. (2010). The effectiveness of tax policy interventions for reducing excessive alcohol consumption and related harms. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 38,* 217–229.

Klitzner M. (2012). Improving the measurement of state alcohol taxes. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Alcohol Policy Information System. Retrieved from http://alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov/uploads/improving_the_measurement_of_state_alcohol_taxes.pdf

Maldonado-Molina, M.M., & Wagenaar, A.C. (2010). Effects of alcohol taxes on alcohol-related mortality in Florida: Time-series analyses from 1969 to 2004. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 34,* 1–7.

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility.* Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Task Force on Community Preventive Services. (2010). Increasing alcohol beverage taxes is recommended to reduce excessive alcohol consumption and related harms. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 38,* 230–232.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2007). *Surgeon General's Call to Action to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking*. Rockville, MD: Office of the Surgeon General. Retrieved from http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/topics/underagedrinking

Wagenaar, A.C., Salois, M.J., & Komro, K. (2009). Effects of beverage alcohol price and tax levels on drinking: A meta-analysis of 1003 estimates from 112 studies. *Addiction, 104,* 179–190.

Wagenaar, A., Tobler, A., & Komro, K. (2010). Effects of alcohol tax and price policies on morbidity and mortality: A systematic review. *American Journal of Public Health, 100,* 2270–2278.

Xuan, Z., Nelson, T.F., Heeren, T., Blanchette, J., Nelson, D.E., Gruenewald, P., & Naimi, T.S. (2013). Tax policy, adult binge drinking, and youth alcohol consumption in the United States. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 37(10),* 1713–1719. doi:10.1111/acer.12152

Low-Price, High-Volume Drink Specials

Policy Description

Low-price, high-volume drink specials restrictions prohibit or limit the ability of on-premises retailers from using various price-related marketing tactics such as happy hours, two-for-one specials, or free drinks that encourage heavier consumption. These promotions are particularly prevalent in college communities, where large numbers of underage students are present.

Research has examined the impact of on-premises retail drink specials on binge drinking among college students. For example, one study measured self-reported binge-drinking rates among college students from 119 colleges, conducted an assessment of marketing practices of on-premises outlets in neighboring communities, and determined whether these communities restricted low-price, high-volume drink specials. The results demonstrated that price-related promotions were significantly correlated with higher binge drinking and self-reported drinking and driving rates among students (Wechsler, Lee, Nelson, & Lee, 2003).

Based on this and other research, the *Surgeon General's Call to Action* concluded that "increasing the cost of drinking can positively affect adolescent decisions about alcohol use," and recommended "[e]limination of low price, high-volume drink specials, especially in proximity to college campuses, military bases, and other locations with a high concentration of youth."

A state low-price, high-volume drink specials law may prohibit or restrict the following practices:

1. Providing customers with free beverages either as a promotion or on a case-by-case basis (e.g., on a birthday or anniversary, as compensation for poor services)
2. Offering additional drinks for the same price as a single drink (e.g., two-for-ones)
3. Offering reduced-price drinks during designated times of day ("happy hours")
4. Instituting a fixed price for an unlimited amount of drinks during a fixed period of time (e.g., "beat the clock" and similar drinking games)
5. Offering drinks with increased amounts of alcohol at the same price as regular-sized drinks (e.g., double shots for the price of single shots)
6. Service of more than one drink to a customer at a time

Status of Low-Price, High-Volume Drink Specials Law

Exhibit 4.3.49 shows the number of states that prohibited the six low-price, high-volume specials listed above. Sixteen states prohibited *free beverages*. Six additional states (California, New Jersey, New Mexico, South Carolina, Texas, and Washington) allowed a licensee to offer a free drink on a case-by-case basis only (e.g., on a birthday or anniversary, as compensation for poor services). Four states prohibited *multiple servings at one time.* In one of these states (Tennessee), this prohibition applied only after 10 p.m. Eighteen states prohibited *multiple servings for single serving price*. Twenty-four states prohibited *unlimited beverages for a fixed price or period.* In one of these (Louisiana), this prohibition applied only after 10 p.m. Ten states prohibited *increased volume without increase in price*, with Tennessee making it unlawful after 10 p.m.

Exhibit 4.3.49: Number of States Prohibiting Various Low-Price, High-Volume Drink Specials



As can be seen in Exhibit 4.3.50, nine states prohibited *happy hours (reduced prices)*. Eight additional states allowed happy hours but restricted the hours in which they may be offered.

Exhibit 4.3.50: Happy Hours 2013



Trends in Low-Price, High-Volume Drink Specials Law

Between 2011 and 2012, one state (Pennsylvania) increased the number of hours during which discounts may be offered. Between 2012 and 2013, Kansas now allows reduced-price drinks during designated times of day and increased volume of an alcoholic beverage.

References and Further Information

Legal research for this topic is planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For further information and background, see:

Babor, T.F., Mendelson, J.H., Greenberg, I., & Kuehnle, J. (1978). Experimental analysis of the 'happy hour': Effects of purchase price on alcohol consumption. *Psychopharmacology, 58,* 35–41.

Beverage Information Group, Fact Book. (2010). Norwalk, CT: Beverage Information Group (annual publication).

Chaloupka, F., Grossman, M., & Saffer, H. (2002). The effects of price on alcohol consumption and alcohol-related problems. *Alcohol Research & Health, 26(1),* 22–34.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2007). *Surgeon General's Call to Action to Prevent and Reduce Underage Drinking*. Rockville, MD: Office of the Surgeon General. Retrieved from http://www.surgeongeneral.gov/topics/underagedrinking

Kuo, M., Wechsler, H., Greenberg, P., & Lee, H. (2003). The marketing of alcohol to college students: The role of low prices and special promotions. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 25(3),* 1–8.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. (2005). *Research report: Preventing over-consumption of alcohol – sales to the intoxicated and "happy hour" (drink special) laws.* Springfield, VA: National Technical Information Service, DOT HS 809 878.

Wechsler, H., Lee, J., Nelson, T., & Lee, H. (2003). Drinking and driving among college students: The influence of alcohol control policies. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 25(3),* 212–218.

Wholesaler Pricing Restrictions

Policy Description

The 21st Amendment to the Constitution repealed Prohibition and gave states broad authority to regulate alcohol sales within their borders. Most states established a three-tier structure: producers, wholesalers, and retailers. Many states included restrictions on wholesaler pricing practices intended to strengthen the three-tier system, reduce price competition among wholesalers and retailers, and combat corruption and crime in the alcohol market.

Research suggests that the specific wholesaler pricing restrictions described below increase the price of alcohol to consumers. Research also shows that underage consumption and problems are strongly influenced by alcohol prices. One study has suggested that restrictions on certain wholesale pricing practices may have a stronger effect on alcohol pricing than do alcohol taxes.

Some states operate alcohol wholesale operations directly through a state agency, usually limited to distilled spirits, beer with high alcohol content, and wine with high alcohol content.[46] In these cases, the state sets wholesaler prices as part of its administrative function, and statutory provisions are relevant only to that portion of the wholesaler market in the control of private entities. For this policy, an index beverage has been selected: beer (5 percent), wine (12 percent), and spirits (40 percent). If the index beverage is controlled, in whole or in part, by the state at the wholesale level, the state is coded as CONTROL and no additional coding is displayed.

Types of Wholesaler Pricing Policies

In general, wholesaler pricing policies fall within four types: (a) restrictions on volume discounts; (b) restrictions on discounting practices; (c) price posting requirements; and (d) restrictions on the ability of wholesalers to provide credit extensions to retailers. These policy categories are closely interrelated but may operate independently of each other. Each is described briefly below.

Volume Discounting Restrictions

Large retailers often have an advantage over smaller retailers due to the large volumes they are able to purchase at once. This purchasing power allows them to negotiate lower prices on most commodities and therefore offer items at lower prices to consumers. Many states have imposed restrictions on the ability of wholesalers to provide volume discounts—the same price must be charged for products regardless of the amount purchased by individual retailers. The primary purpose of these laws is to protect small retailers from predatory marketing practices of large-volume competitors and to prevent corruption. They have a secondary effect of increasing retail prices generally by making retail price discounting more difficult.

Minimum Pricing Requirements

States may require wholesalers to establish a minimum markup or maximum discount for each product sold to retailers based on the producer's price for the product, or states may enact a ban against selling any product below cost. These provisions are designed to maintain stable prices

[46] For a state-by-state review of control state wholesaler systems, see http://www.apis.niaaa.nih.gov.

on alcohol products by limiting price competition at both retail and wholesale levels. In most cases, this increases the retail price to consumers, and thus affects public health outcomes.

Post-and-Hold Provisions

This policy requires wholesalers to publicly "post" prices of their alcohol products (i.e., provide a list of prices to a state agency for review by the public, including retailers and competitors) and hold these prices for a set amount of time, allowing all retailers the opportunity to make purchases at the same cost. Post-and-hold requirements are typically tied to minimum pricing and price discounting provisions and enhance the states' ability to enforce those provisions. The wholesalers' submissions can be reviewed easily to determine whether wholesalers are paying the proper taxes on their products and whether they are providing any illegal price inducements to retailers. Post-and-hold provisions reduce price competition among both retailers and wholesalers because the posted prices are locked in for a set amount of time. They also promote effective enforcement of other wholesaler pricing policies. Some states require wholesalers to post prices but have no "hold" requirement—that is, posted prices may be changed at any time. This is a weaker restriction.

Credit Extension Restrictions

Wholesalers often provide retailers with various forms of credit (e.g., direct loans or deferred payment of invoices). Many states restrict alcoholic beverage wholesalers' ability to provide credit to retailers, typically by banning loans and limiting the period of time required for retailers to pay invoices. The primary purpose of the restrictions is to limit the influence of wholesalers on retailer practices. When a retailer is relying on a wholesaler's credit, the retailer is more likely to promote the wholesaler's products and to agree to the wholesaler's demands regarding product placement and pricing. The restrictions have a secondary effect of limiting the retailer's ability to operate on credit, indirectly increasing retail prices.

Federal Court Challenges to State Wholesaler Pricing Restrictions

As noted earlier, in general, states have broad authority under the 21st Amendment to the Constitution to regulate alcohol availability within their boundaries. That authority has been constrained by U.S. Supreme Court and Federal Court of Appeals cases, which have interpreted the Interstate Commerce Clause (ICC) and Sherman Antitrust Act[47] to prohibit certain state restrictions on the alcohol market.[48,49] These cases have led to considerable uncertainty regarding the validity of state restrictions on alcohol wholesaler prices, and additional challenges

[47] July 2, 1890, ch. 647, 26 Stat. 209, 15 U.S.C. § 1-7.

[48] See, e.g., California Retail Liquor Dealers Ass'n v. Midcal Aluminum, Inc., 445 U.S. 97, 100 S.Ct. 937 (1980).

[49] Several federal and state courts have addressed the constitutionality of selected wholesaler pricing practices, with conflicting results. For example, in *Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Maleng*, 522 F.3d 874 (9th Cir. 2008), the plaintiff challenged nine distinct Washington state restrictions governing wholesaler practices, including policies in all four categories described above. The court upheld the state's volume discount and minimum markup provisions but invalidated the post-and-hold requirements. In *Manuel v. State of Louisiana*, 982 So.2d 316 (3rd Cir. 2008), a Louisiana appellate court rejected six separate challenges to the Sherman Act, including the ban on volume discounts. It upheld the state's ability to regulate alcoholic beverages within the state and concluded that the Sherman Act had to yield to the state's authority granted under the 21st Amendment. Maryland's post-and-hold law and volume discount ban were challenged in *TFWS, Inc. v. Franchot*, 572 F.3d 186 (4th Cir. 2009), a complicated case involving multiple appeals and rehearings. On Maryland's fourth appeal, the court upheld its previous decisions to strike down the two policies.

to those restrictions are anticipated. In the meantime, this uncertainty has prompted states to reexamine their alcohol wholesaler practices provisions.

Status of Wholesaler Pricing Restrictions

Federal Law

Federal law addresses restrictions on wholesaler credit practices:

> The Federal Alcohol Administration Act provides for regulation of those engaged in the alcohol beverage industry and for protection of consumers (27 U.S.C. § 201 et seq). Under the Act, wholesalers may not induce retailers to purchase beverage alcohol by extending credit in excess of 30 days from the date of delivery (27 U.S.C. § 205(b)(6), 27 C.F.R. § 6.65).

Some states allow wholesalers to extend credit to retailers for a longer period than is permitted under federal law.

State Law

Exhibits 4.3.51 through 4.3.54 show summary distributions of volume discounts, minimum markup/maximum discount, post and hold, and retailer credit for the license states (beer = 49 license states; wine = 41 license states; spirits = 33 license states).[50] Only two license states (Alaska and Rhode Island) have no wholesaler pricing restrictions. Among the remaining states, bans on extending credit and post and hold (excluding post only) are the most common wholesaler pricing restrictions (ranging from about a fifth to about half the states depending on beverage type). Other restrictions range from under 10 percent of the license states to about a quarter of the states depending on beverage type.

Trends in Wholesaler Pricing Restrictions

Between 2010 and 2011, only one state (South Dakota) changed its wholesaler pricing restriction policies, adopting a price-posting requirement. No additional changes occurred between 2011 and 2012. On November 8, 2011, voters in Washington approved Initiative Measure 1183, which privatized all aspects of the wholesale distribution and retail sale of beer, wine, and distilled spirits effective December 8, 2011. Implementation occurred in 2012.

Exhibits 4.3.55 through 4.3.58 present detailed state-by-state information for wholesaler pricing policies for beer.

[50] Comparisons among beverage types must be made with some caution, because the number of license states differs for each beverage.

Exhibit 4.3.51: Volume Discounts



Exhibit 4.3.52: Minimum Markup/Maximum Discount



Exhibit 4.3.53: Post and Hold



Exhibit 4.3.54: Retailer Credit



Exhibit 4.3.55: Volume Discounts for Beer as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.56: Minimum Markup, Maximum Discount for Beer as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.57: Post-and-Hold Requirements for Beer as of January 1, 2013



Exhibit 4.3.58: Retail Credit for Beer as of January 1, 2013



*MI allows 30 days credit to on-sale retailers but no credit to off-sale retailers

References and Further Information

Legal research and data collection for this topic are planned and managed by SAMHSA and conducted under contract by The CDM Group, Inc. To see definitions of the variables for this policy, go to Appendix B. For further information and background see:

Chaloupka, F. (2008). *Legal challenges to state alcohol control policy: An economist's perspective.* Presentation at the Alcohol Policy 14 Conference, San Diego, CA, January 28, 2008.

Gruenewald. P.J., Ponicki, W.R., Holder, H.D., & Romelsjö, A. (2006). Alcohol prices, beverage quality, and the demand for alcohol: Quality substitutions and price elasticities. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 30*, 96–105.

National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Reducing underage drinking: A collective responsibility*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.