

# PRC Regional Needs Assessment



HHSC  
PRC Region # 1

**Due by: December 30, 2010 to your contract manager**

## OVERVIEW

*Step 1 of the Strategic Prevention Framework involves a needs assessment of community needs, resources and readiness. The needs assessment, in turn, involves data collection, data management, analysis and the specification of risk and protective factors and target populations or geographic areas based on needs assessment data. Implementation of Step 1 implementation is important, because it directs your community to guide planning and activity.*

*The purpose of the Regional Needs Assessment is to determine the incidence and prevalence of ATOD use, misuse, and abuse and related problems within the targeted community in your PRC region.*

**Note:** *please use your contract service requirements to guide you in developing this PRC Regional Needs Assessment.*

**INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS FORM:** *DOUBLE CLICK on check box of choice and mark checked in the default value and click OK to mark the chosen box. CLICK in text boxes located below each question and begin typing your response, the text box will expand as you type your response.*

*Please complete this needs assessment and submit electronically. Keep a signed copy in your PRC files*

## SECTION I. Contact Information

### Organization Name:

Managed Care Center For Addictive/ Other Disorders, Inc.

### Executive Director

Name: Susan Lilly	E-mail: <a href="mailto:S_lilly@mccaod.com">S_lilly@mccaod.com</a>	Phone #: 806-780-8300
----------------------	---	--------------------------

### Program Director

Name: Richard Kolas	E-mail: <a href="mailto:r_kolas@mccaod.com">r_kolas@mccaod.com</a>	Phone #: 806-780-8300
------------------------	---	--------------------------

### PRC Coordinator:

Name: Lola Coppage	E-mail: <a href="mailto:lola.coppage@mccaod.com">lola.coppage@mccaod.com</a>	Phone#: 806-780-8300
-----------------------	---	-------------------------

### PRC Tobacco Education Specialist:

Name: Adolphus Cleveland	E-mail: <a href="mailto:Adolph.cleveland@mccaod.com">Adolph.cleveland@mccaod.com</a>	Phone #: 806-780-8300
-----------------------------	---	--------------------------

## **SECTION II - Geographic, Demographic, Cultural Characteristics, and Population**

**Provide an overview of the target areas listed above.**

### **1. Provide a geographic and demographic description about the target area:**

#### **A. List counties in your region to be served:**

- We serve 41 counties in region 1: Armstrong, Bailey, Briscoe, Carson, Castro, Childress, Cochran, Collingsworth, Crosby, Dallam, Deaf Smith, Dickens, Donley, Floyd, Garza, Gray, Hale, Hall, Hansford, Hartley, Hemphill, Hockley, Hutchinson, King, Lamb, Lipscomb, Lubbock, Lynn, Moore, Motley, Ochiltree, Oldham, Parmer, Potter, Randall, Roberts, Sherman, Swisher, Terry, Wheeler, Yoakum

#### **B. What are the zip codes in your region?**

- Armstrong County: 79079, 79094
- Bailey County: 79320, 79324, 79344, 79347
- Briscoe County: 79255, 79257
- Carson County: 79039, 79068, 79080, 79097
- Castro County: 79027, 79043, 79063, 79085
- Childress County: 79201, 79259
- Cochran County: 79346
- Collingsworth County: 79230, 79251, 79095
- Crosby County: 79322, 79343
- Dallam County: 79022, 79087
- Deaf Smith County: 79045
- Dickens County: 79220, 79229, 79243, 79370
- Donley County: 79226, 79237, 79240
- Floyd County: 79235, 79241
- Garza County: 79330, 79356
- Gray County: 79057, 79065
- Hale County: 79311, 79041, 79250, 79072
- Hall County: 79239, 79245
- Hansford County: 79040, 79062, 79081
- Hartley County: 79018, 79044
- Hemphill County: 79014
- Hockley County: 79313, 79336, 79353, 79358
- Hutchinson County: 79007, 79036, 79083
- King County: 79236
- Lamb County: 79312, 79031, 79326, 79339, 79064, 79082, 79371
- Lipscomb County: 79005, 79034, 79046, 79056
- Lubbock County: 79329, 79363, 79364, 79366, 79382, 79401, 79402, 79403, 79404, 79405, 79406, 79407, 79409, 79410, 79411, 79412, 79413, 79414, 79415, 79416, 79423, 79424
- Lynn County: 79351, 79373, 79381
- Moore County: 79029, 79058, 79086
- Motley County: 79234, 79244, 79256
- Ochiltree County: 79070

- Oldham County: 79001, 79092, 79098
- Parmer County: 79009, 79325, 79035
- Potter County: 79111, 79116, 79117, 79120, 79123, 79124, 79159, 79160, 79189
- Randall County: 79109, 79110, 79114, 79118, 79119, 79121
- Roberts County: 79059
- Sherman County: 79084
- Swisher County: 79042, 79052
- Terry County: 79316, 79345
- Wheeler County: 79011, 79061, 79079, 79096
- Yoakum County: 79323, 79355, 79376

**2. Population:**

**A. Gender and number of each in your Region.**

Armstrong: **Total-2065**  
**Female-1132 Male-933**

Bailey: **Total-6273**  
**Female-3568 Male 2705**

Briscoe: **Total-1428**  
**Female-947 Male-921**

Carson: **Total-6110**  
**Female-3352 Male-2758**

Castro: **Total-8755**  
**Female-4682 Male-2448**

Childress: **Total-7548**  
**Female-3256 Male-4292**

Cochran: **Total-2927**  
**Female-2065 Male-862**

Collingsworth: **Total-3276**  
**Female-1677 Male-1599**

Crosby: **Total-7389**  
**Female-3799 Male-3590**

Dallam: **Total-6293**  
**Female-3269 Male-3024**

Deaf Smith: **Total-18353**  
**Female-9633 Male-8720**

Dickens: **Total-2439**  
**Female-1063 Male-1376**

Donley: **Total-3848**  
**Female-1972 Male-1876**

Floyd: **Total-9474**  
**Female-4565 Male-4909**

Garza: **Total-5299**  
**Female-2463 Male-3973**

Gray: **Total-22522**  
**Female-10940 Male-11582**

Hale: **Total-38408**  
**Female-18464 Male-19944**

Hall: **Total-3902**  
**Female-2000 Male-1902**

Hansford: **Total-5676**  
**Female-2872 Male-2804**

Hartley: **Total-5688**  
**Female-2223 Male-3465**

Hemphill: **Total-3632**  
**Female-1783 Male-2925**

Hockley: **Total-23272**  
**Female-13952 Male-9320**

Hutchinson: **Total-23827**  
**Female-11992 Male-11835**

King: **Total-367**  
**Female-188 Male-179**

Parmer: **Total-10492**  
**Female-5247 Male-5245**

Lamb: **Total- 13162**  
**Female-8112 Male-5050**

Potter: **Total-119866**  
**Female-59348 Male-60518**

Lipscomb: **Total- 3129**  
**Female-1592 Male-1537**

Randall: **Total- 116483**  
**Female-60007Male-56476**

Lubbock: **Total-265,008**  
**Female-130137 Male-134871**

Roberts: **Total- 926**  
**Female-461 Male-465**

Lynn: **Total-5674**  
**Female-3377 Male-2297**

Sherman: **Total-3323**  
**Female-1612 Male-1711**

Moore: **Total-20964**  
**Female-10398 Male-10566**

Swisher: **Total-7424**  
**Female-4135 Male-3289**

Motley: **Total- 1428**  
**Female-705 Male-723**

Terry: **Total-13197**  
**Female-6303 Male-6894**

Ochiltree: **Total-9615**  
**Female-4796 Male-4819**

Wheeler: **Total-5100**  
**Female-2627 Male-2473**

Oldham: **Total-2319**  
**Female-1111 Male-1208**

Yoakum: **Total-7698**  
**Female-4027 Male-3671**

## **B. Age and Number in your Region**

Armstrong: 17 and Under- 21.5% 65 and Older-21.1% 85 and Older-4.0% Median Age-42.8%

Bailey: 17 and Under-30.6% 65and Older-14.2% 85 and Older-2.1% Median Age- 33.6%

Briscoe: 17 and Under-25.8% 65 and Older-19.7% 85 and Older-2.4% Median Age-44.0%

Carson: 17 and Under-24.1% 65 and Older-16.0% 85 and Older-2.3% Median Age-40.8%

Castro: 17 and Under-30.9% 65 and Older-13.8% 85 and Older-1.6% Median Age-35.5%

Childress: 17 and Under-20.7% 65 and Older-14.1% 85 and Older-2.3% Median Age-36.6%

Cochran: 17 and Under-30.2% 65 and Older-14.7% 85 and Older-2.0% Median Age-36.6%

Collingsworth: 17 and Under-25.1% 65 and Older-20.2% 85 and Older-3.9% Median Age-42.3%

Crosby: 17 and Under-29.7% 65 and Older-15.2% 85 and Older-2.4% Median Age-35.3%

Dallam: 17 and Under-30.3% 65 and Older-10.5% 85 and Older-1.0% Median Age-34.0%

Deaf Smith: 17 and Under-32.6% 65 and Older-12.2% 85 and Older-1.7% Median Age-30.9%

Dickens: 17 and Under-16.7% 65 and Older-18.9% 85 and Older-3.9% Median Age-38.7%

Donley: 17 and Under-18.6% 65 and Older-22.4% 85 and Older-3.7% Median Age-42.1%

Floyd: 17 and Under-28.0% 65 and Older-17.0% 85 and Older-2.8% Median Age-39.5%

Garza: 17 and Under-25.7% 65 and Older-14.5% 85 and Older-2.1% Median Age-35.8%

Gray: 17 and Under-23.5% 65 and Older-17.7% 85 and Older-3.1% Median Age-38.5%

Hale: 17 and Under-29.5% 65 and Older-12.3% 85 and Older-2.0% Median Age-32.1%

Hall: 17 and Under-26.2% 65 and Older-20.9% 85 and Older-3.8% Median Age-40.9%

Hansford: 17 and Under-29.0% 65 and Older-14.6% 85 and Older-2.2% Median Age-36.4%

Hartley: 17 and Under-21.8% 65 and Older-10.5% 85 and Older-1.7% Median Age-39.8%

Hemphill: 17 and Under-26.6% 65 and Older-15.9% 85 and Older-2.5% Median Age-40.8%

Hockley: 17 and Under-26.7% 65 and Older-12.5% 85 and Older-1.9% Median Age-33.6%

Hutchinson: 17 and Under-26.1% 65 and Older-15.1% 85 and Older-2.1% Median Age-38.1%

King: 17 and Under-26.1% 65 and Older-9.3% 85 and Older-2.1% Median Age-38.4%

Lamb: 17 and Under-27.8% 65 and Older-16.8% 85 and Older-3.2% Median Age-36.7%

Lipscomb: 17 and Under-26.1% 65 and Older-15.6% 85 and Older-2.6% Median Age-38.7%

Lubbock: 17 and Under-25.3% 65 and Older-11.2% 85 and Older-1.6% Median Age-30.8%

Lynn: 17 and Under-28.2% 65 and Older-15.0% 85 and Older-1.7% Median Age-37.1%

Moore: 17 and Under-33.8% 65 and Older-10.1% 85 and Older-1.3% Median Age-30.4%

Motley: 17 and Under-21.6% 65 and Older-24.4% 85 and Older-3.8% Median Age-47.3%

Ochiltree: 17 and Under-29.7% 65 and Older-10.8% 85 and Older-1.2% Median Age-33.0%

Oldham: 17 and Under-34.3% 65 and Older-11.2% 85 and Older-1.1% Median Age-33.0%

Parmer: 17 and Under-31.9% 65 and Older-13.1% 85 and Older-2.4% Median Age-33.4%

Potter: 17 and Under-28.8% 65 and Older-11.8% 85 and Older-1.9% Median Age-32.5%

Randall: 17 and Under-24.6% 65 and Older-10.3% 85 and Older-1.2% Median Age-34.6%

Roberts: 17 and Under-20.0% 65 and Older-14.0% 85 and Older-0.7% Median Age-44.4%

Sherman: 17 and Under-28.5% 65 and Older-12.2% 85 and Older-2.1% Median Age-37.1%

Swisher: 17 and Under-26.9% 65 and Older-16.5% 85 and Older-2.4% Median Age-36.0%

Terry: 17 and Under-27.0% 65 and Older-14.6% 85 and Older-2.2% Median Age-35.2%

Wheeler: 17 and Under-23.4% 65 and Older-19.3% 85 and Older-3.8% Median Age-42.8%

Yoakum: 17 and Under-30.0% 65 and Older-11.6% 85 and Older-1.5% Median Age-34.6%

**3. Describe Cultural Characteristics: Place an X on ALL that apply and indicate the (%) of each.**

**Armstrong**

**Race:** White Alone-97.5% African American Alone-0.8% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-.09% Asian Alone-0.0% Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-0.8%

**Ethnicity:** Hispanic-10.6%

**Geographic:** Rural

**Socio-Economic Status:** \$29296 Average Wage

**Bailey**

**Race:** White Alone-95.8% African American Alone-1.9% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.0% Asian Alone-0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1%

Multi-Racial-1.0%

**Ethnicity:** Hispanic-54.9%

**Geographic:** Rural

**Socio-Economic Status:** \$30829 Average Wage

**Briscoe**

**Race:** White Alone-95.0% African American Alone-3.4% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.5% Asian Alone-0.1% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-1.0%

**Ethnicity:** Hispanic- 25.4%

**Geographic:** Rural

**Socio-Economic Status:** \$25119 Average Wage

**Carson**

**Race:** White Alone-96.4% African American Alone-1.4% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.2% Asian Alone-0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-0.9%

**Ethnicity:** Hispanic-8.4%

**Geographic:** Rural

**Socio-Economic Status:** \$57198 Average Wage

**Castro**

Race: White Alone-94.4% African American Alone-3.0% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.9% Asian Alone-0.0% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-0.6%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-54.2%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$29984 Average Wage

**Childress**

Race: White Alone-81.6% African American Alone-16.0% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.4% Asian Alone-0.7% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.2% Multi-Racial-1.1%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-23.7%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$27156 Average Wage

**Cochran**

Race: White Alone-91.2% African American Alone-6.5% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.2% Asian Alone-0.4% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-0.6%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-47.9%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$29092 Average Wage

**Collingsworth**

Race: White Alone-89.5% African American Alone-6.7% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.9% Asian Alone-0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0% Multi-Racial-1.7%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-25.3%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$26212 Average Wage

**Crosby**

Race: White Alone-93.2% African American Alone-4.8% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.0% Asian Alone-0.1% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.2% Multi-Racial-0.7%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-52.4%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$34713 Average Wage

**Dallam**

Race: White Alone-94.5% African American Alone-2.4% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.3% Asian Alone-0.7% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0% Multi-Racial-1.0%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-34.2%  
Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$31249 Average Wage

**Deaf Smith**

Race: White Alone-95.8% African American Alone-1.9% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.1% Asian Alone-0.5% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.2%

Multi-Racial-0.5%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-63.9%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$31807 Average Wage

**Dickens**

Race: White Alone-88.1% African American Alone-9.7% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.4% Asian Alone-0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.5%

Multi-Racial-1.0%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-29.9%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$26493 Average Wage

**Donley**

Race: White Alone-92.0% African American Alone-5.8% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.1% Asian Alone-0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-1.0%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-8.1%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$24364 Average Wage

**Floyd**

Race: White Alone-93.0% African American Alone-4.6% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.2% Asian Alone-0.3% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.2%

Multi-Racial-0.7%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-49.9%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$26018 Average Wage

**Garza**

Race: White Alone-91.3% African American Alone-6.2% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.5% Asian Alone-0.1% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1%

Multi-Racial-1.4%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-39.6%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$37815 Average Wage

**Gray**

Race: White Alone-89.8% African American Alone-6.4% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.2% Asian Alone-0.5% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-2.0%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-20.0%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$42876 Average Wage

**Hale**

Race: White Alone-91.0% African American Alone-6.1% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.3% Asian Alone-0.6% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-0.9%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-53.4%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$29645 Average Wage

**Hall**

Race: White Alone-88.4% African American Alone-9.2% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.9% Asian Alone-0.6% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0% Multi-Racial-0.9%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-33.1%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$23024 Average Wage

**Hansford**

Race: White Alone-97.6% African American Alone-0.2% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.0% Asian Alone-0.4% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0% Multi-Racial-0.7%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-43.6%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$33983 Average Wage

**Hartley**

Race: White Alone-89.5% African American Alone-8.9% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.6% Asian Alone-0.3% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-0.6%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-19.0%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$32713 Average Wage

**Hemphill**

Race: White Alone-96.6% African American Alone-1.6% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.8% Asian Alone-0.3% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-0.6%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-21.2%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$47513 Average Wage

**Hockley**

Race: White Alone-93.5% African American Alone-4.0% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.2% Asian Alone-0.3% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-1.0%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-42.8%  
Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$37439 Average Wage

**Hutchinson**

Race: White Alone-92.9% African American Alone-3.1% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.7% Asian Alone-0.5% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-1.8%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-19.2%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$35383 Average Wage

**King**

Race: White Alone-95.% African American Alone-3.9% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.7% Asian Alone-0.0% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-0.4%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-13.9%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$40760 Average Wage

**Lamb**

Race: White Alone-92.5% African American Alone-4.9% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.2% Asian Alone-0.3% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1%

Multi-Racial-0.9%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-50%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$29941 Average Wage

**Lipscomb**

Race: White Alone-96.7% African American Alone-0.7% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.7% Asian Alone-0.1% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-0.9%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-29.5%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$42857 Average Wage

**Lubbock**

Race: White Alone-89.1% African American Alone-7.7% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.7% Asian Alone-1.4% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1%

Multi-Racial-1.%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-30.6%

Geographic: Urban

Socio-Economic Status: \$33981 Average Wage

**Lynn**

Race: White Alone-93.3% African American Alone-4.1% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.5% Asian Alone-0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-0.9%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-47.0%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$29864 Average Wage

**Moore**

Race: White Alone-95.1% African American Alone-1.7% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.9% Asian Alone-1.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-1.1%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-54.2%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$34558 Average Wage

**Motley**

Race: White Alone-93.9% African American Alone-4.1% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.7% Asian Alone-0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.2% Multi-Racial-1.1%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-15.0%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$26100 Average Wage

**Ochiltree**

Race: White Alone-96.7% African American Alone-0.5 % American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.0% Asian Alone-0.6% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0% Multi-Racial-1.0%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-44.4%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$40807 Average Wage

**Oldham**

Race: White Alone-93.5% African American Alone-3.6% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.5% Asian Alone-0.5% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-0.8%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-14.4%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$27548 Average Wage

**Parmer**

Race: White Alone-95.3% African American Alone-1.9% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.7% Asian Alone-0.6% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-0.7%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-57.3%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$30711 Average Wage

**Potter**

Race: White Alone-84.4% African American Alone-10.3% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.0% Asian Alone-2.5% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-1.7%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-33.4%  
Geographic: Urban

Socio-Economic Status: \$39541 Average Wage

**Randall**

Race: White Alone-93.9% African American Alone-2.5% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.8% Asian Alone-1.5% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0% Multi-Racial-1.2%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-15.1%  
Geographic: Rural/ Urban  
Socio-Economic Status: \$31462 Average Wage

**Roberts**

Race: White Alone-97.7% African American Alone-0.4% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-.8% Asian Alone-0.1% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0% Multi-Racial-0.8%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-7.7%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$32827 Average Wage

**Sherman**

Race: White Alone-97.1% African American Alone-0.8% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.1% Asian Alone-0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.2% Multi-Racial-0.5%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-36.3%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$29364 Average Wage

**Swisher**

Race: White Alone-89.6% African American Alone-7.8% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.0% Asian Alone-0.3% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0% Multi-Racial-1.3%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-37.7%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$25184 Average Wage

**Terry**

Race: White Alone-92.2% African American Alone-5.8% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.8% Asian Alone-0.3% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0% Multi-Racial-0.8%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-49.2%  
Geographic: Rural  
Socio-Economic Status: \$34556 Average Wage

**Wheeler**

Race: White Alone-93.4% African American Alone-3.9% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-1.0% Asian Alone-0.7% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.1% Multi-Racial-0.9%  
Ethnicity: Hispanic-21.8%  
Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$36115 Average Wage

### **Yoakum**

Race: White Alone-96.9% African American Alone-1.7% American Indian and Alaska Native Alone-0.8% Asian Alone-0.2% Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander Alone-0.0%

Multi-Racial-0.3%

Ethnicity: Hispanic-53.9%

Geographic: Rural

Socio-Economic Status: \$48576 Average Wage

## **SECTION III – Prevention Resources Capacity and Gaps**

### **1. Resources:**

- a. **What type of prevention resources currently exist in your target community?** CHCL (Community Health Center of Lubbock), the Wellness Center at Texas Tech University, Lubbock Regional MHMR, Catholic Family Services and the Texas Tech University Center for Resilience and Prevention. Managed Care Center for Addictive/Other Disorders, Inc. also provides services through YPU, YPI, YPS, CCP, TSR, and TPCC, Family Support Services in Amarillo and Central Plains MHMR in Plainview.  
Family Guidance Center, Parenting Cottage, Communities in Schools of the South Plains, Hale County Crisis Center, Texas Homeless Network, South Plains Community Action Association, Religious Organizations, Boys and Girls Clubs, Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts, MADD, Texas Panhandle MHMR in Amarillo and Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission. VOICES Community Coalition,

### **2. Please describe how you can engage the following entities in assisting the PRC:**

- a. DSHS funded Coalitions (includes CCPs, SPFs)
  - Continue participating with the VOICES Coalition in collecting data to develop and update the needs assessment
  - Promote the PRC resources at VOICES Coalition meetings in different counties.
  - Invite coalition members to attend trainings that are hosted by the PRC.  
Provide literature for dissemination to DSHS funded coalitions such as VOICES and TPCC who serve 6 outlying counties thereby covering gaps in service. Attend Coalition meetings and encourage collaboration efforts for upcoming Campaigns such as Red Ribbon Week, GASO, and Texas Tobacco Free Kids Day, Back to School Kickoffs as well as Health Fairs to enhance services and avoid duplication.
- b. Drug-Free Community Coalitions, etc.
  - Disseminate literature to Coalition members such as current drug prevention information and also disseminate information regarding prevention training opportunities in Region 1.
  - Invite community coalitions to be represented at PRC organized activities.
  - Attend Coalition meetings and encourage collaboration efforts for upcoming Campaigns such as Red Ribbon Week, GASO, Texas Tobacco Free Kids Day, Back to School Kickoffs as well as Health Fairs to enhance services and avoid duplication.
- c. School Programs

- School programs can provide a platform for provider’s information on services available through the PRC and Managed Care Center.
  - Engage school personnel and parents to participate in surveys and data collection.
  - Encourage collaboration efforts to assist the PRC with such campaigns as GASO, Red Ribbon Week activities, Back to School Kickoffs as well as School Sponsored Health Fairs. One example: During our “Back to School Kickoff” in Levelland, the National Honor Society assisted the PRC in manning our booth and helping with set up and take-down efforts.
  - Offer the PRC the opportunity to inform parents of current drug trends and issues at family involvement activities.
- d. Community services (YMCA, Goodwill, etc.)
- The Parenting Cottage and Texas Agri-lfe Extension are two examples of community organizations that assist the PRC in substance abuse material distribution.
  - The PRC collaborates with Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts by providing tobacco presentations to their groups as well as information dissemination to them and their parents. Also, the Hockley County Juvenile Probation assisted the PRC in disseminating bags of literature about ATODs to the community during our “Neighborhood Walk”.
  - Meals on Wheels will disseminate our literature once a quarter while delivering meals to the elderly and disabled.
  - Community Health Centers of Lubbock requests ATOD presentations once a quarter to all public health workers.
- e. Parent programs (PTA, etc.)
- Parent programs can assist the PRC in distributing Red Ribbon Week supplies to their schools, participate in PRC Surveys, and encourage collaboration efforts in assisting the PRC with campaigns such as GASO, Red Ribbon Week activities, Back to School Kickoffs as well as School- Sponsored Health Fairs.
  - PTA’s in Crosby, Garza, Dickens, Hockley, Lubbock, and Terry counties allow the PRC to present to parents during monthly PTO meetings.
- f. Direct Prevention Service Providers
- Managed Care Center has offices in Crosbyton, Plainview and Amarillo and other services providers include Family Support Services in Amarillo and CPMHMR in Plainview.
  - The PRC meets with Direct Prevention Service Providers either in person, by phone or email to share training needs, raise awareness of concerns in each area and also to make them aware of PRC’s services and resources that are available to them and their agency. We disseminate literature to these agencies as well as lend videos thru our Video Lending Library. When the Needs Assessment is complete we will furnish them with a copy. Also PRC1 shares their website address and 1-800 number with these agencies as well.
- g. Treatment Providers
- Make Treatment Providers aware of resources and information that the PRC has to offer.
  - PRC1 disseminates literature to Providers and will continue to lend videos and provide presentations when requested.
  - We will continue to share information with them regarding upcoming trainings in our Region and State.
  - The PRC will continue to give ATOD presentations during group sessions upon request.

- h. OSAR providers
  - We share opportunities for DSHS required training with OSAR Providers.
  - PRC1 will contact the OSAR providers and make them aware of the services and resources that we have to offer their agency.
- i. Mental Health Centers
  - We provide MHMR and Sunrise Canyon Hospital and Canyon Lakes Residential Treatment Center with literature and other substance abuse and behavioral health materials.
  - We partner with MHMR staff on coalitions and prevention activities in our Region.

**3. Who do you serve in your Region? Place an X on all that apply.**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concerned Individual     | <input type="checkbox"/> Colonias                         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Educator                 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevention Staff      |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faith-based Organization | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DSHS funded-providers |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Parent                   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Youth                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Teacher                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hurricane evacuees    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DSHS funded coalitions   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, List _____                |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, List _____                |

**4. Gaps:**

- a. What prevention gaps exist in your target population?
  - Law enforcement and judicial system assistance and collaboration are gaps that currently exist....
  - Due to lack of funding for prevention programs, lack of prevention services in our communities continue to be a huge gap, such as targeted parent ATOD information.
  - Because of the travel distance to our outlying areas, a lot of these communities need more knowledge about PRC 1 services.
  - Other Prevention gaps that exist in our target population consist of lack of seller/server training for retailers and clerks.

**SECTION IV - Consequences and Consumption Patterns of the Community**

Please identify the patterns in each of the following data sources, when available. If the data source is unavailable in the community, provide an explanation. Please feel free to also utilize alternative data sources.

**A. DWI Rates- Number of Arrest/% of population**

According to The Texas Department of Public Safety, the State of Texas had 98,349 DWI arrests in 2004. As of December 29, 2010 The following 2004 data is the most current that we could locate **per county** for DWI Rates.

Armstrong: 34 (1.55%)  
 Bailey: 71 (1.03%)  
 Briscoe: 0 (0%)  
 Carson: 63 (.96%)  
 Castro: 83 (.96%)  
 Childress: 35 (.44%)  
 Cochran: 31 (.8%)  
 Collingsworth: 22 (.68%)  
 Crosby: 59 (.81%)  
 Dallam: 46 (.70%)  
 Deaf Smith: Not Available  
 Dickens: 17 (.62%)  
 Donley: 90 (2.3%)  
 Floyd: 30 (.37%)  
 Garza: 73 (1.4%)  
 Gray: 137 (.6%)  
 Hale: 176 (.47%)  
 Hall: 30 (.78%)  
 Hansford: 20 (.36%)  
 Hartley: 15 (.26%)  
 Hemphill: 27 (.76%)  
 Hockley: 229 (.99%)  
 Hutchinson: 70(.296%)  
 King: 1 (.27%)  
 Lamb: 88 (.58%)  
 Lipscomb: 9 (.29%)  
 Lubbock: 1817 (.71%)  
 Lynn: 86 (1.27%)  
 Moore: 152 (.73%)  
 Motley: 1 (.07%)  
 Ochiltree: 119 (1.25%)  
 Oldham: 14 (.61%)  
 Parmer: 80 (.77%)  
 Potter: 509 (.43%)  
 Randall: 246 (.22%)  
 Roberts: 2 (.22%)  
 Sherman: 23 (.70%)  
 Swisher: 10 (.12%)  
 Terry: 51 (.39%)  
 Wheeler: 44 (.85%)  
 Yoakum: 56 (.73%)

Donley County had the highest DWI Rates at 2.3% followed by Armstrong County at 1.55%.  
 Motley County had the lowest DWI Rates at .07% followed by Swisher County at .12%.

**b. Alcohol related vehicular fatalities.**

Texas had a grand total of 3,382 Total Fatalities in all Crashes. Of these total fatalities, Texas had a total of 1,269 Alcohol-Impaired Driving Fatalities in 2008 with a BAC = .08+

Compared to the Nation- wide average of 32%, Texas is higher with 38%. In comparison to the Best State Average of 16%, Texas has more than doubled that percentage.

Armstrong: 2009 - 0  
Bailey: 2009 - 2  
Briscoe: 2009 - 0  
Carson: 2009- 0  
Castro 2009- 1  
Childress: 2009 - 2  
Cochran: 2009 - 1  
Collingsworth: 2009 - 0  
Crosby: 2009 - 0  
Dallam: 2009-2  
Deaf Smith: 2009 - 0  
Dickens: 0; 2009- 0  
Donley: 2009- 0  
Floyd: 2009 - 0  
Garza: 2009 - 1  
Gray: 0; 2009 - 0  
Hale: 2009 - 3  
Hall: 2009 - 0  
Hansford: 2009- 0  
Hartley: 2009 - 1  
Hemphill: 2009- 0  
Hockley: 2009- 0  
Hutchinson: 2009 - 1  
King: 2009 - 0  
Lamb: 2009- 2  
Lipscomb: 2009 -1  
Lubbock: 2009 - 10  
Lynn: 2009- 2  
Moore: 2009 - 0  
Motley: 2009 - 0  
Ochiltree: 2009- 0  
Oldham: 2009- 2  
Parmer: 2009- 0  
Potter: 2009 - 3  
Randall: 2009 - 2  
Roberts: 2009 - 1  
Sherman: 2009- 0  
Swisher: 2009 - 0  
Terry: 2009 - 0  
Wheeler: 2009-0  
Yoakum: 2009- 0

Lubbock County had the highest number (10) of alcohol related vehicular fatalities. Potter County had the second highest number (3). 24 counties had zero.

**c. Violent crimes per year- % of population**

Texas had 33,666 violent crimes in 2004. As of December 29, 2010, the following **county data** from 2004 is the most current available data.

Armstrong: 3 (.14%)  
Bailey: 17 (.25%)  
Briscoe: 0 (0%)  
Carson: 8 (.12%)  
Castro: 10 (.12%)  
Childress: 13 (.17%)  
Cochran: 1 (.025%)  
Collingsworth: 0 (0%)  
Crosby: 25 (3.4%)  
Dallam: 18 (.276%)  
Deaf Smith: Not Available  
Dickens: 0 (0%)  
Donley: 6 (.16%)  
Floyd: 8 (.10%)  
Garza: 1 (.02%)  
Gray: 36 (.16%)  
Hale: 26 (.07%)  
Hall: 3 (.07%)  
Hansford: 4 (.07%)  
Hartley: 1 (.017%)  
Hemphill: 10 (.28%)  
Hockley: 29 (.125%)  
Hutchinson: 23 (.097%)  
King: 0 (0%)  
Lamb: 20 (.13%)  
Lipscomb: 2 (.06%)  
Lubbock: 411 (.16%)  
Lynn: 0 (0%)  
Moore: 21 (.10%)  
Motley: 0 (0%)  
Ochiltree: 16 (.167%)  
Oldham: 3 (.13%)  
Parmer: 16 (.15%)  
Potter: 310 (.26%)  
Randall: 39 (.034%)  
Roberts: 2 (.2%)  
Sherman: 2 (.06%)  
Swisher: 8 (.09%)  
Terry: 8 (.06%)  
Wheeler: 13 (.25%)  
Yoakum: 32 (.42%)

Crosby County had the highest Violent Crime Rate per year - % of population with a rate of 3.4%

Five Counties reported 0%.

**d. Possession of illicit drugs (Arrests/% of Population)**

Texas had a total of 112,677 Possession of Illicit Drugs Arrests for 2004. As of December 29, 2010, the following data is the most current available **by county** for Arrests / % of population.

Armstrong: 12 (.55%)  
Bailey: 11 (.16%)  
Briscoe: 4 (.22%)  
Carson: 142 (2.16%)  
Castro: 18 (.21%)  
Childress: 43 (.55%)  
Cochran: 16 (.4%)  
Collingsworth: 4 (.12%)  
Crosby: 74 (1.01%)  
Dallam: 65 (.995%)  
Deaf Smith: Not Available  
Dickens: 16 (.58%)  
Donley: 56 (1.45%)  
Floyd: 27 (.34%)  
Garza: 60 (1.16%)  
Gray: 126 (.56%)  
Hale: 176 (.475%)  
Hall: 28 (.73%)  
Hansford: 17 (.30%)  
Hartley: 14 (.25%)  
Hemphill: 7 (.20%)  
Hockley: 166 (.72%)  
Hutchinson: 140 (.592%)  
King: 0 (0%)  
Lamb: 104 (.69%)  
Lipscomb: 19 (.61%)  
Lubbock: 885 (.35%)  
Lynn: 66 (.98%)  
Moore: 100 (.48%)  
Motley: 3 (.21%)  
Ochiltree: 88 (.93%)  
Oldham: 32 (1.4%)  
Parmer: 74 (.71%)  
Potter: 1745 (1.48%)  
Randall: 199 (.177%)  
Roberts: 3 (.3%)  
Sherman: 3 (.09%)  
Swisher: 9 (.10%)  
Terry: 77 (.6%)  
Wheeler: 48 (.93%)  
Yoakum: 25 (.32%)

Carson County had the highest percent (2.16%) of arrests for possession of illicit drugs for 2004. King County had the lowest percent (0%) for 2004.

**e. Public intoxications (Arrests/ % of Population)**

The following numbers and percentages are based on 2004 data. The total number of arrests for public intoxication in Texas in 2004 were 131,221. This data is the most current as of December 29, 2010.

Armstrong: 8 (.36%)  
Bailey: 15 (.22%)  
Briscoe: 0 (0%)  
Carson: 26 (.40%)  
Castro: 17 (.20%)  
Childress: 20 (.26%)  
Cochran: 22 (.57%)  
Collingsworth: 2 (.06%)  
Crosby: 55 (.75%)  
Dallam: 81 (1.24%)  
Deaf Smith: Not Available  
Dickens: 14 (.51%)  
Donley: 26 (.68%)  
Floyd: 5 (.06%)  
Garza: 44 (.85%)  
Gray: 117 (.52%)  
Hale: 266 (.72%)  
Hall: 10 (.26%)  
Hansford: 4 (.07%)  
Hartley: 4 (.07%)  
Hemphill: 4 (.11%)  
Hockley: 97 (.42%)  
Hutchinson: 51 (.22%)  
King: 1 (.28%)  
Lamb: 41 (.27%)  
Lipscomb: 11 (.35%)  
Lubbock: 1387 (.55%)  
Lynn: 59 (.87%)  
Moore: 110 (.53%)  
Motley: 0 (0%)  
Ochiltree: 56 (.59%)  
Oldham: 12 (.53%)  
Parmer: 23 (.22%)  
Potter: 1533 (1.30%)  
Randall: 85 (.075%)  
Roberts: 0 (0%)  
Sherman: 22 (.68%)  
Swisher: 3 (.03%)  
Terry: 90 (.69%)  
Wheeler: 11 (.21%)  
Yoakum: 30 (.39%)

Potter County had the highest number of public intoxications / % of population (1.30%) followed by Dallam County (1.24%). Brisco, Motley and Roberts Counties all reported 0%.

**f. Suicide Rates- cases per 100,000 People of Population**

The number of Suicides for Texas in 2005 was 2,400 with 10.5 cases per 100,000 people. The following information is the most recent data available as of December 29, 2010.

Armstrong: 0-10.5  
Bailey: 0-10.5  
Briscoe: 24.9-127.9  
Carson: 24.9-127.9  
Castro: 0-10.5  
Childress: 0-10.5  
Cochran: 24.9-127.9  
Collingsworth: 0-10.5  
Crosby: 0-10.5  
Dallam: 10.6-24.8  
Deaf Smith: 0-10.5  
Dickens: 0-10.5  
Donley: 0-10.5  
Floyd: 0-10.5  
Garza: 0-10.5  
Gray: 10.6-24.8  
Hale: 0-10.5  
Hall: 0-10.5  
Hansford: 0-10.5  
Hartley: 24.9-127.9  
Hemphill: 0-10.5  
Hockley: 10.6-24.8  
Hutchinson: 10.6-24.8  
King: 0-10.5  
Lamb: 0-10.5  
Lipscomb: 0-10.5  
Lubbock: 10.6-24.8  
Lynn: 24.9-127.9  
Moore: 0-10.5  
Motley: 0-10.5  
Ochiltree: 24.9-127.9  
Oldham: 0-10.5  
Parmer: 0-10.5  
Potter: 10.6-24.8  
Randall: 10.6-24.8  
Roberts: 0-10.5  
Sherman: 0-10.5  
Swisher: 24.9-127.9  
Terry: 0-10.5  
Wheeler: 10.6-24.8  
Yoakum: 10.6-24.8

**g. Homicide rates**

- 1370 Homicides for Texas state wide in 2008

**h. Hospital discharges for youth alcohol poisoning.**

- Data Not Available Currently

**i. Hospital discharges for youth**

Data Not Available Currently

**j. Underage binge drinking rates**

- Substance Abuse Trends in Texas: June 2010 reports that 24.02% of Texas underage youth reported past month binge drinking, as compared to 22.84 percent nationally. Region 1 had the highest rate of binge drinking in Texas 26.89%.

**k. College age binge drinking**

- According to Substance Abuse Trends in Texas; June 2010, Region 1 had the highest rate of binge drinking in Texas. There are several factors that contribute to this high rate. One of these factors is the number of universities in Region 1. Our Region is home to the following Colleges/ Universities: Texas Tech University, Wayland Baptist University, Lubbock Christian University located in Lubbock, South Plains College in Levelland, and West Texas A& M University in Canyon and Amarillo College in Amarillo. Another factor that contributes to underage binge drinking rates is low perceived risk.
- According to the AlcoholEdu Program implemented at Texas Tech University, 29% of college freshmen classify themselves as “heavy episodic drinkers,” and 10% classify themselves as “problematic drinkers.”

**l. Past 30 day drinking rates by grades state wide**

The following updated information was taken from “Adolescent Substance Use in Texas” 2008. Grade 6 was not included in this report. The State baseline data was 30.4% for 2008. Most Current Data

- Grade 6
  - Alcohol
    - 12%-11.0%
  - Binge Drinking
    - 18%-18.3%
- Grade 7
  - Alcohol
    - 16.9%
  - Binge Drinking
    - 21%-20.3%
- Grade 8
  - Alcohol
    - 22.4%

- Binge Drinking
  - 28%-27.2%
- Grade 9
  - Alcohol
    - 29.4%
  - Binge Drinking
    - 42%-41%
- Grade 10
  - Alcohol
    - 34.2%
  - Binge Drinking
    - 47%-43.2%
- Grade 11
  - Alcohol
    - 38.0%
  - Binge Drinking
    - 52%-52.7%
- Grade 12
  - Alcohol
    - 45.2%
  - Binge Drinking
    - 53%-52.6%

Binge Drinking was reported by 20.6 percent of students in grades 7-12, down from 21.9 percent two years ago.

#### **m. Current 30 day illicit drug use rates**

The following updated information was taken from “Adolescent Substance Use in Texas” 2008. Grade 6 was not included in this report. The State baseline data was 11.7% for 2008 Most Current Data

- Grade 7 - 5.0%
- Grade 8 - 6.9%
- Grade 9 - 11.6%
- Grade 10 - 14.8%
- Grade 11 - 16.1%
- Grade 12 - 17.4%

Marijuana remained the most commonly used illegal drug among 7-12 graders. About 25% in 2008 reported having smoked marijuana.

#### **n. Perceptions of harmfulness of use (alcohol and other substances) Most Current Data**

- Hockley County 2008 School Survey
  - Any Tobacco: Ever Used (Hockley County) 5.8%- (State) 5.4%
  - Any Alcohol: Ever Used (Hockley County) 25.4%- (State) 23.1%
  - Marijuana: Ever Used (Hockley County) 3.2%- (State) 1.7%
- According to “Adolescent Substance Use in Texas” in 2008, Alcohol and tobacco were thought to be the least threatening substances to use. Only 44 to 50 percent of all secondary students in 2008 thought that alcohol or tobacco was very dangerous to use, and 60 percent thought marijuana was very dangerous to use. Some 82 to 87 percent believed that cocaine, crack, heroin, and methamphetamine were very dangerous to use.

- The perceived danger of substance use varies among grade levels, which reflects the expanding variety of drugs to which older students have been exposed.
- Youth who believed that substances were dangerous to use were less likely to actually use them. Only 2 percent of secondary students who thought marijuana was very dangerous to use had actually used it in the past month; whereas 48 percent of those who believed marijuana was not dangerous at all had used it.
- 42 percent of students in grades 7-12 reported initiating tobacco use before age 13.
- 50.5 percent of students in grades 7-12 reported first using alcohol before age 13.
- 27.5 percent of students in grades 7-12 reported first use of marijuana before age 13.

**o. Future intentions to use**

- According to the “Adolescent Substance Use in Texas, 2008” Alcohol and tobacco were thought to be the least threatening substances to use.
- The perceived danger of substance use varies among grade levels, which reflects the expanding variety of drugs to which older students have been exposed.
- Youths who believed that substances were dangerous to use were less likely to actually use them.
- Youths who said that their parents disapproved of teens their age using substances were less likely to use these substances.

**p. Family/social bonding indicators**

- Data Not Available Currently

**q. HIV infection rates and transmission route**

- Region 1 has 1467 cumulative reported cases of HIV/AIDS and 827 who are currently living with the disease.
- There are 627 people living in Lubbock and Amarillo and the remaining 200 reside in rural communities.
- The 2009 Texas HIV/STD Surveillance data indicated that among men the increase in HIV cases are due to male-to-male sexual activity and intravenous drug use. Among women the leading modes of transmission are intravenous drug use and heterosexual activity.

**r. Noise violation data**

- Data Not Available Currently

**s. Treatment episode admission data**

- The following 2009 data is only for DSHS - Funded Treatment Centers.
- Adult (Detox, Residential, Outpatient) 2280
- Youth : ( Outpatient) 154

**TOTAL ADMISSIONS FOR YOUTH AND ADULTS**

Armstrong: YOUTH 0% / ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol; \*\*\*Amphetamines

Bailey: YOUTH\*\*\*Marijuana ; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol; \*\*\*Cocaine Powder; \*\*\*Marijuana; \*\*\*Crack Cocaine.

Briscoe: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS 0%

Carson: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol; \*\*\*Amphetamines  
 Castro: YOUTH \*\*\*Amphetamines; \*\*\*Marijuana/Hash; ADULTS \*\*\*Heroin; \*\*\*Alcohol; Amphetamines 19; \*\*\*Cocaine (Powder); \*\*\*Marijuana/Hash  
 Childress: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS\*\*\*Alcohol; \*\*\*Amphetamines; \*\*\*Marijuana/hash; \*\*\*Crack Cocaine.  
 Cochran: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS\*\*\*Alcohol; \*\*\*Other Opiates; \*\*\*Cocaine (Powder): \*\*\*Crack Cocaine.  
 Collingsworth: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol, Crack Cocaine  
 Crosby: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS\*\*\* Alcohol, Marijuana, Crack Cocaine  
 Dallam: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Other Opiates, Amphetamines, Cocaine (Powder); Alcohol 10  
 Deaf Smith: YOUTH\*\*\*Marijuana; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol, Amphetamines, Cocaine (Powder), Marijuana/Hash; Crack Cocaine  
 Dickens: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol  
 Donley: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol, Amphetamines, Marijuana/Hash  
 Floyd: YOUTH \*\*\* amphetamines; \*\*\*Cocain(Powder); Marijuana 12; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol, Cocaine (Powder), Marijuana/Hash, Crack Cocaine  
 Garza: YOUTH \*\*\*Marijuana; ADULTS\*\*\*Alcohol, Crack Cocaine  
 Gray: YOUTH\*\*\*Alcohol; \*\*\*Amphetamines;\*\*\*Crack Cocaine; ADULTS \*\*\*Other Opiates, Cocaine (Powder)\*\*\* Alcohol 15; Amphetamines 23, Marijuana/Hash 17, Crack Cocaine 13  
 Hale: YOUTH Alcohol 26; ADULTS \*\*\*Other Opiates, Amphetamines, other drugs.\*\*\* Alcohol 37, Cocaine (Powder) 25, Marijuana12, Crack Cocaine 22.  
 Hall: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol, Amphetamins, Marijuana/Hash  
 Hansford: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Heroin, Alcohol.  
 Hartley: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS 9%  
 Hemphill: YOUTH \*\*\*Alcohol; ADULTS 0 %  
 Hockley: YOUTH\*\*\*Alcohol; \*\*\*Marijuana/Hash; ADULTS \*\*\*Heroin, Cocaine (Powder); Marijuana/Hash; Crack Cocaine; Alcohol 14, Amphetamines 15  
 Hutchinson: YOUTH 0% ; ADULTS \*\*\*Heroin, Other Opiates, Amphetamines, Cocaine (Powder), Marijuana; Crack Cocaine 10; Alcohol 14.  
 King: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol  
 Lamb: YOUTH\*\*\*Alcohol; ADULTS \*\*\*Other Opiates, Cocaine Powder, Marijuana/Hash; Other Drugs; Crack Cocaine; Alcohol 16  
 Lipscomb: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\* Alcohol  
 Lubbock: YOUTH\*\*\*Alcohol; \*\*\*Amphetamines; \*\*\*Cocaine; **75** for Marijuana; \*\*\*other drugs. ADULTS \*\*\*Downers, Other Drugs; Heroin 45; Other Opiates 78; Alcohol 342; Amphetamines 161; Cocaine (Powder) 86; Marijuana/Hash 171; Crack Cocaine 217.  
 Lynn: YOUTH\*\*\*Marijuana/Hash; ADULTS \*\*\* Crack Cocaine  
 Moore: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Other Opiates, Alcohol, Amphetamines, Cocaine (Powder), Marijuana/Hash  
 Motley: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Amphetamines  
 Ochiltree: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol, Amphetamines, Cocaine (Powder), Marijuana/Hash.  
 Oldham: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol, Amphetamines  
 Parmer: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol, Amphetamines, Cocaine (Powder) Crack Cocaine  
 Potter: YOUTH\*\*\*Alcohol; ADULTS \*\*\*Heroin, Downers, Other Drugs\*\*; Other Opiates 22; Alcohol 154; Amphetamines 116; Cocaine (Powder) 22; Marijuana/Hash 61; Crack Cocaine 96.  
 Randall: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Heroin, Downers, Cocaine (Powder); Other Opiates 12, Alcohol 76; Amphetamines 46; Marijuana 29; Crack Cocaine 23.

Roberts: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Crack Cocaine  
Sherman: YOUTH 0%; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol  
Swisher: YOUTH\*\*\*Alcohol; \*\*\*Marijuana/Hash; ADULTS \*\*\*Alcohol, Amphetamines,  
Cocaine (Powder), Marijuana/Hash, Crack Cocaine  
Terry: YOUTH\*\*\* amphetamines- youth.  
Wheeler: 0%  
Yoakum: 0%

\*\*\*- Did have admissions but number was fewer than 4.

**t. Minors in Possession (MIP) data**

- 108 Lubbock County MIP as of 2008
- All other counties- Data Not Available Currently

**u. Truancy data / drop-out rates- % Per Population**

Armstrong: 2.8%  
Bailey: 2.4%  
Briscoe: 0.0%  
Carson: 0.6%  
Castro: 1.8%  
Childress: 0.5%  
Cochran: 3.1%  
Collingsworth: 0.9%  
Crosby: 1.7%  
Dallam: 1.1%  
Deaf Smith: 3.3%  
Dickens: 3.2%  
Donley: 2.7%  
Floyd: 2.1%  
Garza: 1.8%  
Gray: 1.2%  
Hale: 1.4%  
Hall: 1.1%  
Hansford: 1.6%  
Hartley: 0.0%  
Hemphill: 1.0%  
Hockley: 1.3%  
Hutchinson: 1.7%  
King: 0.0%  
Lamb: 3.0%  
Lipscomb: 3.1%  
Lubbock: 1.7%  
Lynn: Not Available  
Moore: Not Available  
Motley: Not Available  
Ochiltree: Not Available  
Oldham: Not Available  
Parmer: Not Available  
Potter: Not Available

Randall: 0.2%  
 Roberts: 0.0%  
 Sherman: 0.7%  
 Swisher: 2.5%  
 Terry: 3.4%  
 Wheeler: 0.9%  
 Yoakum: 1.2%

**v. TABC data on citations**

**TABC**  
**\*Lubbock District in Region 1**

Number of Attempts		Number of Attempts Resulting in Sales		Number Resulting in Restrained	
<b>1/1/2007 – 1/1/2008</b>					
On Prem.	Off Prem.	On Prem.	Off Prem.	On Prem.	Off Prem.
131	91	15	13	4	8
<b>1/1/2008 – 1/1/2009</b>					
On Prem.	Off Prem.	On Prem.	Off Prem.	On Prem.	Off Prem.
116	111	13	17	7	9
<b>**1/1/2009 – 1/1/2010</b>					
On Prem.	Off Prem.	On Prem.	Off Prem.	On Prem.	Off Prem.
48	121	5	12	1	6

\* Lubbock District includes all 6 of the counties VOICES serves

\*\* Denotes that the City of Lubbock and Terry County went wet in September 2009

**W. Texas School Survey data**

- Prevalence and recency of use of selected substances by grade-All Students (State: Grades 4-6, Spring 2008) Most Current Data to date
  - Tobacco
    - Ever Used 5.4 %, School Year 3.0%, Not Past year 2.4%, Never Used 94.6%
  - Alcohol
    - Ever Used 23.1%, School Year 15.3%, Not Past year 7.8%, Never Used 76.9%
  - Inhalants
    - Ever Used 8.9%, School Year 6.5%, Not Past year 2.4%, Never Used 91.1%
  - Marijuana
    - Ever Used 1.7%, School Year 1.2%, Not Past year 0.5%, Never Used 98.3%
- How recently, if ever, have you used...(State: Grades 4-6, Spring 2008)
  - Any tobacco product
    - Ever Used 5.4%, School Year 3.0%, Not Past year 2.4%, Never Used 94.6%
  - Cigarettes
    - Ever Used 4.7%, School Year 2.6%, Not Past year 2.1%, Never Used 95.3%

- Smokeless tobacco
  - Ever Used 1.4%, School Year 0.8%, Not Past year 0.7%, Never Used 98.6%
- Average number of times selected tobacco products were used by those who reported use of...
  - School year 3.1%, Lifetime 3.0%
- How recently, if ever, have you used... (State: Grades 4-6, Spring 2008)
  - Any alcohol products
    - Ever Used 23.1%, School Year 15.3%, Not Past year 7.8%, Never Used 76.9%
  - Beer
    - Ever Used 14.7%, School Year 8.1%, Not Past year 6.5%, Never Used 85.3%
  - Wine coolers
    - Ever Used 10.8%, School Year 7.1%, Not Past year 3.7%, Never Used 89.2%
  - Wine
    - Ever Used 11.8%, School Year 7.1%, Not Past year 4.7%, Never Used 88.2%
  - Liquor
    - Ever Used 6.0%, School Year 3.9%, Not Past year 2.1%, Never Used 94.0%
- Prevalence and recency of use selected substances by grade- All Students (State: Grades 7-12, Spring 2008)
  - Tobacco
    - Ever Used 12.9%, School Year 17.9%, Not Past year 31.7%, Never Used 68.3%
  - Alcohol
    - Ever Used 30.4%, School Year 41.7%, Not Past year 62.9%, Never Used 37.1%
  - Inhalants
    - Ever Used 2.7%, School Year 4.3%, Not Past year 9.3%, Never Used 90.7%
  - Any Illicit Drug
    - Ever Used 11.7%, School Year 16.6%, Not Past year 26.4%, Never Used 73.6%
  - Marijuana
    - Ever Used 10.0%, School Year 14.9%, Not Past year 24.6%, Never Used 75.4%
  - Marijuana Only
    - Ever Used 3.9%, School Year 6.5%, Not Past year 12.9%, Never Used 87.1%
- How recently, if ever, have you used... (State: Grades 7-12, Spring 2008)
  - Any tobacco product
    - Ever Used 12.9%, School Year 17.9%, Not Past year 31.7%, Never Used 68.3%
  - Cigarettes

- Ever Used 11.5%, School Year 16.4%, Not Past year 30.1%, Never Used 69.9%
  - Smokeless tobacco
    - Ever Used 3.8%, School Year 5.6%, Not Past year 9.6%, Never Used 90.4%
- How recently, if ever, have you used... (State: Grades 7-12, Spring 2008)
  - Any alcohol product
    - Ever Used 30.4%, School Year 41.7%, Not Past year 62.9%, Never Used 37.1%
  - Beer
    - Ever Used 19.8%, School Year 29.1%, Not Past year 47.7%, Never Used 52.3%
  - Wine coolers
    - Ever Used 18.1%, School Year 28.6%, Not Past year 46.5%, Never Used 53.5%
  - Wine
    - Ever Used 12.3%, School Year 21.6%, Not Past year 42.1%, Never Used 57.9%
  - Liquor
    - Ever Used 19.1%, School Year 29.1%, Not Past year 43.6%, Never Used 56.4%
- How recently, if ever, have you used... (State: Grades 7-12, Spring 2008)
  - Marijuana
    - Ever Used 10.0%, School Year 14.9%, Not Past year 24.6%, Never Used 75.4%
  - Cocaine
    - Ever Used 2.1%, School Year 3.4%, Not Past year 6.5%, Never Used 93.5%
  - Crack
    - Ever Used 0.5%, School Year 0.8%, Not Past year 1.7%, Never Used 98.3%
  - Hallucinogens
    - Ever Used 1.5%, School Year 2.4%, Not Past year 4.4%, Never Used 95.6%
  - Uppers
    - Ever Used 2.1%, School Year 3.3%, Not Past year 5.3%, Never Used 94.7%
  - Downers
    - Ever Used 2.2%, School Year 3.5%, Not Past year 5.5%, Never Used 94.5%

#### **x. Other data sources**

- Texas Standing Tall Report Card
- SAMSA
- CSAP

## **Part V – Intervening Variables**

1. Please discuss each of the following variables as they relate to Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs (ATOD) in the target community of your region.

**A. Easy Retail Access-**

The TST 2009 Report Card indicates that 66% of youth perceive alcohol as easy/ fairly easy to access.

- Many cities in the South Plains and Panhandle area have been historically dry but that has changed for several communities in our Region. Easy Retail Access is a growing problem due to lack of Seller/Server Training in these newly voted “wet” communities.
- According to the Monitoring the Future Survey 2008, about 92% of 12<sup>th</sup> graders say that alcohol is easy to get.
- Several communities in Region 1 that have traditionally been “dry” have recently gone “wet”. Because of this change the availability of alcohol is increasing. Some retailers are opting to sell alcohol and tobacco to youth and minors because they perceive no risk.

**B. Low Enforcement-**

- Texas Tech University has the largest stadium in the region and therefore many people, including students, get into the games with alcohol. At each gate there are a minimum number of uniformed officers that are responsible to check and inspect attendees. However, because of the low number of police officers, much of the alcohol goes undetected.
- Outside concerts that take place in the community are permitted to sell alcohol. Even though identification cards are checked at the point of sale or at the entrance some people give alcohol to minors who are also attending these concerts.
- Local bars and clubs are being held accountable for sales of alcohol to persons only when they are acting intoxicated. One major club in the region has been shut down because of constant sales to minors and intoxicated individuals..
- In some instances judges in our counties have been lenient with upholding the laws by dismissing citations for MIPs. In Lubbock County, the increased number of MIPs back -logged the court system so heavily that many citations were dismissed. Law enforcement, even in our rural communities, has been looking the other way when they discover minors in possession. This lack of enforcement sends mixed messages to youth.

**C. Social Access**

- According to Adolescent Substance Use in Texas, 2008, about 63 percent of grade 7-12 past- month drinkers said they always/most of the time obtained alcohol at parties, compared to 58% said so from friends and 18 percent obtained alcohol from stores.
- Some parents in Region 1 believe that teens are going to drink anyways so why not provide a safe environment like their home where teens many drink, but not drink and drive.
- We currently have many stores that still lack seller sever training and many underage students are using fake ID’s or an ID that does not belong to them.

There are also high numbers of college students that say they are never carded by their peers at some bars that largely employ college students.

#### **D. Perceived Risk**

- Studies show that as students get older, their parents are less likely to disapprove of the students' drinking alcohol or using tobacco, which might explain why many parents host parties. Their mindset is 'they are drinking at home and not drinking and driving. It's just alcohol; at least they are not using drugs.'
- According to Substance Abuse Trends in Texas; June 2009, Region 1 had the highest rate of binge drinking in Texas. There are several factors that contribute to this high rate. One of these factors is the number of universities and colleges in Region 1. As an example, according to the AlcoholEdu Program implemented at Texas Tech University, 29% of college freshmen classify themselves as "heavy episodic drinkers," and 10% classify themselves as "problematic drinkers." This data suggests that youth do not comprehend the consequences of binge drinking.

#### **E. Social Norms:**

- Several communities who have recently gone "wet" wanted this change because they believed the 'kids were going to get it somewhere, and why not keep the money local. It's just alcohol, I drank when I was young and I'm okay.' Also, parents host alcohol parties in their homes. They believe if they take away their keys and let them drink in their home, it will keep the kids from drinking and driving.
- The "cowboy culture" is a very strong belief system that impacts the target population throughout our Region. This culture tends to believe that alcohol and tobacco use is seen as a right of passage and a normal occurrence for their age. In our region there are many celebrations that promote the use of alcohol and youth have access.
- Four universities and two junior colleges bring over 55,000 college students into Region 1 each year. This migrant sub-culture tends to subscribe to the belief that "I am free now; I can do what I want, when I want to do it. I can drink alcohol if I want; it's a right of passage."

#### **F. Promotion-**

- A popular magazine distributed on the Texas Tech Campus is Study Breaks. This magazine promotes alcohol consumption with no resistance from the Texas Tech University administration. Local clubs that advertise in the Study Breaks magazine promotes 'Happy Hour' and 2 for 1 drink specials. This magazine that was previously isolated to just the Tech Campus has spilled over into the community, showing up in tanning salons and other businesses that are frequented by minors.
- Major sporting events and other events sponsored by alcohol companies (that do not advertise directly) are allowed to place alcohol banners and flags throughout the event sites.
- There is usually high instances of alcohol promotions during College and NFL football game days

#### **G. Pricing-**

- Many clubs and bars that are trying to attract customers will use special pricing such as 2 for 1 drink specials **and ladies night** discounts. These clubs and bars are promoting their business on the radio and television with no resistance from the community.

2. Do you feel that the area in which you serve has a high incidence of drug use?

Yes  No

3. If yes, what types of drugs are being used in the areas you serve? Place an X to ALL that apply:

Amphetamines

Club Drugs

Crack

Heroin

Inhalants

Marijuana

Methamphetamines

PCP

Tobacco

Alcohol

Cocaine

Ecstasy

Prescription Drugs

Steroids

Other \_\_\_\_\_

## Part VI – Community Readiness

Please describe the readiness of your community, in each of the following community sectors:

**A. Youth- Vague Awareness** The youth in our communities have been receiving materials and programs offered by the PRC for several years. We have provided services to many elementary, middle, and high school students. We partner with our VOICES Coalition in the Lubbock area that serves 6 surrounding counties and Impact Futures Coalition which serves the Amarillo area to promote major campaigns such as Red Ribbon Week and GASO. Both Coalitions are working hard to bring awareness of atods and readiness to the community as well. Because some community norms encourage or tolerate social access, the youth segment of our community seems to be very aware of problems that exist in our communities.

**B. Parents- No Awareness to Denial** Parents in our communities have been able to receive information from the PRC about tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs at health fairs, as walk-ins to the PRC and from their children. In some of our communities, the PRC and parents have partnered with our Voices Coalition and Impact Futures Coalition to bring awareness to their community regarding substance abuse. The PRC engages the media to bring awareness to the community on atods as well. However, despite the attempts to bring awareness to the community, some parents continue to be ignorant of the existing ATOD use regarding youth. In addition, several communities which have traditionally been “dry” have recently voted to become “wet” which shows that the voting adults/ parents in these communities deny that there is a problem. While some parents recognize that this behavior is a problem, the majority of parents in the most of our counties continue to remain vaguely aware of any problems that exist.

**C. Business community- Denial to Vague Awareness** The larger businesses in Region 1 seem to limit substance abuse prevention to mandatory and random drug testing. There are many businesses that partner with the PRC to bring awareness to ATOD such as United Pharmacy. In

September, the PRC partnered with United Pharmacy to distribute pharmacy bags to the community with facts about prescription drugs. The PRC also partners with several businesses each year to host the Building Strong Families Conference in Lubbock. In Levelland, Lubbock, and surrounding areas, several business leaders are members of our VOICES Coalition and are very active in prevention efforts. However, as a whole, we believe our business community is vaguely aware that problems exist in the community.

**D. Media- Initiation** The media in our region have been a strong proponent of reporting the news and statistics of youth but not as much proactive with adults. We are regularly invited to do live interviews on the radio and news channels to discuss topics about tobacco, alcohol and other drugs. Because of their willingness to report the news and statistic, we understand the media to have some knowledge that problems exist.

**E. Schools- Preplanning** The schools in our region have been great to work with. They have opened their doors to us and frequently invite us to do presentations and participate in their health fairs. However, due to lack of funding for prevention programs in many of our rural areas, many schools need more education about the harmful effects of ATOD. Some principals and school boards in our rural areas are in denial and believe they ‘don’t have a problem.’ In contrast, our larger school districts are very supportive of prevention efforts and are very aware of problems that exist in their communities. Overall I would gauge this segment of the community as knowledgeable that problems exist in their communities.

#### **F. Youth-serving organizations- Initiation**

The PRC partners with many youth-serving organizations throughout the year. Several have helped the PRC with many campaigns such as Kick Butts Day, Building Strong Families Conference and we will continue these partnerships in the future. In our region our youth serving organizations are very supportive and participate in prevention efforts. Because of these partnerships that have been built over the years, we determined that these organizations are extremely knowledgeable of problems that exist.

**G. Law enforcement agencies- Denial to Vague Awareness** We collaborate with DPS (Department of Public Safety), Lubbock County Jail and Court Residential Treatment Centers by distributing literature about the harmful effects of ATOD. Presentations are provided upon request to the Lubbock County Jail.

We also collaborate with Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission by exchanging information about ATOD.

In some of the smaller communities, law enforcement looks the other way when they discover minors in possession.

The large number of MIPS that were being issued in the City of Lubbock backlogged the court system so heavily that many citations were dismissed. Until the issue of a flooded court system is resolved, things may not change. Even though some segments of law enforcement are extremely aware of the problems that exist in their communities, their attitude is “we can’t do anything about it” or denial.

**H. Religious or fraternal groups-, Initiation** Region 1 PRC partners with faith based organizations such as churches, ministerial alliances/staff by providing presentations, supporting their Health Fairs, and working together on Coalitions. In one of our rural areas, Terry County, the Ministerial Alliance invited us to partner with them and the community churches by participating in a Health Fair/Back to School Kickoff. The PRC provided school supplies to needy children in Terry County. It was a huge success. This group seems extremely knowledgeable of the problems

that exist in their communities. We have just recently partnered with the East Lubbock Minister's Alliance and they are ready to approach local government about ATOD issues and the lack of enforcement and attention.

**I. Civic or volunteer groups- Preparation** Texas Tech University student volunteers assist the PRC at health fairs and community events to raise awareness of services available to prevent or treat substance abuse issues. Students and non-profit groups help us disseminate ATOD materials throughout the community and they help us engage the youth in activities at our tobacco awareness events..

**J. Healthcare professionals- Initiation** The PRC has participated and partnered with healthcare professionals at health fairs, Back to School Kickoffs, in our Coalitions, and provided presentations to school children at the requests of school nurses. Healthcare professionals are very knowledgeable of the problems that exist in their communities.

**K. State, local, tribal government- Denial to Vague Awareness** Judges in some of our counties have been lenient regarding minors and underage drinking by dismissing citations for MIPs. In Lubbock County, the increased number of MIPs back-logged the court system so heavily that many citations were dismissed. Because of this and other factors, law enforcement, in some of our rural communities, has been looking the other way when they discover minors in possession. While local government may be aware of problems that exist in our communities, they still remain in denial that they can do anything about these problems.

**L. Other organizations interested in substance abuse prevention-** N/A

## **Part VII – Putting it all Together**

- 1. Now that you have conducted your needs assessment, what have you identified as your primary target population? Why?** Our primary target population will be youth. Data shows that this population is at an increased risk of using substances because of their age, the social norms in our communities, the college/university underage drinking factor that influences our youth and easy access to ATOD. We feel it is important to continue to educate this segment of the population.
- 2. What have you identified as your target intervening variables? Why?** We have identified social norms as our target intervening variable. The norms in our communities encourage underage drinking and tobacco use.
- 3. What have you identified as secondary target populations? Why?** Parents/Adults are our secondary target population because we feel it is important to continue to educate this population about the dangers of ATOD to bring them to an increased stage of awareness of the problems that exist in our communities and the harmful effects of ATOD.
- 4. What have you identified as secondary variables you would *like* to address but *may not be able to address* this fiscal year? Why?**

Low Perceived Risk, we need to expose parents and decision makers in our communities to data that shows the consequences of ATOD use. We will address the economic , health and literacy impact.

**5. How will you go through the process of creating a strategic plan for the selection of evidence-based environmental strategies, policy and procedure recommendations?**

***Note: This is a process question. I am not asking what strategies you have chosen (you may not know yet). I am asking what process you will use to strategically choose the strategies.***

*We will compare our Statement of Work requirements with the issues addressed in this document, conduct an analysis and determine a course of action. The current strategic plan; being continuously evaluated, will be updated to include any necessary adjustments.*

**[Redacted]**  
*Acknowledgement of this Needs Assessment:*

**Executive Director**

Name (PRINT): Susan Lilly	Signature: Date:
------------------------------	---------------------

**Program Director**

Name (Print): Lola Coppage	Signature: Date:
-------------------------------	---------------------