

Social Host Ordinance Development, Implementation and Enforcement Across Ventura County

Ventura County State Incentive Grant (SIG)

Case Study/Process Evaluation Report

Phase II Program Implementation Year Two

Prepared for

Ventura County Behavioral Health Department
Alcohol and Drug Prevention Division/Ventura County Limits

By

Kristen Donovan, Ph.D.
Julie Slay, Ph.D.
& Amy Ward, M.A.

June 2007



EVALCORP
Research & Consulting

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge and thank the individuals who contributed to the development of this report. To begin, we thank Division Manager Kathleen Staples and Program Administrator Daniel Hicks of Ventura County Behavioral Health/Ventura County Limits for being true partners of the evaluation and for providing EVALCORP the opportunity to work with them. We appreciate their ongoing commitment to data-informed decision making and the use of evaluation findings to shape prevention planning. They have been and continue to be a pleasure to work with. We also wish to thank Management Assistants Glenda Valles and Chandra Penderland for their assistance and support throughout our data collection process.

Many thanks are extended to the Ventura County Sheriff's Department for their willingness to share information to inform the evaluation. We especially appreciate the leadership of Chief Deputy Geoff Dean who made it possible for us to have access to law enforcement data, and for taking time to meet with us on multiple occasions. Thanks also to Captain Gary Pentis for his support of the evaluation and willingness to seek out data on our behalf. We also thank Captain Randy Pentis for his work tracking and summarizing ordinance enforcement activities, providing us with key enforcement related information, and answering our many questions. We also appreciate the efforts of Senior Crime Analyst Stacie Snow, Crime Analyst David James, and Crime Analyst Albert Mesa, all of whom have been helpful in responding to our specific data requests.

We would like to acknowledge the individuals who participated in key informant interviews with the evaluation team. In particular, we would like to thank: Julie Arroyo, Fillmore Community Member; John Baker, former Ojai Interim City Manager; Cindy Cattle, Assistant to Ventura County Supervisor Steve Bennett; Jackie Clark, Ojai Community Member; Steve Conaway, Fillmore City Council Member; Ruth Cooper, Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition Coordinator; Anne Davis, Oak Park Community Member; Geoff Dean, Chief Deputy, Patrol Services Division, Ventura County Sheriff's Department; Rae Hanstad, Ojai City Council Member and former Mayor; Martin Hernandez, Assistant to Ventura County Supervisor Kathy Long; Jim Higgins, CEO of the Higgy Foundation and former Fillmore Family Coalition Coordinator; Barbara Kennedy-Beaver, Oak View Park and Resource Center Director; Kathy Long, Ventura County Supervisor; Bruce Macedo, Chief of Police, Fillmore Station, Ventura County Sheriff's Department; Paulette Matheson Whiting, Assistant to the Ojai City Manager; Bruce Norris, Chief of Police, Ojai Station, Ventura County Sheriff's Department; Gary Pentis, Captain, Major Crimes Division, Thousand Oaks Station, Ventura County Sheriff's Department; Randy Pentis, Assistant Chief of Police, Thousand Oaks Station, Ventura County Sheriff's Department; Todd Schieferle, Fillmore Middle School Counselor; Ernie Villegas, Mayor, City of Fillmore; and Charles Weis, Superintendent, Ventura County Office of Education. We are grateful for their willingness to share their time and valuable feedback with us.

We also would like to recognize Dan Higgins, formerly of EVALCORP, for his initial involvement in the current study, and contributions to the development of the evaluation strategy and corresponding data collection instruments. Acknowledgment also goes to the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) for funding the Ventura County State Incentive Grant (SIG) initiative.

Table of Contents

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
II.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Ventura County’s Environmental Approach.....	1
	Model Implemented	1
	Ventura County’s SIG Initiative	2
	Ventura County Limits Collaboratives	2
III.	EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	4
	Purpose of the Evaluation and Research Questions	4
	Data Collection Strategies and Tools	4
	Key Informant Interviews	4
	Document Reviews.....	5
	Media Output Tracking	6
	Analysis of Ordinance Enforcement Data.....	6
	Presentation of Findings.....	6
IV.	DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM.....	7
	Why People Assembled Around the Issue	9
V.	DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRENT POLICY ENVIRONMENT: BASELINE AND COMMUNITY READINESS.....	10
	Community Readiness in Ojai and Fillmore	10
VI.	STRATEGIES USED TO ADVANCE POLICY IN VENTURA COUNTY.....	12
	Strategic Data Collection Activities.....	12
	Media Advocacy	13
VII.	FINDINGS AND LESSONS LEARNED	14
A.	OJAI KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS.....	14
	Description of Coalition Members and Background	14
	Interview Participants	14
	Summary of Findings	15
	Need/Intended Purpose of the Social Host Ordinance	15
	Role/Involvement with the Passage of the Social Host Ordinance.....	16
	Policy Process	18
	Satisfaction with Outcomes	21
	Looking Ahead.....	22
B.	FILLMORE KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS.....	24
	Description of Coalition Members and Background	24
	Interview Participants	24
	Summary of Findings	25
	Need/Intended Purpose of the Social Host Ordinance	25
	Role/Involvement with the Passage of the Social Host Ordinance.....	25
	Policy Process	27

	Satisfaction with Outcomes	31
	Looking Ahead.....	32
C.	VENTURA COUNTY KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS	34
	Interview Participants	34
	Summary of Findings	34
	Need/Intended Purpose of the Social Host Ordinance	34
	Role/Involvement with the Passage of the Social Host Ordinance.....	35
	Policy Process	37
	Satisfaction with Outcomes	39
	Looking Ahead.....	40
VIII.	SOCIAL HOST ORDINANCE ENFORCEMENT.....	43
	Key Informant Interview Data – Law Enforcement Addendum.....	43
	Ordinance Violation Statistics.....	44
IX.	SUMMARY	45
	Fidelity to the CMCA Model.....	45
	Process Evaluation Research Questions	45
X.	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	49
XI.	APPENDICES	
	Appendix A: Key Informant Interview Protocol	51
	Appendix B: Document Review	57
	Appendix C: Media Output Tracking	60
	Appendix D: Copies of Ordinances	66

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In early 2006, EVALCORP Research & Consulting was contracted by the Ventura County Behavioral Health (VCBH) Department's Alcohol and Drug Prevention Division to measure the implementation and resulting outcomes associated with VCBH/Ventura County Limits' State Incentive Grant (SIG) funded efforts. One component of the overall SIG evaluation design included an assessment of the policy advancement and adoption process (i.e., in the three regions that were first to pass a Social Host Ordinance in Ventura County) utilizing an in-depth case study approach. The evaluation framework and content of the current report is in alignment with agreed-to criteria among local evaluators participating in the statewide SIG evaluation. Findings gleaned from the Social Host Case Study component of the evaluation are presented in the current report, along with recommendations for consideration as VCBH/Ventura County Limits and its collaborative partners move forward.

VENTURA COUNTY'S ENVIRONMENTAL APPROACH

Ventura County is one of 13 counties in California selected for a three-year SIG grant based on its ability to effectively plan and use science-based, environmental prevention strategies to attain measurable outcomes related to binge and underage drinking. For the past 10 years, VCBH has focused its prevention efforts in the direction of environmental/policy change relying on comprehensive, strategic, community-based prevention strategies.

Model Implemented

VCBH/Ventura County Limits is using selected components of the Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA) model to achieve their SIG prevention objectives. CMCA, a Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Model Program, is an evidence-based community-organizing program designed to reduce adolescent access to alcohol by changing community policies and practices. Research has demonstrated that effectively limiting alcohol access to minors not only reduces underage drinking, but also communicates a clear message to the community that underage drinking is inappropriate and unacceptable. CMCA utilizes a variety of social organizing techniques to address legal, institutional, social, and health issues in order to reduce youth alcohol use by obstructing the provision of alcohol to youth by adults and eliminating illegal alcohol sales to youth by retailers. The CMCA model includes motivating community members to seek and achieve changes in local public policies and in the practices of organizations that can affect youth's access to alcohol. Other components of CMCA involve building a mass support base, institutionalizing changes, and evaluating changes on an ongoing basis.

VENTURA COUNTY'S SIG INITIATIVE

Supported by SIG funds, Ventura County Limits is an established community partnership aimed at addressing the issue of binge and underage drinking in Ventura County. Members of law enforcement, higher education, city and county government, local coalitions, parents, youth/young adults, and additional community prevention partners work together to develop and implement alcohol-related policies and practices throughout Ventura County intended to curb youth alcohol use.

Generally speaking, Ventura County's binge and underage drinking prevention strategies consist of the passage and enforcement of new policies/laws (i.e., focusing on two settings in

particular – home parties and problem outlets), as well as media advocacy and events, and sustained involvement of concerned groups, local experts, administrators, and policy makers. While a number of goals and objectives were put forth by VCBH/Ventura County Limits as part of their SIG Phase II Work Plan, the current report addresses progress made toward the achievement of the following:

- Formal consideration of new “party host accountability” policies in at least 8 of the 10 Ventura County municipalities to deter underage and young adult binge drinking.
- Adoption/enactment of improved policies for managing problematic underage and heavy drinking environments, including home parties (e.g., Social Host).
- Coordinated media campaigns to accompany policy adoption (promulgation of new policies/enforcement).

A primary focus of the local Ventura County SIG evaluation is an assessment of the Social Host Ordinance policy development, implementation and enforcement process within three Ventura County regions/municipalities. The specific regions targeted for the case study included: Ojai, Fillmore and Ventura County Unincorporated. These regions were first in the county to formally adopt Social Host policies and all are within the jurisdiction of the Ventura County Sheriff’s Department, which was important for tracking enforcement operations.

EVALUATION OVERVIEW

The specific purposes of the Ventura County Social Host Case Study/Process Evaluation were to:

- ✓ Provide pertinent background information leading up to the passage of Social Host Ordinances in three regions within Ventura County (i.e., Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County Unincorporated);
- ✓ Summarize findings and lessons learned during the policy advancement process; and
- ✓ Describe initial findings relative to enforcement of the Social Host Ordinance.

Data Collection Strategies and Tools

The primary methodology used to capture evaluative data for the Social Host Ordinance Case Study/Process Evaluation was a series of semi-structured key informant interviews. Additionally, the evaluation design called for document reviews, media output tracking, and analyses of enforcement data.

FINDINGS

To date, VCBH/Ventura County Limits has effectively implemented many of the core aspects of the CMCA model including assessment of current policies and extent of the problem in each targeted community, gathering together a group of passionate and committed citizens to lead their intended policy change efforts, core leadership groups who were able to build citizen involvement in support of policy change, implementation of an action plan, institutionalizing policy changes, and evaluation of such changes. A significant amount of time also was spent by VCBH/Ventura County Limits in helping to build skills among local coalition members, developing media, and making available resources and tools such as a Model Social Host Ordinance to support policy advancement.

Four process-related evaluation questions were investigated as part of the Year Two SIG Social Host Ordinance Case Study/Process Evaluation. Overall findings gleaned from the case studies are presented for each research question.

- *Who and what processes/steps were involved in the passage of Social Host policies in the three targeted regions (Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County)?*

Local coalitions drove the Social Host policy advancement process in the cities of Ojai and Fillmore. A core group of representatives from the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, County Supervisor's office, and VCBH/Ventura County Limits served as champions of the Ventura County Social Host Ordinance. Members of the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition also assisted in helping to pass the countywide Social Host Ordinance. Of note, VCBH/Ventura County Limits provided key technical assistance, training, funding, and other resources in support of the Social Host policy advancement process in all three regions.

Similar processes were used to pass Social Host policies in Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County. The first step involved data collection/assessment to determine the specific issues and problems that coalitions/regions were facing relative to underage and binge drinking. Across regions, initially through anecdotal evidence and then confirmed through survey data and law enforcement statistics, large unruly house parties (i.e., where youth were accessing alcohol from adults) emerged as a core problem with serious consequences. Law enforcement's perspective stating that they currently lacked an effective tool to hold adults responsible for providing alcohol to minors was an additional key in suggesting that Social Host Ordinances could be an effective solution to known underage drinking problems.

The next step involved garnering community support and, ultimately, community mobilization. Activities used to develop public buy-in included media campaigns, pamphlets delivered door-to-door, public presentations at schools and in front of policymakers, as well as word of mouth, letters, and other data sharing strategies to let the community know about the extent of the problem.

Once initial community support was obtained, coalitions addressed local policymakers and requested that a Social Host Ordinance be developed and adopted. Providing data about the problem and coupling that with a tool to help address the problem appeared to make a serious impact on the ability of policy makers to agree relatively quickly about adopting a Social Host Ordinance. In each case study region, the use of the Model Social Host Ordinance provided by PIRE/VCBH was advantageous in helping the communities adopt an ordinance that incorporated lessons learned from other counties/regions.

- *Were there any challenges or opposition encountered? If yes, what steps were taken to address/overcome them?*

Challenges and opposition to the Social Host Ordinance were similar across regions. In all three case study regions, citizens and some policymakers initially voiced concerns about privacy and personal freedoms. Some believed that the Social Host Ordinance would allow law enforcement to infringe on their privacy rights. There also was a concern, particularly in Fillmore, that families could no longer celebrate traditions consistent with their culture. Despite these initial concerns, public education efforts letting communities know of the true purpose and intended outcomes of the Social Host Ordinance served to quiet most, if not all, of the opposition to the new policy. One additional shared challenge was development of the appropriate language for the

ordinances. Those involved did not want to write an ordinance that could be challenged or that posed problems for enforcement. Having the Model Ordinance from PIRE/VCBH, along with extensive due diligence on the part of city and county attorneys, served to make sure that the ordinances were legally sound and reflective of local needs.

- *What related media activities/events took place to support community-wide awareness and acceptance of the policies?*

Common media activities included the use of newspaper articles and editorials to engage the community in a discussion about the Social Host Ordinance. In all three regions, newspaper print articles were used to document youth alcohol use, its negative consequences, and the need for the Social Host Ordinance. Also, presentations were made to school boards and city councils about how the ordinance could address youth alcohol problems. Coalitions were encouraged to use the press as much as possible, and VCBH/Ventura County Limits created press kits and fact sheets that could be used to educate the community. Overall, data were typically incorporated into media to demonstrate the need for the ordinance. Despite significant media coverage and related activities during the policy advancement and adoption process, there exists a need to keep community members informed about its implementation and enforcement. VCBH/Ventura County Limits is in the process of developing a media campaign to continue educating the public about the new ordinances.

- *Have agencies (e.g., law enforcement) accepted responsibility for enforcement? Has key staff been assigned for enforcement? Have operational steps/procedures been put in place for enforcement?*

The Ventura County Sheriff's Department served as a key participant in the passage of the Social Host Ordinances in each of the three case study regions. In fact, law enforcement was frequently referred to as one of the champions of the Social Host Ordinance. One of the most senior ranking law enforcement personnel within the Sheriff's Department is in full support of the ordinance, and has taken steps to ensure that the ordinance is enforced and that enforcement tracking takes place locally (in each station for the Sheriff's Department contract cities) and countywide. Interviews with former and current Chiefs of Police in Ojai and Fillmore confirm that they also are in complete support of Social Host Ordinance enforcement. All patrol officers are assigned to enforcement, meaning that every patrol officer can enforce the ordinance. Each of the case study regions (Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County unincorporated) have had at least one citation issued between June 2006 and early January 2007. Moreover, a total of 23 Social Host Ordinance violations were issued during this timeframe (i.e., across all eight of the municipalities/regions that have adopted a Social Host Ordinance in Ventura County).

A Social Host Ordinance Enforcement Protocol was developed and distributed to communicate policies/procedures relative to enforcement of the ordinance. Additionally, the current Chiefs of Police in Ojai and Fillmore also have their own local protocols and enforcement monitoring processes in place.

CONCLUSION

VCBH/Ventura County Limits and their collaborative partners are ahead of schedule relative to formal consideration and passage of Social Host Ordinances in Ventura County. Two of their objectives were to have at least eight municipalities formally consider a Social Host Ordinance by September 15, 2006, and by September 1, 2007, have six municipalities adopt or enact

improved policies for managing problematic underage drinking environments. As of January 2007, VCBH/Ventura County Limits has facilitated the adoption/enactment of eight Social Host Ordinances countywide, three of which are in Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County Unincorporated.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are provided to facilitate the continued achievement of VCBH/Ventura County Limits' stated goals and objectives, and are based on information gleaned through the Social Host Ordinance Case Study/Process Evaluation activities carried out to date.

- **Develop and implement a targeted media plan to increase public awareness regarding adopted Social Host Ordinances.**

While the current study focused only on the three regions that were first to pass Social Host policies in the county, five other municipalities also have successfully adopted Social Host Ordinances in Ventura County. It is vital to provide continued education about the intent of the ordinance and its associated consequences if violated. The Social Host Ordinances were developed both as a tool to hold hosts accountable for underage drinking and as a deterrent to adults who provide alcohol to minors. In order to be a successful deterrent in the community, both adults and youth need to know about the consequences for hosting parties where youth are given access to alcohol.

- **Encourage similar criteria/language in municipal and countywide ordinances.**

Ventura County is comprised of 10 cities that are surrounded by large, rural unincorporated areas that fall under the jurisdiction of the Sheriff's Department. In addition, the Sheriff's Department is contracted with five municipalities to provide law enforcement services. Ventura County's Social Host Ordinance has the strictest criteria for violation of the ordinance (i.e., the presence of two underage youth). Municipalities, such as Ojai and Fillmore, require five youth in order to issue a violation. Modifications to municipal ordinances so that they are consistent with the requirements of the countywide ordinance may assist law enforcement with Social Host Ordinance enforcement, particularly among those police departments responsible for enforcing both the municipal and countywide ordinances.

- **Continue the provision of opportunities/forums for peer learning in support of underage and binge drinking prevention.**

Over the past two years, VCBH/Ventura County Limits has sponsored a number of valuable peer-learning opportunities for community coalitions and others interested in addressing underage and binge drinking in Ventura County to participate in. These types of activities help to foster an environment where individuals countywide (from varying perspectives and municipalities) can share best practices and learn "what's working" relative to effective alcohol prevention activities and enforcement strategies. Continuing to fund these types of forums will support ongoing dialogue and likely will result in the sustainability of changes effected thus far throughout the county.

II. INTRODUCTION

In early 2006, EVALCORP Research & Consulting was contracted by the Ventura County Behavioral Health (VCBH) Department's Alcohol and Drug Prevention Division to measure the implementation and outcomes associated with VCBH/Ventura County Limits' State Incentive Grant (SIG) funded efforts. One component of the overall SIG evaluation design included an assessment of the policy advancement process (i.e., in the three regions of the county that were first to pass a Social Host Ordinance) utilizing a case study approach. Findings gleaned from the Social Host Case Study component of the evaluation are presented in the current report. Recommendations for consideration as VCBH/Ventura County Limits and its collaborative partners move forward also are included.¹

Ventura County's Environmental Approach

Ventura County is one of 13 counties in California selected for a three-year SIG grant based on its ability to effectively plan and use science-based, environmental prevention strategies to attain measurable outcomes related to binge and underage drinking. In 1996, a new strategic plan was adopted by VCBH's Prevention Division, which was then known as Ventura County Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs. While Ventura County's previous alcohol and other drug prevention efforts had focused almost entirely on individual behavior change, the new plan shifted focus to a public health model addressing the environmental factors (i.e., the physical and social contexts) in which drinking and other drug use occurs. This change in perspective, considered rather innovative at the time, followed from extensive reviews of research demonstrating: (1) the rather limited effects of educational prevention programs to promote individual-level change, and (2) growing evidence confirming the effectiveness of prevention approaches that address the environment surrounding alcohol and other drug use. VCBH prevention staff developed a work plan and began implementing environmental approaches aimed at altering the context and social norms pertaining to alcohol/other drug use. For the past 10 years, VCBH has continued to focus its prevention efforts in the direction of environmental/policy change relying on comprehensive, strategic, community-based prevention strategies.

Model Implemented

VCBH/Ventura County Limits is using selected aspects of the Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol (CMCA) model to achieve their SIG prevention objectives. CMCA, a Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Model Program, is an evidence-based community-organizing program designed to reduce adolescent access to alcohol by changing community policies and practices. Research has demonstrated that effectively limiting alcohol access to minors not only reduces underage drinking, but also communicates a clear message to the community that underage drinking is inappropriate and unacceptable. CMCA utilizes a variety of social organizing techniques to address legal, institutional, social, and health issues in order to reduce youth alcohol use by obstructing the provision of alcohol to youth by adults and eliminating illegal alcohol sales to youth by retailers. CMCA essentially involves motivating community members to seek and achieve changes in local public policies and in the practices of organizations that can affect youth's access to alcohol. Examples of entities that have effectively joined together to achieve such changes include representatives from law enforcement, schools/colleges, community groups, civic

¹ The framework for this report is aligned with expectations of the statewide SIG Evaluation Team relative to county-level policy advancement evaluation activities.

organizations, parents, and others. Keys to the effective implementation of the CMCA model are:

- ✓ Assessment of community norms, current policies, and resources;
- ✓ A small group of passionate/committed citizens to lead efforts in advocating for change;
- ✓ A core leadership group able to build broad citizen movement in support of policy change; and
- ✓ Implementation of an action plan.

Other components of CMCA involve building a mass support base, institutionalizing changes, and evaluation of changes on an ongoing basis. The specific approaches employed by the model include community involvement, media education, skill development, and other relevant practices (e.g., compliance checks).

Ventura County's SIG Initiative

Supported by SIG funds, Ventura County Limits is an established community partnership aimed at addressing the issue of binge and underage drinking in Ventura County. Members of law enforcement, higher education, city and county government, local coalitions, parents, youth/young adults, and additional community prevention partners work together to develop and implement alcohol-related policies and practices throughout Ventura County intended to curb youth alcohol use. The specific components of Ventura County Limits' prevention strategies were developed based on information obtained through strategic data collection efforts (e.g., community-wide surveys, focus groups, reviews of law enforcement statistics, etc.) and expert knowledge of environmental prevention. VCBH's Prevention Division also notes that Ventura County Limits is "a natural outgrowth of the prevention experiences in the county over the past decade."

Generally speaking, Ventura County's binge and underage drinking prevention strategies consist of the passage and enforcement of new policies/laws (i.e., focusing on two settings in particular – home parties and problem outlets), as well as media advocacy and events, and the sustained involvement of concerned groups, local experts, and policy makers. While a number of goals and objectives were put forth by VCBH/Ventura County Limits as part of their SIG Phase II Work Plan, the current report addresses progress made toward the achievement of the following:

- Formal consideration of new "party host accountability" policies in at least 8 of the 10 Ventura County municipalities to deter underage and young adult binge drinking.
- Adoption/enactment of improved policies for managing problematic underage and heavy drinking environments, including home parties (e.g., Social Host).
- Coordinated media campaigns to accompany policy adoption (promulgation of new policies/enforcement).

Ventura County Limits Collaboratives

A key underpinning of all of the work carried out under the Ventura County Limits partnership is strong collaboration – both at the community and county levels. In addition to community-specific collaboratives (e.g., the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition and Fillmore Family Coalition) Ventura County Limits also formed four countywide collaboratives as part of their SIG efforts: the Law

Enforcement Collaborative, Higher Education Collaborative, Municipal Collaborative, and Community Collaborative.

The Ventura County Limits Law Enforcement Collaborative, led by a high-ranking member of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, brings together every law enforcement agency in the county to share data and experiences dealing with underage and binge drinking related problems. The Ventura County Limits Higher Education Collaborative unites the county's colleges and universities for the same purpose. The acting leader of the Higher Education Collaborative was the Coordinator of the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition working in partnership with the Ventura County Limits Project Administrator. This Collaborative is in need of a designated leader at the current time and efforts to revitalize the work of the Higher Education Collaborative are underway. The Ventura County Limits Municipal Collaborative, led by a City Council Member and former Mayor of the city of Ojai, hosts Municipal Strategies Conferences to study and implement effective municipal policies to address and prevent underage and binge drinking, and serves as a network of city and county officials. The Ventura County Limits Community Collaborative is led by the VCBH Division Manager and is comprised of representatives from VCBH Prevention Division's funded community-level prevention partners. The Community Collaborative comes together every other month to keep other community-level representatives/coalition members apprised of progress and to share lessons learned.

III. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

During the evaluator breakout sessions at the SIG Learning Community Conference led by the San Diego State University statewide evaluation team in March 2006, it was agreed that local SIG evaluators would utilize a case study approach, relying heavily on qualitative data, to inform county-level evaluations of policy development and implementation activities. Consistent with this, a primary focus of the local Ventura County SIG evaluation is an assessment of the Social Host Ordinance policy development, implementation, and enforcement process within three Ventura County regions/municipalities. The specific regions targeted for the case study included: Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County Unincorporated. These regions were first in the county to formally adopt social host policies and all are within the jurisdiction of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, which was deemed useful for tracking enforcement operations.

Purpose of the Evaluation and Research Questions

The specific purposes of the Ventura County Social Host Case Study/Process Evaluation were to:

- ✓ Provide pertinent background information leading up to efforts to pass Social Host Ordinances in three regions within Ventura County (i.e., Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County Unincorporated);
- ✓ Summarize findings and lessons learned during the policy advancement process; and
- ✓ Describe initial findings relative to enforcement of the Social Host Ordinance.

The process-related evaluation questions that were investigated as part of the Year Two SIG Social Host Ordinance Case Study/Process Evaluation included:

1. Who and what processes/steps were involved in the passage of social host policies in the targeted regions?
2. Were there any challenges or opposition encountered? If yes, what steps were taken to address/overcome them?
3. What related media activities/events took place to support community-wide awareness and acceptance of the policies?
4. Have agencies (e.g., law enforcement) accepted responsibility for enforcement? Has key staff been assigned for enforcement? Have operational steps/procedures been put in place for enforcement?

Data Collection Strategies and Tools

The primary methodology used to capture evaluative data for the Social Host Ordinance Case Study/Process Evaluation was a series of semi-structured key informant interviews. Additionally, the evaluation design called for document reviews, media output tracking, and analyses of enforcement data.

Key Informant Interviews

A Key Informant Protocol was developed for the Year Two series of structured interviews. The purpose of the interviews was to inform the Social Host Ordinance policy development and passage process; more specifically, through obtaining the perceptions, experiences, and

lessons learned by those persons most closely involved in the process. Several items on the interview protocol also were added to examine issues relative to ordinance enforcement.

A total of 33 questions comprised the core interview protocol, almost all of which were open-ended – allowing for probes and clarification during the interview process. Items assessed through the interview were categorized into one of six sections: (1) Need/Purpose of the Intended Ordinance, (2) Role and Involvement with the Passage of the Social Host Ordinance, (3) Policy Process, (4) Satisfaction with Outcomes, (5) Looking Ahead, and (6) Participation in Ventura County Limits Collaboratives. An additional set of six questions was developed for and asked only of Law Enforcement personnel. Questions asked of law enforcement centered on the following: level of departmental support for passage of the Social Host Ordinance, whether operational steps had been put in place for ordinance enforcement, whether enforcement was assigned to particular officers, potential barriers to enforcement, and how the county would gauge whether enforcement was working. Also assessed were the number of ordinance citations issued to date. A copy of the interview protocol, including the Law Enforcement Addendum, is included in Appendix A.

In addition to VCBH/Ventura County Limits staff, key informants identified to participate in the interviews included representatives from law enforcement, municipal and county government, local community collaboratives, higher education, as well as concerned parents and youth. Three lists of potential key informants were created by VCBH/Ventura County Limits, one for each region. In total, 29 individuals were identified and invited to participate in the interview process. Of the list of 29 potential interviewees identified for all three regions, a total of 23 interviews were completed. Specific agencies/groups represented by those who participated in interviews were: VCBH/Ventura County Limits; Ventura County Sheriff's Department; Ventura County Board of Supervisors Office; City of Ojai; City of Fillmore; Ventura County Office of Education; Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition; Fillmore Family Coalition; Ventura County Limits Law Enforcement Collaborative; Ventura County Limits Higher Education Collaborative; Ventura County Limits Municipal Collaborative; and Ventura County Limits Community Collaborative.

Four of the six individuals unable or choosing not to participate either informed us that they were unable to participate or did not return multiple calls and emails inviting them to take part in the process. One individual had moved out of the county and was no longer available. Another declined to participate due to a perceived conflict of interest. More than half of the completed interviews took place in person, while the remainder were completed via telephone. Each interview took between 45 and 90 minutes to complete. All of the interviews took place over a two month period at the end of the SIG Phase II Program Implementation Year Two.

Document Reviews

Thorough reviews of all project related documents have taken place. Examples of the types of documents/materials used to inform the evaluation include: VCBH/Ventura County Limits SIG Quarterly Reports; VCBH/Ventura County Limits publications; copies of drafted and approved ordinances; media pieces (e.g., articles in the Ventura County Star, LA Times, Ojai Valley News, Fillmore Gazette); and copies Monthly Reports submitted to VCBH by their funded community-level coalitions. All enforcement related documents also were reviewed (i.e., Ventura County Sheriff's Department Social Host Ordinance Enforcement Protocol – Policies and Procedures; incident report forms; and copies of ordinance citation forms and related documents). A list of specific documents reviewed is included in Appendix B.

Media Output Tracking

Relevant media outputs were tracked following reviews of pertinent articles/print media contained in two sources (i.e., media binders compiled by the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition and VCBH/Ventura County Limits). A majority of the articles pertained directly to passage of Social Host Ordinances in Ojai, Fillmore, and County Unincorporated. Other articles focused on the problem of alcohol/other drug use among youth and its associated dangers within the targeted case study regions. A copy of the Media Output Tracking Form containing the list of articles is included in Appendix C.

Analysis of Ordinance Enforcement Data

A request was made to the Ventura County Sheriff's Department for data pertaining to Social Host Ordinance citations/violations issued to date for the targeted regions. The Assistant Chief of Police in charge of tracking all Social Host Ordinance violations for the Sheriff's Department's jurisdiction provided the evaluation team with all requested data for each violation issued through early January 2007.

The types of information that the evaluation team requested for each citation included: location, date, calls for service history, age and gender of the person issued the ordinance violation, and size of party. The information provided to the evaluation team was extracted following a review of all incident reports written by the Ventura County Sheriff's Department. Given privacy laws, the actual incident reports could not be released to the evaluation team directly; however, the evaluators worked very closely with the Assistant Chief throughout the process and received summary statistics for each Social Host Ordinance violation issued between June 2006 and early January 2007.

Presentation of Findings

In addition to information contained in Appendix B and Appendix C, evaluative data gathered through Document Reviews and Media Output Tracking processes are woven into the report within the following sections: "Section IV. Description of the Problem," "Section V. Description of the Current Policy Environment," and "Section VI. Strategies Used to Advance Policy in Ventura County." Results of the key informant interviews are presented separately for each region in "Section VII. Findings and Lessons Learned." Findings from the Law Enforcement Addendum and analysis of ordinance enforcement data are included in "Section VIII. Social Host Ordinance Enforcement."

IV. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM

In addition to abundant nationwide research findings, multiple local data sources also confirm that private residences are a typical location for underage and binge drinking among young people. Results from a countywide telephone survey revealed that the second and third highest rated alcohol-related concerns among Ventura County residents (i.e., that were occurring near their homes) were “binge drinking” and “drinking at parties in private homes where only youth were present.” The survey also indicated that almost 30% of Ventura County residents (aged 18-25) who binge drink reported that their last “binge drinking occasion” took place in their own homes and almost half (45.2%) reported binge drinking recently at someone else’s home. Among adults 18 and older, alcohol consumption was found to be highest among 18 to 20 year olds (32.7 drinks in the last 30 days), followed by 21 to 25 year olds (22.3 drinks in the last 30 days). Young adults also were found to binge drink at almost three times the rate of older adults (i.e., 42.0% of those 18-25 years of age reported binge drinking during the past 30 days compared with 14.5% of those 26 and older).²

According to 2003 California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS) data, high school students in Ventura County report binge drinking at relatively high rates (i.e., 19% of 9th graders and 30% of 11th graders reported having consumed five or more drinks in a row during the previous 30 days). A comparison of county and state level CHKS data showed that Ventura County 9th and 11th graders who have “ever used” alcohol exceeds state averages (i.e., 52% of Ventura County 9th graders have used alcohol in their lifetime compared with 42% of all students in California, and 68% of 11th graders in Ventura County have ever consumed alcohol in contrast to 63% of students statewide). The percentages of middle and high school students who report having driven or ridden in a car driven by a friend who had been drinking also are significantly higher (by 5%-8%) than statewide rates. The percentages of young people who report that alcohol is easy to obtain are high as well: 44% of 7th graders, 72% of 9th graders, and 85% of 11th graders report that alcohol is “fairly easy” or “very easy” to obtain. Other sources indicate that more than half (57%) of adults in Ventura County report hearing about binge drinking among young people and close to half (46%) recognize the apparent ease of access for youth trying to obtain alcohol.³

In a survey of students attending one of the county’s three community colleges, underage students were much more likely to report drinking at a private residence when asked to name the location where they had drank the most during the past 30 days (87.7% compared to 55.9% of older students). Underage students also were more likely to describe their most recent drinking event as having been a “house party” (52.0%) compared with students 21 years or older (35.4%). Students aged 18 to 20 were significantly more likely to have consumed more drinks on any one day in the past 30 days compared to older students (more than 6 drinks compared with 5 drinks consumed by “of age” students). Significantly greater percentages of underage students reported negative consequences as a direct result of their alcohol use (e.g., getting sick, missing class, getting injured/hurt, etc). Twice as many underage students admitted to damaging property and/or getting into verbal arguments due to drinking compared with their “of age” counterparts. Also, significantly greater percentages of underage students responded

² *Underage and Binge Drinking: Selected Findings from a Telephone Survey of Ventura County Residents*, G. Robinson (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department Publication, 2005).

³ *Ventura County Facts and Figures – Underage Drinking and Home Parties*. (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department/Ventura County Limits Publication, undated).

affirmatively to 10 of 11 potential indicators for increased risk/harms as part of their recent drinking activities.⁴

Data gathered through Ventura County's "Place of Last Drink Survey," collected from participants in the county's Drinking Driver Program (DDP), indicated that among 18-25 year olds arrested for a DUI:

- Approximately two-thirds were binge drinking prior to their DUI arrest;
- About 1 in 5 reported consuming 11 or more drinks prior to arrest;
- More than one-quarter had a Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) twice the legal limit or more (i.e., .16 or higher); and
- Three-quarters of 18 and 19 year olds arrested for a DUI were drinking at a private residence or home party.

In Ventura County, the number of alcohol-involved vehicle collisions rose steadily in recent years among 18-25 year olds. A reported 540 serious injuries and 36 deaths among this age group occurred between 2000 and 2003. The estimated costs of fatalities due to impaired driving among young adults in Ventura County for the years 2001 through 2003 were placed at \$3.8 million per death, or approximately \$136.8 million.⁵

Local law enforcement shed additional light on the problem of underage drinking at home parties, providing statistics on the type of calls they were responding to on a consistent basis. In one summer, Ventura County Sheriff's deputies responded to complaints regarding 298 problem parties involving underage drinking and/or drug use in Ojai and the Ojai Valley. This computed to an average of about 25 underage drinking parties each week in just one area of the county for which data were available.⁶ The former Chief of Police in Ojai reported that two-thirds of the youth sexual assault cases that his department was responding to involved alcohol, and that the alcohol often was consumed in a home party setting. Officers in Ojai also were responding to 4-5 calls per month involving non-lethal alcohol and/or drug overdoses among young teenagers (sometimes as young as 13 or 14 years old). And again, the overdoses were occurring in home party settings. It was also reported by local law enforcement that about 25% of the time, an adult was home when they responded to a home party call.

In order to assess the issue of underage drinking in Fillmore, the Fillmore Family Coalition conducted a survey with middle and high school students. The results of the survey pointed to a problem with underage drinking as well as insight into how youth were obtaining alcohol. Of the 271 students participating in the survey (which was conducted in both English and Spanish), 34% admitted to having used alcohol during the previous 30 days. Of those who had consumed alcohol during the past month, 66% indicated that it was at a home party and 67% reported that an adult had provided the alcohol to them. When asked whether they had ever experienced a list of potentially dangerous co-occurring circumstances in situations where people were drinking, Fillmore middle and high school students reported that they had seen someone show a

⁴ *Alcohol Use among Community College Students: Selected Findings from the Ventura County Community College District Student Survey*, K. Donovan and J. Slay (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department Publication, 2006).

⁵ *Circumstances of Drinking Prior to DUI Arrest among Persons 18 to 25 Years of Age in Ventura County*, G. Robinson, S. Osborn, and D. Hicks (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department Publication, 2005).

⁶ *Adult Accountability for Underage Drinking: The Case for Social Host Laws* (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department/Ventura County Limits Publication, June 2005).

weapon (25%), threaten another person with violence (35%), and saw people engaged in an argument or fight (59%). Other findings from the survey were that almost half (48%) of 7th graders reported that they had ridden in a car with a drunk driver and about one-quarter (24%) of 11th graders binge drank during the past 30 days. Also, just over one-fourth (26%) of all students who reported drinking in the past 30 days indicated that there were illegal drugs being used where they had been partying. Lastly, the survey documented that young people had concerns about alcohol abuse among their peers, parents, and other adults.

Why People Assembled Around the Issue

Representatives from Fillmore noted that while the problem of underage drinking has always been a matter of concern in the community, it came to the forefront in 2003 when a 16-year-old Fillmore High School football player was shot and blinded in one eye during a teen party. The shooting took place during a home party for football players and cheerleaders. During the party, uninvited guests (suspected gang members) showed up and were turned away. When they returned shortly after, they began shooting. In late 2002, the Ojai community was impacted by the drug-related death of a 19-year-old young woman. The incident brought the community together at a new level. Policymakers, school personnel, parents, community members, and others met to seek answers and begin to take action around adolescent substance use.

Despite very serious incidents occurring at home parties involving young people in both Ojai and Fillmore, there was previously very little that law enforcement could do relative to holding anyone accountable. When cities attempted to prosecute adults responsible for such parties, they ran into many challenges. Although it was already against the law to furnish alcohol to underage persons and for youth to possess alcohol when on public property, state law does not prohibit youth possession on private property. Law enforcement officers who came upon an underage party generally did not have legal grounds to enter the premises, to confiscate alcohol, or to hold the adult homeowner or landlord responsible for allowing the party. Even if they did have grounds to arrest the responsible adult, they had a difficult time proving their case in court unless police had actually witnessed the adult purchasing the alcohol and giving it to minors.

Given the amount of evidence validating community concerns regarding youth access to alcohol and documented consumption levels, coupled with several catalytic events, community groups began to look for ways to address their concerns. Findings from the countywide telephone survey revealed high levels of concern about excessive alcohol consumption and youth drinking, and provided evidence that the community was potentially ready to begin considering the adoption of policies to do something about it. In fact, the two policies receiving the highest levels of support included the use of penalties on older adults who illegally provided alcohol to minors and laws that allow police to recover costs for service when they had to come back the same night (to the same party) after providing warning to a house party involving underage drinking – both of which are underpinnings of the Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County Social Host Ordinances adopted in early 2006.

V. DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRENT POLICY ENVIRONMENT: BASELINE AND COMMUNITY READINESS

In 1996, when VCBH first began implementing environmental prevention efforts, its focus was at the community level. Discovering that local community members were eager to address community health and safety issues, VCBH began funding neighborhood/community coalitions to help members get started with local prevention efforts. Small grants were provided for six-month timeframes, along with training and guidance pertaining to environmental prevention strategies. With this “seed money,” coalitions were expected to conduct local assessments (i.e., obtain data on existing alcohol and other drug problems), attend trainings, begin mobilizing their community, and develop an implementation plan. Those groups that successfully achieved these criteria could apply for a larger implementation grant through VCBH. An expectation of the implementation grant was that it would be used by local coalitions to respond to the problems identified through their data collection/assessment process using environmental approaches.

During the past 10 years, VCBH has provided small planning grants to about 30 community-level coalitions. After receiving larger implementation grants for several years, many of the coalitions effectively achieved their community mobilization goals and no longer required additional funding; essentially, funding from VCBH often lead to local coalitions that were self-sustaining. In effect, coalitions had the tools, skills, community partners, and other resources needed to continue their work without ongoing funding from the county.

Community Readiness in Ojai and Fillmore

In 2003, two community groups within the cities of Ojai and Fillmore received small planning grants, and later an implementation grant, to begin identifying and responding to local needs pertaining to youth alcohol and other drug use. The Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition (which consisted of representatives from law enforcement, city and county government, local schools, parents, and youth) applied for and received grant funds to address issues specific to underage drinking in the community. Through an extensive data review process, it was clear that home parties were of primary concern in Ojai and the surrounding Ojai Valley. Similarly, in the city of Fillmore, the Fillmore Family Coalition started receiving funds from VCBH to help address a growing concern about youth alcohol use at home parties. Alcohol-involved teen parties were known to be a regular occurrence in Fillmore, and were directly correlated with drunk driving, violence, sexual assaults, and alcohol/drug overdoses among young people. In addition to a recognized youth alcohol problem, stemming primarily from home parties in both Ojai and Fillmore, coalition members learned from law enforcement that an effective tool was missing to deal with these issues.

Through assessment/data collection activities, extensive research (including following what was happening relative to San Diego’s Social Host Ordinance), and training and technical assistance made available through VCBH, coalitions in Ojai and Fillmore began to recognize that the Social Host Ordinance was a tool that could help law enforcement hold adults accountable for hosting parties where underage drinking occurs and serve as a deterrent for repeat party throwers.

Over a period of about two and a half years, the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition and Fillmore Family Coalition worked with VCBH/Ventura County limits, law enforcement, and city and county government leaders to educate the community about the extent of youth alcohol problems, share information about social host ordinances as an effective tool to address the problems and issues resulting from underage drinking, draft a Social Host Ordinance, and ensure that all of

the necessary elements were in place to facilitate successful adoption of a Social Host Ordinance in their communities. Interestingly, the S.A.F.E. Coalition began discussing the need for Ventura County to pass a similar ordinance for the unincorporated areas surrounding the city of Ojai back in 2003. In fact, the geography of Ventura County is such that most cities are surrounded by large unincorporated areas, and without a similar policy in those areas, it was believed that underage drinkers might simply “move their parties” to places lacking a Social Host ordinance.

VI. STRATEGIES USED TO ADVANCE POLICY IN VENTURA COUNTY

In response to documented high rates of binge-level drinking among youth locally and growing public concern over the impact of alcohol on the lives of young people in Ventura County, VCBH's Training, Applied Research, and Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Division established a countywide community partnership, known as Ventura County Limits, aimed at preventing and reducing underage and binge drinking through responsible alcohol policies and practices. Local colleges and universities, law enforcement, municipal government, parents, youth and young adults participate in Ventura County Limits to effectively prevent alcohol-related harms and increase overall community safety. Many of the individuals participating in the community partnership also play a role in their own local community-level coalition and/or one of several Ventura County Limits countywide Collaboratives (i.e., Law Enforcement Collaborative, Higher Education Collaborative, Municipal Collaborative, and the Community Collaborative).

Consistent with the CMCA model, VCBH/Ventura County Limits' strategies to effect policy change involved:

1. Providing funding, technical assistance, and training to existing community-level coalitions – helping them to conduct assessments of local community norms, policies, and problems and responding to requests for additional resources (e.g., model policies, media advocacy skill building, etc.).
2. Recognition of the need to build core leadership groups able to build citizen support of policy change, which is accomplished through the Ventura County Limits countywide Collaboratives – particularly the Law Enforcement and Municipal Collaboratives.
3. Implementation of the SIG Phase II Work Plan as an action plan.
4. Use of ongoing data collection and evaluation activities to inform and shape planning efforts, as well as to monitor/track progress and measure outcomes.
5. Use of media education and advocacy to garner additional community support and educate the public about the desirable impact that intended policy change will have on the safety and well being for all residents.
6. Strong emphasis on building and maintaining relationships with all of the VCBH/Ventura County Limits prevention partners.
7. Recognition of the fact that policy change most definitely requires a collaborative process, and must come from the “ground up,” and acting in accord with this idea.

Strategic Data Collection Activities

Consistent with an ongoing commitment to informed planning through data-driven prevention strategies, VCBH/Ventura County Limits commissioned several studies to assess rates of binge and underage drinking and identify unmet needs. In 2004, information was collected from over 2,000 households in Ventura County through a Random Digit Dial (RDD) telephone survey to learn about alcohol availability, related problems, and opinions on how best to prevent and respond to underage and binge drinking. Ongoing analyses of “Place of Last Drink (POLD) Surveys” completed by over 9,000 Ventura County Drinking Driver Program participants have been used to better understand the settings and circumstances surrounding excessive drinking prior to DUI arrest among 18-25 year olds, and to further examine the factors associated with underage persons drinking excessively at home parties. POLD survey findings pertaining to 18-25 year olds are regularly shared with key VCBH prevention partners such as the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, Naval Base Ventura County's Drug and Alcohol Working Group, and representatives of the Ventura County Limits Collaboratives.

In 2005, a telephone survey was administered to a random sample of community college students attending one of the three community colleges in the county (i.e., Moorpark College, Oxnard College, and Ventura College). These data are being used to inform prevention efforts of the Higher Education Collaborative and other college administrators/personnel from each campus. While extensive research is available regarding alcohol use and its consequences among college students attending traditional four-year institutions, surprisingly little data exist regarding the prevalence of binge/underage drinking among community college students. Given that the three community colleges enroll over 30,000 students – a majority of whom are under the legal drinking age and who report drinking primarily at home parties – Ventura County Limits recognized the need to address this subpopulation.

Media Advocacy

Media advocacy and education efforts also are a core strategy implemented by VCBH/Ventura County Limits in their efforts to reduce and eliminate underage and binge drinking. Relative to information used to support the Social Host Ordinance policy advancement process, numerous publications/articles were developed and distributed. In addition, the Ventura County Limits website contains additional Fact Sheets, Issue Briefings, and a copy of the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance with Legal Commentary and Resources developed by PIRE/Center for the Study of Law and Enforcement Policy in collaboration with VCBH/Ventura County Limits.⁷ VCBH/Ventura County Limits staff and their collaborative partners often are quoted in local newspapers (e.g., the Ventura County Star, LA Times, Ojai Valley News), and most recently, received coverage in two articles in USA Today. Ventura County Limits Project Administrator, Dan Hicks, has appeared on television discussing Ventura County's Social Host Ordinance related efforts. In the early stages of the ordinance development process, Dan Hicks appeared on a local public access show – which aired about 40 times across a five-week period. He was interviewed by a Santa Barbara television station (KEYT) just as the Ventura County Social Host Ordinance was being considered, which aired about four separate times on evening, nightly, and morning news programs.

The Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition and Fillmore Family Coalition also have executed local media campaigns to support their efforts during the Social Host Ordinance development process. Types of media education/advocacy activities engaged in were: distributing flyers, presentations to civic and community groups, authoring Op-Ed pieces and other articles, and newspaper announcements conveying local findings/data as well as progress made toward policy adoption. VCBH/Ventura County Limits' Collaborative members and other prevention partners throughout the county have appeared on television speaking about the Social Host Ordinance. Captain Gary Pentis of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department was interviewed on a news magazine format show "Studio 2" on KCBS-LA, and again on KCAL-9. Former Ojai Mayor Rae Hanstad, and leader of the Ventura County Limits Municipal Collaborative was interviewed alongside Dan Hicks as part of the KEYT news broadcasts. In early 2006, after an LA Times article appeared about Social Host Ordinances in Ventura County (which was picked up on the AP wire), virtually every TV station ran a story and an estimated dozen news programs did a short piece on "Putting a Cork in Teen Drinking" and discussed Ventura County's policy efforts.

⁷ The URL for the Ventura County Limits website is <http://www.venturacountylimits.org>

VII. FINDINGS AND LESSONS LEARNED

Interview findings and lessons learned are presented separately for each of the three case study regions evaluated: Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County.

A. OJAI KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

Description of Coalition Members and Background

Following the occurrence of a drug-related death of a 19-year-old woman in the city of Ojai in 2002, a group of community members gathered together to discuss how such a thing could happen in their community and how they could prevent it from ever occurring again. Community members, in partnership with district officials and policy makers, started to meet on a volunteer basis and referred to themselves as the Alcohol and Drug Policy Panel. The Panel consisted of the Police Chief, City Council Member, City Manager, Superintendent of Schools, Assistant to one of the County Supervisors, Executive Director of the Ojai Valley Youth Foundation, and the S.A.F.E. Coalition Project Coordinator.⁸ In January 2003, the Panel, with the S.A.F.E. Coalition Project Coordinator as the leader, applied for a planning grant from VCBH to investigate the problems associated with substance use among youth and mobilize the community by recruiting more members representing parents, youth, service providers, businesses, and faith organizations. The Coalition then began to work on environmentally based recommendations for policy change, as well as the development of media to inform the community about their efforts.

Funds were awarded to the S.A.F.E. Coalition in 2003 by VCBH with the Ojai Valley Youth Foundation as the fiscal agent. At about the same time, the Coalition began receiving technical assistance from Dan Hicks -- who later became the Ventura County Limits Project Administrator. Dan Hicks assisted the S.A.F.E. Coalition with the development of a data collection/assessment plan and provided information pertaining to policies that could be useful in addressing youth alcohol and other drug related issues.

Based on the results of their community needs assessment activities, including information shared by the Chief of Police about the types of most pressing alcohol/other drug related calls for service involving youth, the S.A.F.E. Coalition began to focus a majority of their time and efforts on the development of a Social Host Ordinance for Ojai. They also knew in 2003 that it would be insufficient to have only an ordinance for the City of Ojai given that much of the problems were occurring in the surrounding Ojai Valley.

The S.A.F.E. Coalition continued to receive funding from VCBH in 2004, 2005, and 2006.

Interview Participants

A total of 10 key informants were identified and invited to participate in structured interviews to inform the Social Host policy advancement process in Ojai. All but two persons participated, resulting in a total of eight completed interviews. Participating interviewees included two members of law enforcement, four representatives from city and county government, and two representatives of the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition. Five of the interview participants were original members of the Alcohol and Drug Policy Panel of the S.A.F.E. Coalition. Members of law

⁸ The Ojai Valley Youth Foundation and Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition are community groups working to promote safe and healthy environments for youth in the city and surrounding areas of Ojai.

enforcement interviewed also were part of the Ventura County Limits Law Enforcement Collaborative. One of the representatives from city government participated in the Ventura County Limits Municipal Collaborative and one of the representatives from the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition was a member of the Ventura County Limits Community Collaborative.

Summary of Findings

Need/Intended Purpose of the Social Host Ordinance

Interviewees were first asked general questions regarding what drove the need for a Social Host Ordinance in Ojai, what the intended purpose of the ordinance was, and how much time it would take to achieve its intended purpose(s).

Need for the Initiative. The most common theme expressed during interviews regarding what drove the need for the ordinance in Ojai was data from law enforcement, regarding alcohol and other drug related crime involving youth, along with the number of house party calls for service to the Ojai Police Department/Ventura County Sheriff's Department. Alcohol was a known element in two-thirds of sexual assaults involving young people. The number of non-lethal alcohol and/or other drug overdoses among young people also was cited as a significant indicator of need. In addition, it was mentioned by law enforcement that the hundreds of "party calls for service" being received were taking significant amounts of their time and resources -- many of which were to the same residences or locations.

Another common theme identified among responses was that other local data sources (e.g., Ventura County's Place of Last Drink Survey, a randomized countywide telephone survey, S.A.F.E. Coalition's local "environmental assessments/scans") also pointed to the fact that most often underage drinking occurred in private homes. The Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition Program Coordinator commented, "On any given evening, especially in summer, we'd have a lot of teen parties involving alcohol and other drugs. Ojai was no different from any other place. We found that our local data matched national data. Parties were the primary place where kids were accessing alcohol."

A final theme was that law enforcement did not have an effective mechanism to deal with underage consumption at private parties. Although it is against the law for adults to provide alcohol to minors, it is difficult to hold anyone responsible unless police actually witness an adult purchasing the alcohol and giving it to minors. One interviewee stated, "It was clear that the police did not have a tool to use if they did not actually see the kids drinking. We felt that if the issue of underage drinking was addressed, that it would be safer for the entire community."

Purpose. The most frequent response regarding the intended purpose of the Social Host Ordinance was, generally stated, to hold adults accountable for providing alcohol to underage persons. Other purposes provided during interviews centered around (1) the intended deterrent effect of the ordinance and consequences for those who violated it, (2) a means to reduce the number of large home parties involving teens and the dangers associated with excessive drinking among young people, (3) to decrease and, ultimately, eliminate underage drinking, and (4) to change community norms. A comment reflecting the desired social norm change aspect of the ordinance was, "The purpose of the ordinance is to change permanently the social norms in our community so that there is a general sense of agreement that it is not okay for alcohol to be served to minors at home parties."

Timeframe for Achieving the Purpose of the Social Host Ordinance. When asked how long it would take to achieve the intended purposes of the ordinance, several interviewees expressed that they have already begun to see an impact – noting that the ordinance has already been used/enforced multiple times and that there appears to be a decline in the “typical” number of parties. Those who felt it will still take some time provided ranges from six months to two years to really see a significant difference.

Role and Involvement with the Passage of the Social Host Ordinance

In order to put responses in additional context, several items were asked of interviewees to obtain a better sense of their history and motivation for becoming involved with the policy development and advancement process. Interviewees also were asked a number of questions regarding how/when they first became involved, the specific tasks worked on and individuals they had worked with, and whether they encountered any opposition along the way.

Length of Involvement/How Became Involved. Half of the persons interviewed in Ojai became involved after having been a member of their local community coalition, namely the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition, for several years. Some of the comments made when asked how they first became involved in the Social Host Ordinance effort were:

- “Through my involvement with the Ojai Valley Youth Foundation/S.A.F.E. Coalition and Ruth Cooper. I’m not exactly sure about when I started participating in the Social Host Ordinance effort but I’ve been involved with the Ojai Valley Youth Foundation for six years.”
- “As a S.A.F.E. Coalition member. I went to the training sponsored by VCBH/Ventura County Limits where they brought speakers up from San Diego to talk about the Social Host Ordinance here. They explained lessons learned. I got involved right after that training.”
- “Several years ago, before we put the S.A.F.E. Coalition together, there was a young woman who died of an overdose. This began to galvanize the community. There was a large public meeting and a smaller gathering of folks who really wanted to see what we could do. The S.A.F.E. Coalition evolved out of this. When the funding came from VCBH, it made a big difference.”
- “I was part of our community coalition originally, then the mayor got involved. We got the schools involved and had a lot of cooperation from local school personnel. San Diego’s use of a Social Host Ordinance was brought to us as a potential solution by Dan Hicks of VCBH/Ventura County Limits.”

Two respondents started participating in efforts to advance a Social Host policy in Ojai in spring or summer of 2005, also mentioning VCBH/Ventura County Limits as part of what helped shape their decisions to participate. Comments from the city’s mayor and police chief included:

- “In spring 2005, I attended a Kettil Bruun Society training put on by the Ventura County Behavioral Health Department. I learned about the Social Host Ordinance there and thought it could work in Ojai.”
- “Ventura County Behavioral Health Department has been a great help and driving force. They’ve provided lots of support.”

Two other respondents noted that their relationship with the mayor led to their involvement with the Social Host Ordinance and helping to push it forward.

Motivation to Participate. In response to what motivated them to participate in efforts to pass a Social Host Ordinance in Ojai, interviewees most often said something about the fact that there was an underage drinking problem and that the ordinance appeared to be an effective tool to help address it. Personal motivation also was a theme among some respondents, such as having seen the effects of alcohol firsthand and understanding how alcohol affects lives particularly when use begins at an early age. Several respondents pointed to their job/position, stating that given their role in the community, it was part of their personal responsibility to address public safety issues such as underage drinking.

Activities to Promote Passage of the Ordinance. Some of the more common activities mentioned by those involved in the Ojai Social Host policy development/passage process included building community support through education and advocacy efforts, attending meetings with city officials/policymakers, and working strategically on how to first present the idea formally to decision makers. A great deal of research was conducted, gathering all of the necessary data/statistics necessary to demonstrate the need for the ordinance. Research also was done in an effort to learn about the “different types of available party ordinances out there,” where they had been already enacted in California, and how effective they were. Many of the responses centered on working to inform and educate city officials and the public about the ordinance, as well as continuing to describe the problems associated with underage drinking by sharing local data. The S.A.F.E. Coalition Program Coordinator mentioned the additional responsibility of running a media campaign to help get the conversation going among parents and teens, and among teens themselves.

Level of Collaboration and Strongest Allies. In order to gain a sense of the level of collaboration involved in the process, interviewees were asked to indicate which groups/agencies and individuals they had worked with directly to develop and pass the Social Host Ordinance. Of the eight persons interviewed, all of them worked with between 3 and 10 other groups/agencies or persons to accomplish their work. Table 1 depicts the number of persons who indicated that they had worked with each of a list of groups/agencies to get the policy adopted in Ojai.

**Table 1. Community Collaboration to Develop and Pass the Ojai SHO
(Total of 8 Respondents)**

Worked with Directly to Advance the SHO	Agency or Group
✓✓✓✓✓	Ventura County Behavioral Health/Ventura County Limits
✓✓✓✓✓✓✓	Law Enforcement
✓✓✓✓✓✓	The Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition
✓✓✓✓✓✓✓	Members of City Council
✓✓✓✓✓✓✓	City or County Officials
✓✓✓✓✓✓	School District Personnel
✓✓✓✓✓✓	Concerned parents
✓✓✓✓✓	Concerned youth
✓✓✓	Community members (other than concerned parents/youth)
✓✓✓✓	Community-based organizations/agencies
✓✓✓	Members of the media
✓	Other (other county and municipal agencies)

Key informants also were asked who, or which agencies/groups, they considered to be the strongest allies in the Social Host Ordinance development/adoption process. The four most frequently mentioned were: local law enforcement (Captain Pentis and Captain Norris), the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition and its Program Coordinator Ruth Cooper, VCBH/Ventura County Limits, and city government staff (Mayor Rae Hanstad was noted in particular by half of all the respondents). The Chief of Police who was heavily involved in the early stages commented, “Ventura County Behavioral Health was number one. They did much more than bring ideas to us. They also brought the environmental approach, in addition to tools and ideas. They also funded the S.A.F.E. Coalition which was very important.” Other allies mentioned were Ojai Unified School District, County Supervisor Steve Bennett and his Assistant Cindy Cattle, and County Supervisor Kathy Long.

Opposition. As part of the interviews, respondents were asked to share whether they had encountered any critics or opponents to the Social Host Ordinance, and if they had, to comment on why people were opposed. Most of the key informants said that there was no direct opposition and the critics encountered were parents/members of the public who were concerned about infringement of the ordinance on their civil liberties. Some community members raised concerns about not wanting the government/law enforcement “coming into their homes” or overstepping boundaries – using the notion that “I’d rather have my teens drinking at home where they’re supervised” as rationale despite the fact that furnishing alcohol to minors already is illegal. A couple of members of city council also had initial privacy-related concerns. Many of the interviewees were quick to point out, however, that initial fears and concerns were dispelled once people understood the actual intent and purpose of the ordinance.

Policy Process

In order to better understand how the ordinance went from an idea to adoption and implementation, a series of questions were asked. Some of the types of things assessed were the steps involved in the policy development/passage process, the length of time involved between policy development and passage, whether a particular model was used to facilitate drafting the ordinance, what the key factors were in helping to get the Social Host Ordinance passed, who the most influential persons or groups were in the actual passage of the ordinance, and whether any obstacles were encountered and how they were overcome.

Steps involved in the Development/Passage of the Social Host Ordinance in Ojai. One of the more comprehensive items assessed through the interview required key informants to list the specific steps they took in the policy advancement process. Similar themes emerged, with particular emphasis on:

1. Local data collection to quantify the problem and support a need for the ordinance;
2. Legal research (paying attention to challenges others have faced in developing/adopting similar ordinances);
3. Community education (e.g., study sessions, word of mouth, local coalitions, media);
4. Garnering support from both decision makers and the community (sharing the local statistics and true purpose/intent of the Social Host Ordinance);
5. Drafting the ordinance;
6. Ensuring that all critical stakeholders were involved; and
7. Bringing it to policymakers for adoption.

Comments were made about the importance of test-driving the concept with the public to determine what, if any, resistance might be out there. The S.A.F.E. Coalition and Ojai Police Department/Ventura County Sheriff's Department spent significant amounts of time engaging the community to educate them about the ordinance and address any concerns. This type of outreach and education took place in schools, community forums, and during many discussions with the City. The S.A.F.E. Coalition generated consistent "community buzz" about the issues and put out media pieces. VCBH was noted as a "critical partner," and the importance of their willingness to provide funding to the S.A.F.E. Coalition was highlighted. One interviewee commented that the work is not yet finished, and that continued tracking of enforcement will take place as well as any necessary adjustments identified over time.

Length of Time to Policy Passage. A great deal of time and effort had been spent 12-18 months prior to facilitate a relatively rapid adoption process. Initial attempts were made to draft the ordinance prior to having received the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance document from VCBH. In the early stages of the process, time was first spent considering the Social Host Ordinance as a criminal statute until concerns in San Diego arose.

The Ojai Social Host Ordinance first went to City Council in November 2005 and was adopted in February 2006. The first time that the ordinance was presented to City Council was a collaborative effort with County Supervisor Kathy Long. A study session was also held as part of the initial meeting with Ojai City Council, and involved County Supervisor Steve Bennett and his staff. This meeting was an important collaborative effort between the City and the unincorporated Ojai Valley and helped to "set the stage" for the policy passage process.

Use of the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance. When asked about the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance publication developed by PIRE's Center for the Study of Law and Enforcement Policy (and provided to those involved with the passage of the ordinance in Ojai by VCBH), all but three key informants responded that they had used it. The three persons who did not, indicated that they were not sure whether it had been used because their role in the process did not involve actually helping to write the ordinance. In effect, all those who said that they helped develop language for the ordinance, did use it; of them, 100% agreed that the document was very valuable. Some of the comments made were:

- "The model was very useful. Especially for a small city with limited resources. It was the backbone of our ordinance. Also, it helped to have other Council members see the model – it made it feel less risky. It is so thoroughly footnoted. All the footnoting really helped. We felt it covered all the possibilities."
- "It was very helpful. Good initial education tool that provided an opportunity to see what happens in other places."
- "It was a very important piece of information and actually was the foundation of our civil ordinance. Very useful."

Factors Critical to Policy Passage. Factors deemed critical to the actual passage of the ordinance in Ojai included:

- ✓ Full and ongoing support of law enforcement;
- ✓ Commitment of the S.A.F.E. Coalition;
- ✓ Support, training and technical assistance provided by VCBH;
- ✓ Support of the Mayor and City Council;

- ✓ Strong relationships between the S.A.F.E. Coalition and law enforcement, schools, youth, the city and the county;
- ✓ Overall levels of collaboration among all those involved; and
- ✓ Media to support the initiative.

Other things mentioned included making sure policymakers knew clearly what the ordinance was and what it was not, conducting the proper degree of legal research to ensure that the policy was legally sound, and the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance.

Influential Persons/Groups to Policy Passage. The most frequently named groups or persons affecting the actual passage of the ordinance were the S.A.F.E. Coalition, law enforcement, VCBH, and Ojai city government -- especially the Mayor at the time. Some of the comments made were:

- “Law enforcement [was most influential]. They made presentations to City Council, told them that the Social Host Ordinance filled a niche. That the Social Host Ordinance was an additional tool to combat the problems we were seeing.”
- “Ventura County Behavioral Health paid for all of us to attend a conference in Tucson. This really inspired us. Everyone learned that binge and underage drinking was at the root of lots of problems we all care about.”
- “Ventura County Behavioral Health/Ventura County Limits. We couldn’t have done it without them.”
- “Dan Hicks was the Social Host hotline and he was very important – providing us with pats on the back, sound bites, statistics, etc. The Ventura County Sheriff’s Department also – Captain Gary Pentis and Chief Deputy Geoff Dean. Plus, all the knowledge, passion, and enthusiasm everyone shared really made it all come together.”

One informant identified the Ojai Valley Youth Foundation as critical in supporting the activities of the S.A.F.E. Coalition. The Foundation was a partner in the Alcohol and Drug Advisory Board, a countywide group of leaders that supported the prevention work in Ojai and other areas of the county. The Foundation also helped to chair and assist in grant-writing for the S.A.F.E. Coalition and provided a location for the Project Coordinator to use as a headquarters for Coalition activities.

When asked whether there was a particular person that could be identified as a “champion” of the Social Host Ordinance policy advancement process, all agreed that it was a collaborative effort.

Obstacles/Challenges. Very few obstacles or challenges were mentioned. One issue, mentioned by about two-thirds of the key informants was more of a challenge than an obstacle; specifically, avoiding the legal issues that San Diego had experienced relative to their Social Host Ordinance. Comments were made about needing to be sure that any potential legal issues were resolved to avoid potential lawsuits. One respondent stated, “When San Diego’s ordinance was challenged in court. This brought up concerns for any policy that Ojai might pass. Everyone wanted to be absolutely sure that we had an ordinance that would not put the city in danger of legal action. That was really the only obstacle.” A couple of interviewees noted that the city was in a time of financial difficulty and that funding from VCBH/Ventura County Limits along with the tools, TA, and opportunities for training helped tremendously.

Strategies Used to Respond to Challenges. When asked about strategies employed to address challenges/obstacles, comments centered on doing the appropriate amounts of legal research and opting for a civil rather than criminal ordinance. Also, access to the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance was noted as another useful source for overcoming concerns about potential legal implications associated with the passage of a Social Host Ordinance.

Improving the Policy Process. When asked whether there was anything that could have made the policy advancement process proceed more smoothly, many of the key informants said “Nothing would have made the process proceed more smoothly.” One of the specific comments made was, “All the pieces really fell into place. Opposition really wasn’t an obstacle. We were well coordinated and had good communication. I can’t imagine it could have gone much better. VCBH/Ventura County Limits was like an umbrella/team builder providing us with financial support and resources.” Two people said “not having to go first” would have allowed them to learn from another city in Ventura County about the process.

Satisfaction with Outcomes

Several questions were included in the interview protocol to measure how similar the adopted ordinance was to prior drafts and to assess overall levels of satisfaction with the final adopted ordinance. Because the ordinance had already passed by the time the interviews were conducted, key informants also were asked to share any evidence they had thus far relative to whether the ordinance was having its intended outcome.

Similarity of Adopted Ordinance to Early Drafts. The biggest difference in the ordinance that passed to very early drafts was that, originally, the Ojai Social Host Ordinance looked more like the San Diego misdemeanor criminal ordinance. The amount of the fine also was higher than early drafts. Whereas initial drafts had a \$250 fine for the first offense and a \$500 fine for the second, the adopted ordinance states a \$1,000 fine for violation regardless of the number of repeat occurrences. Initial draft language discussed the provision of alcohol to persons under age 18. In the end, it was decided that the ordinance would hold adults accountable for providing alcohol to anyone under the age of 21. Although some things changed during the development process, 100% of key informants agreed that the language of the adopted ordinance reflects their original intent.

Satisfaction with the Ordinance as Written. All key informants indicated that they were satisfied with the ordinance, although two individuals mentioned being “mostly satisfied.” All were very satisfied with the ordinance fee structure and fine of \$1,000 for violators. When asked what changes, if any, they would recommend, several people commented about a desire to increase its consistency with the County’s ordinance. For instance, Ojai’s Social Host Ordinance requires that five minors be present in order to issue a violation/citation. The Ventura County Social Host Ordinance requires only two minors be present to issue a citation. Given the geography of the city of Ojai and the fact that it is surrounded by the Ojai Valley (Unincorporated Ventura County), combined with the fact that patrol officers cover both Ojai and the Ojai Valley, a couple of interviewees stated that it would facilitate enforcement of the ordinance if it was more consistent with the countywide Social Host Ordinance. A couple of interviewees also referenced the relative “newness” of the ordinance and said that they would need to wait and see whether adjustments were necessary after more time has passed.

Evidence of Impact. The most common response offered when asked about initial evidence of impact was that “The number of teen parties and party calls for service appear to be down.” A

couple of respondents noted that an analysis (before and after the Social Host policy implementation) needed to be done to validate whether these observations are true. Many interviewees commented that both parents and teens know about the ordinance and are talking about it. A couple of respondents reported that partial evidence lies in the fact that violations/citations for violating the ordinance have already occurred multiple times. Others mentioned that it was too early to tell.

Looking Ahead

Based on the activities engaged in and lessons learned thus far, questions were asked of key informants to obtain insights that could inform Ventura County Limits moving forward, and perhaps prove useful to other municipalities or counties considering the adoption of a Social Host Ordinance to reduce underage drinking. Specifically, respondents were asked about the factors that will be necessary for the ordinance to achieve its intended purpose, whether they will continue to be involved, what kinds of “success criteria” key informants hold, what advice they would offer to another city or county considering a similar initiative, and whether they felt that the community needed to be “prepared” in order to adopt a Social Host Ordinance.

Factors Necessary for Success Moving Forward. Key informants were asked to look ahead and come up with a list of factors that they believed would be necessary for the Ojai Social Host policy to be effective. The two most common answers were: (1) consistent enforcement and (2) continued outreach and education to the community (i.e., through continued use of media, occasional press releases, news coverage, radio spots, etc.). Two key informants mentioned the fact that the Social Host Ordinance is just one of many laws on the books and that keeping enforcement a priority is critical to the success of the Social Host Ordinance as a useful tool in changing norms and reducing tolerance towards youth alcohol consumption. When asked what type of role they would play moving forward, interviewees stated the following: stay in touch with law enforcement about its use, continue to train patrol officers on its use, track data on home parties, answer questions, and deal with the collection of fines from issued citations.

Indicators of Success. Respondents were asked how they would know that the ordinance is working or has made an impact. Responses fell into one of several categories. Below is the list of response categories for this question in order of frequency:

1. Reduction in party-related police calls for service (particularly repeat calls);
2. Reductions in the consequences associated with underage drinking, including decreased numbers of sexual assaults, overdoes, DUIs and alcohol involved crashes;
3. Enforcement tracking – the number of times violations are issued;
4. Teens going to (and being excited about) parties that do not involve alcohol;
5. Parents feeling knowledgeable about how to help their teens party safely (without alcohol);
6. Having many more alcohol/drug free opportunities for youth to have fun; and
7. When more youth wait until they are 21 to use alcohol.

Advice for Others Desiring to Implement a Similar Ordinance. When asked for suggestions to assist the implementation of a similar initiative in another city/county, the most frequently occurring piece of advice was to collect/use local data, engage the community and policymakers, and use media to effectively support your efforts. Other themes included:

- ✓ Must come from the ground-up – it is not a top-down thing;

- ✓ Collaboration is an absolute must;
- ✓ Strong relationships are key (e.g., among local police, city and county leaders, youth organizations, community members/parents, local coalitions, etc.);
- ✓ Do the legal homework required;
- ✓ Look at your own environment and see what and where the needs are;
- ✓ Embrace the seriousness of the problem; and
- ✓ Use our work as a base.

A couple of additional comments were:

- “Examine the problem. Know the stats. This is ammunition to get it passed. Build support in and out – in the community and throughout city government. It has to be a collaborative effort: policymakers, law enforcement, schools, community, parents, churches, etc.”
- “Partner your passion for change with patience and practicality, and really good networking. Involve the key players from the beginning.”

Community Readiness. Interviewees were asked whether they felt that the community needed to be “prepared” in order to support the adoption of a Social Host Ordinance, and if yes, what types of things needed to happen to help the community become ready for such a policy. By far, the most common response was “yes.”

Factors considered very important in helping those involved in the policy development process were: VCBH having sponsored attendance at the Underage Drinking Enforcement Training Center conference in Tucson (August 2005); key stakeholders coming together at the March 2006 Municipal Strategies Conference; and the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance publication. The training in Tucson and the Municipal Strategies Conference were deemed critical opportunities for strengthening levels of collaboration and fostering team building among all of those involved. One of the interviewees commented, “Supervisor Long was a Keynote Speaker at the Municipal Strategies Conference. She provided leadership for all of the elected officials who were present to proceed in their policy development and implementation efforts.”

Other types of “readiness activities” that needed to occur were: getting the requisite information out to the public and to policymakers – letting them know why the ordinance is a useful tool to address a serious issue in the community. Parents and others also needed to become aware of the facts on teen/underage drinking through presentations on the extent of the problem through local data. The community needed to learn that indeed this “really is a problem” and that law enforcement needed a more effective tool to help solve it. Education about some of the myths associated with teen/underage drinking also needed to occur to dispel myths (e.g., “Kids will be kids,” “I’d rather them drink in my home than somewhere else because its more safe”). Law enforcement and the S.A.F.E. Coalition held numerous meetings in the community and in schools. A Parent Pledge took place to enroll parents in efforts to reduce adult provision of alcohol to minors. Law enforcement also spent a great deal of time letting people know the extent to which alcohol plays a role in other crimes, and shared local Ojai police data to illustrate the kinds of things they were responding to on a regular basis. Police also informed the community about how much time and resources are used up by large, unruly parties with underage drinking – not to mention the harms occurring at and after such “teen house parties.”

B. Fillmore Key Informant Interviews

Description of Coalition Members and Background

Founded in 1997, the Higgy Foundation is an organization in the city of Fillmore that works with youth, families, churches, schools, and community groups to help ensure that young people have access to programs that provide: (1) character and leadership development; (2) education and career development; (3) health and life skills; (4) recreational activities; and (5) civic involvement. While providing a program for middle school students, Higgy Foundation staff heard about how often middle school students were using alcohol, particularly at home parties. In order to get more information on the extent of the problem, staff from the Higgy Foundation worked with students to create a survey to find out how many youth were engaging in using alcohol and how accessible it was at home parties. Based on their survey, they found that 65% of 7th and 8th graders who completed the survey reported that they were offered or used alcohol at a home party. These findings motivated the Higgy Foundation to apply for a planning grant from VCBH as the Fillmore Family Coalition in June 2003. Funds received were used to help create a community coalition focused on preventing youth access to alcohol and other drugs.

At the beginning of the funding period, VCBH provided technical assistance through the Institute for Public Strategies (IPS) to help in the development of the coalition. A bilingual (English and Spanish) adult and a youth coordinator were selected to help build the coalition. The Program Coordinator of the Fillmore Family Coalition, also the CEO of the Higgy Foundation, contacted local leaders including the City Manager, City Council Members, Principals and Counselors at local schools, and law enforcement representatives to discuss the purpose of the coalition and how they might be involved. The Coordinator also recruited pastors in community churches to participate in the coalition. Eventually, three 'sub-coalitions' were developed: adult, youth, and pastor. By early 2004, a decision was made to merge coalitions, which resulted in two Coalitions of the Fillmore Family Coalition, the Adult and Youth Coalitions. These coalitions then focused heavily on the development of both Social Host and special event permit changes by collecting data about the problem of youth access and use of alcohol, educating the community through presentations and other media, and engaging policy makers and civic leaders to garner their support to effect policy change in Fillmore. The Fillmore Family Coalition continued to receive funds from VCBH through 2006 to support their efforts.

Interview Participants

A total of 10 key informants were identified and invited to participate in interviews to inform the Social Host policy advancement process in Fillmore. All but two persons participated, resulting in eight completed interviews. Participating interviewees included three representatives from city and county government, two members of law enforcement, and three representatives of the Fillmore Family Coalition. Members of law enforcement interviewed also were part of the Ventura County Limits Law Enforcement Collaborative and three of the representatives from the Fillmore Family Coalition were members of the Ventura County Limits Community Collaborative.

Interviewees were asked general questions regarding what drove the need for a Social Host Ordinance in Fillmore, what the intended purpose of the ordinance was, and how much time it would take to achieve its intended purpose(s).

Summary of Findings

Need/Intended Purpose of the Social Host Ordinance

Need for the Initiative. Underage drinking at home parties and drunk driving by youth was reported to be a long-standing concern in the community and demonstrated the need for a Social Host Ordinance. Respondents reported that the combination of public tragedies related to youth drinking in Fillmore and their own experiences hearing or seeing consequences of youths' use of alcohol were reasons driving the need for a Social Host Ordinance. Data collected from middle and high school students by the Fillmore Family Coalition about how easy it was to access alcohol from adults and/or through attending home parties also justified the need to pursue a Social Host Ordinance in their city. Another theme was the lack of an effective tool to help law enforcement deal with large private parties. One law enforcement participant commented, "We didn't have anything on the books to hold parents/adults responsible for parties where underage drinking occurs."

Purpose. An equal number of participants identified two purposes of the Social Host Ordinance: (1) to hold adults accountable for providing alcohol to underage persons at private parties, and (2) to educate the community about the problem with underage drinking. As one respondent stated, "It's intended to be an education and enforcement tool." Another stated that the ordinance would "create education and communication, promote awareness among parents, and enhance public safety." Other purposes mentioned in interviews included: a vehicle to communicate that there will be consequences when underage youth have parties where they are drinking alcohol; a way to discourage and eliminate underage drinking at home; and a means to prevent related problems that occur at parties where youth are drinking, such as sexual assault. One respondent summed up many of the responses in saying, "It is supposed to be used more as a deterrent through public education and outreach, to let people know that there were going to be consequences for those providing alcohol to underage youth or serving alcohol to minors at gatherings."

Timeframe for Achieving the Purpose of the Social Host Ordinance. When asked how long it would take to achieve the intended purposes of the ordinance, there seemed to be some disagreement. One interviewee reported that it would take at least two years while another indicated that even in three or four years change may not be seen. Others did not specify how long it would take, though two agreed that it would be an ongoing process of change.

Role and Involvement with the Passage of the Social Host Ordinance

In order to put responses in additional context, several items were asked of interviewees to obtain a better sense of their history and motivation for becoming involved with the policy development and advancement process. Interviewees also were asked a number of questions regarding how/when they first became involved, the specific tasks worked on and individuals they had worked with, and whether they had encountered any opposition along the way.

Length of Involvement/How Became Involved. Three of the respondents became involved with the Social Host policy process through recruitment efforts by the Fillmore Family Coalition. Two respondents were introduced to the idea through data forwarded to them or presentations made to the Fillmore City Council. Some of the comments made when asked how they first became involved in the Social Host Ordinance effort were:

- “A pamphlet was left at my door about how a youth was wounded at a party. It had a description of what happened, findings from a survey that was done. I called and asked how I could help.”
- “The Fillmore Family Coalition was doing grass roots efforts. They would send us data and kept us informed.”
- “Citizens approached the City Council through the Fillmore Family Coalition. I was invited to a community meeting where we formed an Ad Hoc committee with the Fillmore Family Coalition.”

Others became involved in very different ways. The leader of the Fillmore Family Coalition received support and training from VCBH about the Social Host Ordinance, including how it would be useful for Fillmore. The former Chief of Police indicated that a law enforcement colleague from another jurisdiction suggested that he support a Social Host Ordinance in Fillmore. The current Chief of Police, who transferred to Fillmore just after the ordinance was passed, became involved after much of the groundwork and policy development was completed.

Motivation to Participate. The reason most often given by interviewees as to what motivated them to participate in efforts to pass a Social Host Ordinance in Fillmore was personal knowledge about the effects of alcohol use by teenagers combined with its negative/harmful consequences. Knowledge about the problem with underage drinking in Fillmore and the lack of any tool or process to combat it was another theme among several respondents. One respondent identified youth involvement as a motivating factor, “I was really inspired by students taking action and getting involved in the process – they were working collaboratively and doing outreach themselves.”

Activities to Promote Passage of the Ordinance. Attending community meetings and providing education to community members through presentations were the two most commonly cited activities to promote the passage of the Social Host Ordinance in Fillmore. Several interviewees noted the work of the Fillmore Family Coalition, acknowledging that their research about the problem and knowledge about the ordinance helped others to support the passage of the ordinance. One interviewee stated, “The Fillmore Family Coalition did a lot of the legwork, did polling, showed that there was community support. I participated in community meetings, worked with Dan Hicks of Ventura County Behavioral Health and we waited to develop a draft until we got a model from Hicks. Then we asked the Police Chief and City Attorney to draft an ordinance for Fillmore.” The Fillmore Family Program Coordinator mentioned that his role was to build and support the coalition by providing organization to the process, but that youth and other community members presented their research findings to decision-makers. The Youth Coalition of the Fillmore Family Coalition was responsible for creating a DVD that was used to educate the community about the seriousness of the drinking problem among youth and possible policy-related solutions including the Social Host Ordinance and restrictions to access of alcohol at special events. The DVD was used in numerous community presentations and as part of a presentation to the City Council.

Level of Collaboration and Strongest Allies. In order to gain a sense of the level of collaboration involved in the process, interviewees were asked to indicate which groups/agencies and individuals they had worked with directly to develop and pass the Social Host Ordinance. One respondent, the current Chief of Police, identified that they did not directly work with others in the passage of the SHO, as much of the work had been completed prior to his tenure. Of the remaining seven persons interviewed, all of them worked with between 3 and

11 other groups/agencies or persons to accomplish their work. Table 2 depicts the number of persons who indicated that they had worked with each of a list of groups/agencies to help push the policy forward in Fillmore.

**Table 2. Community Collaboration to Develop and Pass the Fillmore SHO
(Total of 7 Respondents)**

Worked with Directly to Advance the SHO	Agency or Group
✓✓✓✓✓✓	Ventura County Behavioral Health/Ventura County Limits
✓✓✓✓✓✓	Law Enforcement
✓✓✓✓	Fillmore Family Coalition
✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓	Members of City Council
✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓	City or County Officials
✓✓✓✓✓✓	School District Personnel
✓✓✓✓✓✓	Concerned parents
✓✓✓✓✓✓	Concerned youth
✓✓✓	Community members (other than concerned parents/youth)
✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓	Community-based organizations/agencies
✓✓✓	Members of the media
✓✓	Other (Churches)

Key informants also were asked who, or which agencies/groups, they considered to be the strongest allies in the ordinance development and adoption process. The most frequently mentioned ally was the Fillmore City Council, followed by the Ventura County Sheriff’s Department, Fillmore Family Coalition, and VCBH/Ventura County Limits. Other allies mentioned were the schools, students, churches and business community, who wrote letters in support of the ordinance. Three respondents also mentioned that the policy development/adoption process was a “collaborative effort” and that they “had lots of support all around.”

Opposition. As part of the interviews, respondents were asked to share whether they had encountered any critics or opponents to the Social Host Ordinance, and if they had, to comment on why people were opposed. Three respondents said that there was no direct opposition while three indicated that they experienced some opposition from young adults and community members who felt that their cultural customs were not being respected. For those younger adults who expressed discontent with the ordinance, one key informant explained that those younger adults who opposed it “were party people.” Another respondent stated that those concerned that the ordinance would infringe on their rights “were mostly people who didn’t want their cultural or religious beliefs interfered with. They thought we were trying to be ‘big brother’ or something like that.” One interviewee reported that local law enforcement was not supportive until the final steps of passage (drafting and presenting the ordinance to City Council) because “They were burdened with other issues. We had three shootings at the time of the Social Host Ordinance with one death.”

Policy Process

In order to understand better how the ordinance went from an idea to adoption and implementation, a series of questions were asked. Some aspects of the process assessed were

the steps involved in the policy development/passage process, the length of time involved between policy development and passage, whether a particular model was used to facilitate drafting the ordinance, what the key factors were in helping to get the Social Host Ordinance passed, who the most influential persons or groups were in the actual passage of the ordinance, whether any obstacles were encountered, and how they were overcome.

Steps involved in the Development/Passage of the Ordinance in Fillmore. One of the more comprehensive items assessed through the interview required key informants to list the specific steps they took in the policy advancement process. Similar themes emerged, with particular emphasis on:

1. Community need identified through anecdotal and some preliminary data collection;
2. Planning more rigorous local data collection to quantify the problem and identify what policies, including SHO, could be useful in addressing the problem;
3. Community education about findings from data collection and utility of a Social Host Ordinance (e.g., video and written media, study sessions, word of mouth, local coalitions);
4. Garnering support from both decision makers and the community including local businesses (sharing the local statistics and true purpose/intent of the ordinance);
5. Ensuring that all critical stakeholders were involved in the development of the ordinance (Ad Hoc committee of the City Council);
6. Legal research (paying attention to challenges others have faced in developing/adopting similar ordinances);
7. Drafting the ordinance; and
8. Bringing it to policymakers for adoption.

The importance of data collection and presentation of findings to educate the community about the problem were key factors in the initial stages of the development and passage of the ordinance. The need to have high community involvement that included youth, schools, local businesses, and community leaders was another theme identified by interviewees. The Fillmore Family Coalition spent one year collecting data and developing educational materials in the form of pamphlets and a youth-developed DVD to educate different stakeholders in the community. The next year, the Fillmore Family Coalition, using the Adult and Youth Coalition groups, set out to make presentations at schools and other civic meetings to gather support for the Social Host Ordinance. They were able to get over 2,000 letters of support from Fillmore citizens in favor of the ordinance (including letters from local business owners). These letters were then presented by a youth member of the Fillmore Family Coalition to the City Council in order to introduce the ordinance as an effective tool to reduce underage drinking in Fillmore. Newspaper articles authored by youth members of the Fillmore Family Coalition, and presentations by other youth and parents to the City Council, also were used to educate and promote community support.

Of note, a related policy and procedure was handled by the Ad Hoc Committee in charge of drafting the Social Host Ordinance. The Fillmore Family Coalition also focused on supporting changes to special event permit requirements in Fillmore. Community members had observed the emphasis on drinking during city festivals that were often sponsored by a beer company. They noticed that children's play areas included signage related to drinking and that youth were being served alcohol at these events. To address this issue, the Fillmore Family Coalition suggested to the City Council that administrative polices be modified to require that in order to receive a permit to serve alcohol at special events the applicant must:

- Have beverage service providers attend a Responsible Beverage Service Training prior to the event;
- Ensure that only individuals 21 years of age or older were allowed to be in alcohol-designated areas;
- Offer non-alcoholic beverages at booths close to booths where alcohol is being sold; and
- Use non-transferable wristbands to indicate those individuals who were at least 21 years old.

The City Council agreed to adopt these changes and implemented the modifications several months after the initial presentation. The Coalition presented the Social Host Ordinance and special events policy revisions as a package to the City Council, though the Committee handled both separately.

Length of Time to Policy Passage. The Fillmore Social Host Ordinance first went to City Council in December 2005 and was adopted in February 2006. The City Council had developed an Ad Hoc Committee in March 2005 that worked on the development of a draft ordinance. The Ad Hoc Committee included civic leaders and a youth representative from the Fillmore Family Coalition. They considered drafting an ordinance based on the San Diego ordinance, though the City Attorney was aware of some problems surrounding the language of that ordinance and it was suggested that the Committee wait until a model ordinance from PIRE/VCBH was available.

As mentioned, the work of the Coalition had begun two years earlier with their initial planning grant funded by VCBH, which explains one comment from an interviewee, “Fillmore has been at this a long time. But, the Social Host Ordinance process from the ordinance being drafted to the time of passage was about two months” while another respondent stated, “It moved fast once it was written/drafted. The design of the ordinance took longer.”

Use of the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance. When asked about the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance publication developed by PIRE’s Center for the Study of Law and Enforcement Policy (and provided to those involved with the passage of the ordinance in Fillmore by VCBH/Ventura County Limits), all but one key informant responded that they had used it. The one interviewee who reported not using the model ordinance stated that the Ad Hoc Committee in charge of drafting the ordinance used the San Diego ordinance, though other sources suggest this was not the case and that this individual was not a member of the Committee. Most of the respondents who reported that they used the model ordinance commented that it was very useful and contained what they needed to write a Social Host Ordinance for Fillmore. They also mentioned that the support offered by VCBH in conjunction with the model ordinance was especially helpful:

- “It was great having VCBH as a partner. I certainly appreciate their time and willingness to help us throughout the entire process. Dan Hicks was very helpful.”
- “It was absolutely useful. I’ve sent the Model Ordinance to others. I attended a training that Dan Hicks put on about the PIRE model document.”
- “We used it and it was very helpful. We used all the supporting information that Dan Hicks provided.”

Factors Critical to Policy Passage. Factors deemed critical to the actual passage of the ordinance in Fillmore included:

- ✓ Youth involvement and commitment to the ordinance;
- ✓ Community involvement;
- ✓ Education of the community;
- ✓ Support of law enforcement;
- ✓ Support of the City Council;
- ✓ Support of local businesses and schools;
- ✓ Strong collaboration and communication among all those involved; and
- ✓ Media to educate and garner support of the ordinance.

Having materials and presentations in English and Spanish were reported as critical in getting the support of the community, as a large proportion of residents in Fillmore are Spanish speaking. One respondent identified the shooting of the Fillmore high school student as a critical event that helped the passage of the Social Host Ordinance, as it highlighted the need for such a policy in Fillmore.

Influential Persons/Groups to Policy Passage. The most frequently named groups or persons affecting the actual passage of the ordinance were the Fillmore City Council, Fillmore Family Coalition, law enforcement, Dan Hicks of VCBH, Jim Higgins of the Fillmore Family Coalition, and local businesses. Some of the comments made were:

- “The City Council and the students. You could see it in their faces, you could see how they lit up and knew it was a concern.”
- “Fillmore Family Coalition. Also, Dan Hicks was a huge influence – people responded very well to him and the way he conducted himself.”
- “Jim Higgins and the Fillmore Family Coalition, law enforcement, local businesses. The Social Host Ordinance is good overall for the community and reflects what the community is all about.”

When asked whether there was a particular person that could be identified as a “champion” of the policy advancement process, three identified Jim Higgins, Project Coordinator of the Fillmore Family Coalition. Two agreed that it was a collaborative effort while the others identified Matt Ortiz, a youth involved in the Fillmore Family Coalition, as the champion.

Obstacles/Challenges. Most respondents indicated an obstacle or challenge in the initial stages of the ordinance development process. Two interviewees identified the lack of support from law enforcement as an obstacle in obtaining community support though both admitted that eventually they received support from the local police department. The language of the ordinance was another challenge identified by two key informants in that it was crucial to educate the community about what the ordinance would mean for their own cultural practices at home. One interviewee commented, “There was an initial lack of education, people not understanding what the ordinance was and wasn’t.” Another respondent stated, “There was a small group that were worried it would change traditional events.” One key informant stated there were “no bumps” in developing and passing the ordinance, but admitted “The only issue was making sure that the language in the ordinance was right for Fillmore.”

Strategies Used to Respond to Challenges. When asked about strategies employed to address challenges/obstacles, several indicated that “bringing the community into the process” helped to address challenges posed by initial limited support from law enforcement and concerns in the community about how the ordinance would affect cultural traditions. Use of the

Model Social Host Ordinance was also identified as a useful tool in helping the City Attorney draft the ordinance.

Improving the Policy Process. A majority agreed that there was nothing that could have made the policy development/adoption process smoother. Several mentioned the importance of the community in bringing attention to a public health issue and a possible solution to it, as one key informant said, “It was really a very true grass roots example of how a community can influence policy change.” One interviewee mentioned that the most serious delay occurred when the Ad Hoc Committee was waiting for the Model Ordinance to be completed so that they could use it as a resource to develop their own and avoid unforeseen problems that other cities encountered.

Satisfaction with Outcomes

Several questions were included in the interview protocol to measure how similar the adopted ordinance was to prior drafts, as well as overall levels of satisfaction with the final adopted ordinance. Because the ordinance had already passed by the time the interviews were conducted, key informants also were asked to share any evidence they had thus far relative to whether the ordinance was having its intended outcome.

Similarity of Adopted Ordinance to Early Drafts. Of those who saw the original draft of the ordinance, all agreed that the ordinance that was passed was very similar and few changes were made from the first to the second reading. This may have resulted from the Ad Hoc Committee, in charge of overseeing the City Attorney who was drafting the ordinance, waiting for the model ordinance before asking the City Attorney to draft the ordinance. The Committee wanted to create a civil ordinance and not make social hosting a criminal offense. By waiting, Fillmore also benefited from policy advancement activities in Ojai. The City Attorney in charge of drafting the Social Host Ordinance for Fillmore also was responsible for the ordinance in the city of Ojai.

Satisfaction with the Ordinance as Written. All key informants indicated that they were satisfied with the ordinance, although one individual mentioned being “mostly satisfied.” All were very satisfied with the ordinance fee structure and fine of \$1,000 for violators. When asked what changes, if any, they would recommend, only one informant mentioned that modifying the ordinance to be consistent with the County’s ordinance would assist law enforcement in enforcing it in both the City of Fillmore and surrounding unincorporated areas. Fillmore’s Social Host policy requires that five minors be present in order to issue a violation/citation. The Ventura County ordinance requires that only two minors be present to issue a citation. Law enforcement that patrol Fillmore also patrol the surrounding unincorporated areas, and thus are responsible for the enforcement of two different ordinances depending on where the home party takes place. This interviewee stated that it would facilitate enforcement if the City’s ordinance was more consistent with the countywide ordinance.

Evidence of Impact. At the time of the interviews, no Social Host Ordinance violations had been written in Fillmore. Two interviewees commented that they had not seen or heard of any large parties since the passage of the SHO, which may indicate that the ordinance is working to discourage large parties. Several mentioned that special events had changed a great deal because of a related change in administrative policies that dictate how alcohol will be served at festivals. Though changes to the special event permit requirements were not a part of the Social Host Ordinance per se, there is the perception that, “The Responsible Beverage Service

Training, permit changes, and Social Host Ordinance in the eyes of the City Council were a whole package.”

Looking Ahead

Based on the activities engaged in and lessons learned thus far, questions were asked of key informants to obtain insights that could inform VCBH/Ventura County Limits moving forward, and perhaps prove useful to other municipalities or counties considering the adoption of a Social Host Ordinance to reduce underage drinking. Specifically, respondents were asked about the factors that will be necessary for the ordinance to achieve its intended purpose, whether they will continue to be involved, what kinds of “success criteria” key informants hold, what advice they would offer to another city or county considering a similar initiative, and whether they felt that the community needed to be “prepared” in order to adopt a Social Host Ordinance.

Factors Necessary for Success Moving Forward. Key informants were asked to look ahead and come up with a list of factors that they believed would be necessary for the Fillmore Social Host Ordinance to be effective. The two most common answers were: (1) continued outreach and education to the community (i.e., through continued use of media, newspaper articles, news coverage, radio spots, etc.) and (2) consistent enforcement. Several informants that mentioned continued outreach and education also mentioned the importance of publicizing when the citation is used as a way of communicating the outcome of the ordinance and educating the community about the consequences of hosting a large party where underage youth are drinking alcohol. As one respondent stated, “We need to continue to keep the information out there. Remind people that there are consequences for adults who provide alcohol to youth. We need to keep the public aware of the ordinance.” When asked what type of role they would play moving forward, interviewees stated the following: reporting use of the citation and related activities to the City Council, notifying the local newspaper when the citation is used, and continuing work through the Higgy Foundation to support community education about the dangers of underage alcohol use. A City Council member who participated in the passage of the Social Host Ordinance stated, “I’m always going to be a champion of the ordinance. I think it’s one of the better things we’ve done as a City Council. It’s a tool. It helps people to make good choices.”

Indicators of Success. Respondents were asked how they would know that the ordinance is working or has made an impact in Fillmore. Responses fell into one of several categories. Below is the list of response categories for this question in order of frequency:

1. Reduction in party-related police calls for service (particularly repeat calls);
2. Reductions in alcohol-related crimes, including decreased levels of teen violence, DUIs and minors under the influence;
3. Enforcement tracking – the number of times violations are issued;
4. Fewer teens who need alcohol-related treatment services; and
5. Feedback from the community that there are fewer large parties involving underage drinking.

Advice for Others Desiring to Implement a Similar Ordinance. When asked for suggestions to assist the implementation of a similar initiative in another city or county, the most frequently occurring piece of advice was to collect and use local data using community youth and adults, gain support from the community and civic leaders/policymakers through education and media,

and be proactive about communicating and engaging in discussions with the community and public agencies.

One key informant indicated that it was a “bottom-up and top-down” process, and went on to say, “First, do a survey to find out the real alcohol issues and include teenagers. Second, evaluate the findings. Third, ask the community to get together and find out how to address the data. Fourth, get letters of support from the community and get support from businesses. Talk to the business community. Go to the schools, not just the heads of the community. While doing that, meet with the City Council, Sheriff’s Department, Fire Department, and City Manager. That made it easier for them to work with us.”

Community Readiness. Interviewees were asked whether they felt that the community needed to be “prepared” in order to support the adoption of a Social Host Ordinance, and if yes, what types of things needed to happen to help the community become ready for such a policy.

Most interviewees indicated that the community needed to be prepared. Several mentioned that in order to get the community “ready,” the community needed to be educated about what the ordinance was and how it might affect them. One respondent commented, “They had to be informed of what can happen, what has happened, and what will continue to happen if the community does not do anything about it. People are afraid to get involved, so we need to encourage them to be involved.” Community education efforts also included sharing information about why the ordinance was needed in Fillmore and communicating findings about the seriousness of problems associated with underage alcohol use. One respondent stated, “Educating them about the survey findings, the number of youth crimes involving alcohol, and information that the students themselves have shared. It is necessary to educate the community about what the kids are doing, why they are doing it and the need for an ordinance.” Another noted that activities to prepare the community “had to be both in English and Spanish to address the language needs of Fillmore residents.”

C. Ventura County Key Informant Interviews

Interview Participants

A total of nine key informants were identified and invited to participate in interviews to inform the Social Host policy advancement process relative to the Ventura County Social Host Ordinance. All but two persons participated, resulting in a total of seven completed interviews. Participating interviewees included two representatives from VCBH/Ventura County Limits, one representative from the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, one County Supervisor, one representative from the Ventura County Office of Education, and two concerned citizens/parents – one of which also directs a community based organization in the unincorporated area of the County. One of the respondents leads the Ventura County Limits Law Enforcement Collaborative, another is a member of the Ventura County Limits Municipal Collaborative, and three of the interviewees are involved with the Ventura County Limits Community Collaborative.

Summary of Findings

Need/Intended Purpose of the Ordinance

Interviewees were first asked general questions about what drove the need for the Ventura County Social Host Ordinance, what the intended purpose of the ordinance was, and how much time it would take to achieve its intended purpose(s).

Need for the Initiative. According to key informants, the driving need for a Ventura County Social Host Ordinance stemmed from recognition of an underage drinking problem and large unruly parties, documented through data. Mention also was made of the need for a way to hold adults accountable to curtail problems and reduce the effects that go along with underage drinking and home parties. In addition, the ordinance was believed to help fill a gap relative to the existing tools that law enforcement had to deal with the issue. Given the geography of the county, it was deemed necessary to deter young people from the mindset that they could “go elsewhere” to party and avoid fines associated with the existing municipal Social Host Ordinances. Some of the comments made reflecting these ideas included:

- “Our data pointed to home parties as being the most problematic. We thought that the ordinance was something that filled gaps. Before the Social Host Ordinance, law enforcement was able to issue citations for Minors in Possession and/or disperse a party but couldn't actually hold anyone accountable. The Social Host Ordinance was a tool that filled an existing void.”
- “Many adults were not taking responsibility for their own actions when it came to providing alcohol to youth.”
- “We needed the Social Host Ordinance to address underage parties where there were lots of dangerous behaviors occurring. Word from law enforcement and local coalitions was that there were large out of control parties with lots of people who often don't even know each other in attendance. Data showed that lots of overdoses, sexual assaults, and even deaths, were coming from large home parties.”
- “When you look at the geography of Ventura County, almost every city is heavily surrounded by unincorporated areas. If we just have a Social Host Ordinance in cities, but not countywide, we'd be missing lots of parties. The parties would have just moved to the unincorporated areas if we didn't have a Social Host Ordinance there. Also,

having the Sheriff's Department as a partner in this was perfect timing. That relationship really helped make it a reality."

Purpose. The most frequent response regarding the intended purpose of the ordinance was that it was a civil tool to hold adults and young people accountable for underage drinking. One interviewee commented that the purpose of the County's Social Host Ordinance was, "To hold accountable hosts of parties where underage drinking is taking place, civilly through a fine. The larger goal was to decrease underage drinking and parties." Others pointed to the usefulness of the ordinance as a tool to help curtail the problems associated with underage drinking. A couple of key informants also commented on the "deterrence factor" built into the ordinance. For instance, "The purpose was to send a message to parents and adults that it was not appropriate to support underage drinking." Another respondent commented, "The purpose was to create a new and easy-to-administer disincentive to repeat, loud and unruly parties, with emphasis being on the easy-to-administer part and 'repeaters'. There are lots of reasons to do it for true first time deterrence, but it is also the repeat party homes we were focused on."

Timeframe for Achieving the Purpose of the Ordinance. When asked how long it would take to achieve the intended purposes of the ordinance, two interviewees thought it could take five years to see the full intended impact of the ordinance, particularly for the deterrence effect to take place. Others felt that it would take one or two years to start seeing an impact. Still others felt that the ordinance was already showing evidence of effect simply by the fact that it was being implemented and that the word was getting out; however, they also noted that seeing a true decrease in underage parties and drinking would take much longer.

Role and Involvement with the Passage of the Social Host Ordinance

In order to put responses in additional context, several items were asked of key informants to obtain a better sense of their history and motivation for becoming involved with the policy development and advancement process. Interviewees also were asked a number of questions regarding how/when they first became involved, the specific tasks worked on and individuals they had worked with, and whether they encountered any opposition along the way.

Length of Involvement/How Became Involved. Comments from interviewees about how they first became involved with the Social Host Ordinance initiative in Ventura County varied. Some became involved given their job role with VCBH or the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, coupled with their ongoing knowledge about the problems occurring relative to underage drinking in Ojai and Fillmore. Comments from VCBH staff and law enforcement about their how they became involved were:

- "We [VCBH] offered a training for our local coalitions several years ago. Fillmore and Ojai were very concerned about underage/binge drinking. We knew San Diego had a Social Host Ordinance. We brought people up from San Diego to come and speak about it. Then there was a need for legal language, so Dan Hicks spoke with PIRE and determined what was needed was a "Model Social Host Ordinance." Soon after, we began working with the Ventura County Sheriff's Department. The whole time, Dan Hicks was providing technical assistance to Ojai and Fillmore to assist with their process."
- "Our coalitions were telling us that kids were drinking in homes so we began looking more closely at the data we were getting, for example our Place of Last Drink Survey

and local coalition surveys, and saw a strong effect. We began working with Ojai Police Department/Ventura County Sheriff's Department soon after."

- "A couple of years ago Gary Pentis, who was the Chief of Police in Ojai at the time, made me aware of the problems. We then began working with VCBH and the S.A.F.E. Coalition."

Others were moved to action following presentations made by VCBH and law enforcement. One interviewee participated in the Ventura County Social Host policy advancement process based on involvement with the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition. Another (i.e., a concerned parent who had written a letter to the editor regarding home parties) was contacted by VCBH/Ventura County Limits and invited to participate in the process. About half of the interviewees became involved within about one year prior to the ordinance actually being passed, the remainder had been working for a couple of years in Ojai and/or Fillmore as part of their local data gathering process.

Motivation to Participate. In response to what motivated interviewees to participate in efforts to pass a Social Host Ordinance, interviewees most often said something relative to the fact that they understood the need for an additional tool to deal with underage drinking, particularly in home settings. Three of the respondents also mentioned having teenage children and were personally motivated about the idea of the ordinance being a way to reduce access to alcohol for young people. Another theme evidenced in the responses was motivation out of knowledge of the consequences associated with underage drinking. One interviewed stated, "I see the significant consequences, especially for young people. For example, unwanted pregnancies, dropping out of school, sexually transmitted diseases, etc. I know that home parties can get really big and know about the connection to sexual assault. I also know that individual educational efforts were ineffective and that the environmental approach seemed very promising. I had always heard stories about parents providing alcohol to kids."

Activities to Promote Passage of the Ordinance. Some of the more common activities mentioned by those involved in the ordinance development/passage process included meeting with elected officials and civil leaders and partnering with others (e.g., VCBH/Ventura County Limits, law enforcement, County Supervisor Long, local coalitions in Ojai and Fillmore) involved in the process. Additional activities included:

- Discussing content of the ordinance (e.g., level of fines, etc.);
- Working with attorneys involved in writing the ordinance;
- Speaking publicly about the problems associated with underage drinking (e.g., through a local conference and conducting presentations with key decision makers);
- Demonstrating a need for the ordinance and framing the relevant issues; and
- Working with members of the media.

VCBH also supported the development of the Model Social Host Ordinance document that was used in developing language for the County's Social Host Ordinance. One interviewee also mentioned that her work involved letting people know that "Kids do not know boundary lines, for example where Ojai and Fillmore end, so we need a regional/countywide ordinance."

Level of Collaboration and Strongest Allies. In order to gain a sense of the level of collaboration involved in the process, interviewees were asked to indicate which groups/agencies and individuals they had worked with directly to develop and pass the countywide ordinance. Of the seven persons interviewed, all of them worked with between

2 and 11 other groups/agencies or persons to accomplish their work. Table 3 depicts the number of persons who indicated that they had worked with each of a list of groups/agencies to advance the countywide Social Host Ordinance.

**Table 3. Community Collaboration to Develop and Pass the Ventura County SHO
(Total of 7 Respondents)**

Worked with Directly to Advance the SHO	Agency or Group
✓✓✓✓✓	Ventura County Behavioral Health/Ventura County Limits
✓✓✓✓✓	Law Enforcement
✓✓✓	Members of City Council
✓✓✓✓✓	City or County Officials
✓✓	School District Personnel
✓✓✓✓✓✓	Concerned parents
✓✓✓✓✓	Concerned youth
✓✓✓✓	Community members (other than concerned parents/youth)
✓✓✓✓✓✓	Community-based organizations/local coalitions
✓✓✓✓✓	Members of the media
✓✓	Other (PIRE)

Key informants also were asked who, or which agencies/groups, they considered to be the strongest allies in the Social Host Ordinance development/adoption process. Those most frequently mentioned were: the Ventura County Sheriff’s Department, Ventura County Board of Supervisors, VCBH/Ventura County Limits, and local community coalitions. An additional ally mentioned was the attorney who wrote Ventura County Social Host Ordinance.

Opposition. All of the key informants indicated that there was no organized opposition to the ordinance. However, a number of respondents indicated that there was some initial resistance. For instance, parents/community members who were fearful about the ordinance crossing the line of privacy rights. Another mentioned that some teens were opposed. Overall, there were a few Letters to the Editor written and one person spoke up at a community meeting citing concerns that they believed that the ordinance was encroaching on their personal rights and freedoms. Interviewees also noted that the opposition was quashed once people began to fully understand the true purpose of the ordinance.

Policy Process

In order to better understand how the Social Host Ordinance went from an idea to adoption and implementation, a series of questions were asked. Some of the types of things assessed were the steps involved in the policy development/passage process, the length of time involved between policy development and passage, whether a particular model was used to facilitate drafting the ordinance, what the key factors were in helping to get the ordinance passed, who the most influential persons or groups were in the actual passage of the ordinance, and whether any obstacles were encountered along the way.

Steps involved in the Development/Passage of the Ventura County Social Host Ordinance.

Key informants were asked to provide a list of steps taken that led up the development and passage of the County’s Social Host Ordinance. Some of the more common

themes and general agreed upon steps were: identifying/documenting the need through collected data, forming a group of committed individuals to lead the initiative, and putting a sample ordinance together and bringing it forward to the County Board of Supervisors. Several respondents noted the importance of the strong alliance consisting of VCBH/Ventura County Limits, Ventura County Sheriff's Department, the County Board of Supervisors Office, and members of local coalitions. Others pointed out the need for ongoing community education/presentations and media throughout the process.

Length of Time to Policy Passage. The Ventura County Social Host Ordinance first went to the County Board in December 2005 and was adopted in April 2006. According to interviewees, initial work on the Ventura County Social host Ordinance began in early 2004.

Use of the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance. All of the key informants that were involved in helping to draft the sample ordinance agreed that they had used the Model Social Host Liability Ordinance publication. Everyone (100%) also agreed about its usefulness. A few select remarks about the VCBH/PIRE Model Ordinance included:

- "It was extremely useful."
- "Very useful and much easier that we had a framework to work from."
- "Yes, we used it and it was very critical."

One interviewee pointed out that while the Model was seminal to the development of the ordinance, also very important was the Ventura County Sheriff's Department's keen attention to what the ordinance stated, as well as the Attorney's experience, expertise, and willingness to ensure that the final ordinance covered all of the essential components.

Factors Critical to Policy Passage. Interview respondents were asked what the most critical factors were to actually helping to pass the countywide ordinance. Common themes noted among responses were strong relationships and having the full support of the County and the Ventura County Sheriff's department. Particular relationships mentioned were between VCBH/Ventura County Limits and law enforcement and the County Supervisor's Office. Also mentioned were the relationships held by law enforcement around the county (with the contract and non-contract cities). Some of the comments made were:

- "Having the County Supervisor's Office strong support."
- "Social philosophy and law enforcement's philosophy holding hands. It brought common sense and balance to this being a useful tool."

Other factors listed as critical were drafting a comprehensive but fair ordinance and having it passed already in the cities of Ojai and Fillmore.

Influential Persons/Groups Contributing to Policy Passage. The most frequently named groups or persons affecting the actual passage of the ordinance were County Supervisor Long's Office, the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, and VCBH. Other influential contributors named were the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition, the Alcohol and Drug Advisory Board, County Commission, and a reporter for the local newspaper who had written multiple articles regarding the Social Host Ordinance initiative in Ventura County.

When asked whether there was a particular person that could be identified as a "champion" of the policy advancement process, respondents indicated that it had been a collaborative effort

yet many pointed to County Supervisor Long, Chief Deputy Geoff Dean of the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, Division Manager Kathy Staples of the Ventura County Behavioral Health Department, and Program Administrator Dan Hicks of VCBH/Ventura County Limits. A couple of respondents also mentioned Mayor Rae Hanstad of Ojai and Ruth Cooper of the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition as "local champions."

Obstacles/Challenges. When asked whether they had encountered any obstacles or challenges in developing or attempting to pass the ordinance, only a few respondents provided examples. Others said that there were really no obstacles "just working through things." Two respondents mentioned a need to fine-tune the language in the ordinance (e.g., specific to landlords). One noted the need to educate the public to overcome fears about any violation of personal rights. Another respondent indicated that work needed to be done to help overcome "the complete and total denial of parents about the problem."

Strategies Used to Respond to Challenges. Strategies employed to respond to or address challenges included: putting together press kits and press releases, providing data on the problem through presentations/meetings and fact sheets, having discussions and showing data on the problems associated with underage drinking, asking parents with teenage children to speak and share their experiences pertaining to underage drinking parties, ensuring that appropriate levels of legal research had taken place so that the ordinance would stand up under scrutiny, and talking through the issues as they arose.

Improving the Policy Process. When asked whether there was anything that could have made the policy advancement process proceed more smoothly, 100% of the respondents said "no." Many remarked about how well the process went. One individual commented on the need to "tread lightly" when dealing with local governments in a countywide effort.

Satisfaction with Outcomes

Several questions were included in the interview protocol to measure how similar the adopted ordinance was to prior drafts, as well as overall levels of satisfaction with the final adopted ordinance. Because the ordinance had already passed by the time the interviews were conducted, key informants also were asked to share any evidence they had thus far relative to whether the Social Host Ordinance was having its intended outcome.

Similarity of Adopted Ordinance to Early Drafts. All of the respondents that had been involved and seen early drafts of the ordinance agreed that it was very similar to what was adopted. They also agreed that the language of the adopted ordinance reflects the original intent of the Social Host Ordinance.

Satisfaction with the Ordinance as Written. All of the key informants agreed that they were satisfied with the language of the ordinance that had been adopted, including its fine of \$1,000 for violators. When asked whether they would recommend any changes to the ordinance, all said "no." One of the respondents pointed out that a strength of the ordinance was an option for underage violators to pay the fine or commit to community service.

Evidence of Impact. The most common response offered when asked about initial evidence of impact was "only anecdotal information so far." Several respondents mentioned that they know that citations have been written (i.e., it is being enforced) and that "kids know about it." One respondent commented, "I think it is going to take some time with consistent enforcement. We

are seeing some promising short-term things though.” Another individual felt that the more media coverage that it receives, the more it will begin to have a greater impact.

Looking Ahead

Based on the activities engaged in and lessons learned thus far, questions were asked of key informants to obtain insights that could inform VCBH/Ventura County Limits moving forward, and perhaps prove useful to other municipalities or counties considering the adoption of a Social Host Ordinance to reduce underage drinking. Specifically, respondents were asked about the factors that will be necessary for the ordinance to achieve its intended purpose, whether they will continue to be involved, what kinds of “success criteria” key informants hold, what advice they would offer to another city or county considering a similar initiative, and whether they felt that the community needed to be “prepared” in order to adopt the ordinance.

Factors Necessary for Success Moving Forward. Key informants were asked to list factors that they believed were necessary for the Ventura County Social Host Ordinance to be effective over time. The most frequent responses were continued public education and outreach, consistent enforcement, and media attention. Some of the specific comments offered by interviewees were:

- “We need increased media attention and community awareness that the ordinance exists and is being enforced.”
- “People need to see that it’s being enforced. See it in the paper.”
- “It is dependent on law enforcement to make sure it’s applied on an ongoing basis. Also, we need media exposure on its use.”

One of the interviewees also mentioned a need for more parent involvement, stating that, “I think more parent involvement is crucial. I still don’t think parents are taking things with their kids seriously. I don’t think they realize that by letting drinking take place in their homes, they are taking someone else’s child in their hands. I am always saying this, but I think that these days, parents are trying to be too cool and be friends with their kids, when what kids really need is supervision.”

One interviewee also mentioned a need for additional information about the ordinance in Spanish. Two other indicated factors needed were: (1) ongoing training and understanding for new patrol officers on how to enforce the ordinance and (2) annual reports to the Commission about the number of violations issued and data on relevant trends.

When asked whether they would have a role moving forward, all but one respondent said that they would. Some of the kinds of things that they planned to be involved in were: continuing to make sure things happen, looking for additional public education opportunities, developing media pieces, continuing relationships with law enforcement, sharing data to show how the ordinance is having an impact, ensuring that its enforced, staying involved with the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition, and setting good examples for their own kids.

Indicators of Success. Respondents were asked how they would know that the Social Host Ordinance is working or has made an impact. A number of responses were provided. Most often, respondents spoke about seeing reductions in the related statistics (i.e., decreases in the number of parties – particularly large parties, reductions in the associated problems of underage drinking, reduced numbers of “party calls for service” to law enforcement) and data indicating

that the ordinance is being enforced. Other “indicators of success” mentioned less frequently were:

- When norm shifts start occurring.
- When parents stop giving their kids alcohol.

One interviewee said that, for him, an important indicator will be, “When I hear from young people that Ventura County is different from other areas relative to being able to party easily. It might not be until 2008-09 though.”

Advice for Others Desiring to Implement a Similar Ordinance. When asked for suggestions to assist the implementation of a similar initiative in another city/county, the most common answer by far was to bring people together – including local coalitions, city/county officials, law enforcement, schools, youth, parents, and organizations that know the effects of binge/underage drinking. Other comments included:

- “Having data is key. Statistics mobilize when you can show them that this really is an issue.”
- “Have a Model Social Host Ordinance – a legal document.”
- “Get one or two elected officials involved early on in the process.”
- “I would also tell parents to set good examples and provide guidance for their kids, because when they are teenagers is when they need guidance the most.”
- “I would tell them that they definitely should do it. They should institute it and not close their eyes to what’s happening among kids.”
- “I would tell them to put a Social Host Ordinance in place. But also, I would keep them informed that there are other preventive factors involved when dealing with alcohol use among youth. The Social Host policy is just one part of the plan.”
- “Figure out the local needs. Don’t take on more than you can chew. Start small.”
- “Get your people, your data, do your community organizing and needs assessment so you are ready. Then the aim is to make sure you know what you are shooting for, don’t get it co-mingled with anything else. Be specific about the target. If you want a cost-recovery ordinance, make it that way.”
- “Find out what your problems are and whether other people care about it. I feel that one of the reasons we were successful in Ventura County is because we didn’t follow exactly the footsteps of others. We spent a great deal of time figuring out what our local needs were and crafted a strategy that was directly responsive to and included our local communities.”

Community Readiness. Interviewees were asked whether they felt that the community needed to be “prepared” in order to support the adoption of a Social Host Ordinance, and if yes, what types of things needed to happen to help the community become ready for such a policy. All of the informants agreed that “yes” there were community readiness activities that needed to occur. One of the most common responses was the need to educate communities about what the ordinance is and is not – letting the public know what it’s purpose is and what it is intended for. Also mentioned was the need to clarify and make certain that people know that the Social Host Ordinance is “not some new power for police to come kick in the door.” Many also mentioned the importance of informing parents and city officials about how frequently police respond to underage parties involving alcohol and the percentage of juvenile crime victims in which they (or their perpetrator) were under the influence of alcohol. Getting parents involved

was also seen as an important piece in helping to “prepare” the community to adopt the Social Host Ordinance.

Some of the types of strategies used in Ventura County to communicate to parents, youth, and elected officials were: media coverage, formal presentations, meetings, publications put out by VCBH/Ventura County Limits, and less formal dialogue (word of mouth). A final comment summarizing the usefulness of having engaged in efforts to “prepare the community” was, “Once they understood it, they all were accepting of it.”

VIII. SOCIAL HOST ORDINANCE ENFORCEMENT

Key Informant Interview Data – Law Enforcement Addendum

The following includes a summary of responses to items asked only of law enforcement personnel during key informant interviews.

Participants. Five high-ranking law enforcement personnel were interviewed to obtain information and their perceptions regarding enforcement of the Social Host Ordinance. All (100%) of the law enforcement personnel identified for the interviews agreed to participate. Four of the interviewees were either current or former Chiefs of Police in Ojai or Fillmore. The additional representative was a Chief Deputy of the Ventura County Sheriffs Department, who has oversight for all of the contract cities throughout Ventura County, including the cities of Ojai and Fillmore.

All of the law enforcement personnel interviewed had played a role in the Social Host Policy advancement and/or enforcement process, and two were specifically named “champions” of the policy process by other interviewees. All of the law enforcement personnel interviewed are members of the Ventura County Limits Law Enforcement Collaborative.

Departmental Support. Law enforcement was asked whether their department had supported passage of the Social Host Process. A unanimous “yes” was the response. One interviewee reported, “Our Chief Deputy really pushed it. He continues to be very supportive of it.”

Operational Steps/Procedures Put in Place Regarding Enforcement. The Ventura County Sheriff’s Department developed and distributed a departmental policy laying out patrol procedures for the enforcement of the ordinance. One interviewee also noted that the Chief Deputy put out a Memo regarding enforcement, and stated, “You can’t put a new ordinance on the books that is this important without having policies in place to support it.” In addition to the Ventura County Sheriff’s Department policies/procedures, the current Chiefs of Police (in both Ojai and Fillmore) reported that they also have their own guidelines to support enforcement in their local jurisdictions.⁹ When asked whether “particular officers” are assigned to enforcement, all of the interviewees stated that everyone who works patrol enforces it.

Potential Barriers to Consistent Enforcement. Law enforcement was asked whether they could foresee any potential barriers to enforcement. The most common response centered on the need to keep enforcement of the ordinance a priority. One officer reported, “I don’t think there are any barriers. We just need to keep it in the forefront of officers’ minds.” Another indicated, “I don’t see any barriers. However, we do need to keep it a priority and need to use it properly. We don’t want a situation where we have a good law, but poor enforcement. We need to use it for what it was designed to accomplish and should do press releases when its used to let the public know that it really is being used. It gives credibility to the ordinance.” One officer indicated that although it was not necessarily a barrier to enforcement, the requirement of five underage youth needing to be present for the enforcement of the municipal ordinance was something to consider, given that the county ordinance only requires two minors to be present. He also mentioned that time will tell about any challenges encountered in collecting fees when citations are written.

⁹ Law enforcement from the Ojai and Fillmore stations are responsible for enforcing their respective municipal and the Ventura County Social Host Ordinances.

Indicators of Successful Enforcement. When asked how the county will know whether enforcement is working, a comment summarizing most of the responses was, “When we see repeat calls for service, particularly to the same location, going down.” Two additional frequently mentioned responses were: (1) fewer underage parties and (2) reductions in related criminal activity, such as sexual assault.

Ordinance Violation Statistics

Between June 2006 and early January 2007, at least one Social Host Ordinance violation had been issued in each of the targeted case study regions.¹⁰

During this timeframe, a total of six violations were issued in the City of Ojai, half of which were issued to males between the ages of 18 and 23. The three violations issued to females were to persons either 18 or 19 years old. The size of parties ranged from five to more than 50 attendees.

Only one ordinance violation was issued in Fillmore. The citation was written in November 2006 to a 19-year-old male. He was cited for serving alcohol to minors at a party consisting of six individuals.

Five Social Host Ordinance violations were issued in the following areas of Ventura County unincorporated: Oak View, Oak Park, and Meiners Oaks. Interestingly, two of the violations were issued to the same individual in the Ojai Valley – a 19-year-old male with a history of calls for service related to underage parties. This person received two Social Host Ordinance violations during the same month in the summer of 2006. The three additional citations issued were to two females (one age 17 and the other age 19) and one male (age 21). Of note, all three of these citations occurred for parties ranging in size from 50 to 100 attendees.

For our case study regions, all of the persons receiving Social Host violations were age 21 or younger. Additionally, of the 23 total ordinance violations written in the entire county over the past seven months, only three were written to persons older than 25 years of age – suggesting that often the adults who are providing alcohol to underage persons are peers more often than parents. It is possible, however, that younger “hosts” have been caught more frequently than older adults/parents.

¹⁰ In addition to a total of 12 citations issued for Social Host Ordinance violations in the three targeted case study regions, data received from the Ventura County Sheriff’s Department confirm that an additional 11 ordinance violation citations were issued between June 2006 and early January 2007 in other municipalities within Ventura County that currently have a Social Host Ordinance in place.

IX. SUMMARY

VCBH/Ventura County Limits and their collaborative partners are ahead of schedule relative to formal consideration and passage of Social Host Ordinances in Ventura County. Two of their objectives were to have at least eight municipalities formally consider a Social Host Ordinance by September 15, 2006, and by September 1, 2007, have six municipalities adopt or enact improved policies for managing problematic underage drinking environments. As of January 2007, VCBH/Ventura County Limits has facilitated the adoption/enactment of eight Social Host Ordinances countywide, three of which are in Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County Unincorporated.

An area where VCBH/Ventura County Limits is somewhat behind schedule is the development of coordinated media campaigns to accompany policy adoption (promulgation of new policies/enforcement). While a significant amount of media advocacy/education work was done during the policy advancement process, media education efforts are still needed to support community awareness in regions that now have a Social Host Ordinance in place.

Fidelity to the CMCA Model

To date, VCBH/Ventura County Limits has effectively implemented many of the core aspects of the CMCA model including assessment of current policies and extent of the problem in each targeted community, gathering together a group of passionate and committed citizens to lead their intended policy change efforts, core leadership groups who were able to build citizen involvement in support of policy change, implementation of an action plan, institutionalizing policy changes, and evaluation of such changes. A significant amount of time also was spent by VCBH/Ventura County Limits in helping to build skills among local coalition members, developing media, and making available additional resources/tools such as a Model Social Host Ordinance to support policy advancement.¹¹

Process Evaluation Research Questions

Several process-related evaluation research questions were developed to shape the data collection process for the policy advancement Case Study/Process Evaluation component of our overall SIG evaluation research design. The following section provides answers to each of the questions posed.

- *Who and what processes/steps were involved in the passage of Social Host policies in the three targeted regions (Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County)?*

Local coalitions drove the Social Host policy advancement process in Ojai and Fillmore; namely, the Ojai S.AF.E. Coalition and Fillmore Family Coalition. The Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition was comprised of members of law enforcement, city and county government, local schools, concerned parents and community residents. The Fillmore Family Coalition was comprised primarily of concerned youth and families from the community; however, the Fillmore Family Coalition also worked closely with the city council, mayor, county government, local schools, churches and businesses to push the policy process forward. A core group of representatives

¹¹ For a step-by-step summary of VCBH/Ventura County Limits' efforts to effect policy change consistent with the CMCA model see "Section VI. Strategies Used to Advance Policy in Ventura County."

from the Ventura County Sheriff's Department, County Supervisor's office, and VCBH/Ventura County Limits served as champions of the Ventura County Social Host Ordinance. Members of the Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition also assisted in helping to pass the countywide Social Host Ordinance. Of note, VCBH/Ventura County Limits provided key technical assistance, training, funding, and other resources in support of the Social Host policy advancement process in all three regions.

Similar processes were used to pass Social Host policies in Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County. The first step involved data collection/assessment to determine the specific issues and problems that coalitions/regions were facing relative to underage and binge drinking. Across regions, initially through anecdotal evidence and then confirmed through survey data and law enforcement statistics, large unruly house parties (i.e., where youth were accessing alcohol from adults) emerged as a core problem with serious consequences. Law enforcement's perspective stating that they currently lacked an effective tool to hold adults responsible for providing alcohol to minors was an additional key in suggesting that Social Host Ordinances could be an effective solution to known underage drinking problems.

The next step involved garnering community support and, ultimately, community mobilization. Activities used to develop public buy-in included media campaigns, pamphlets delivered door-to-door, public presentations at schools and in front of policymakers, word of mouth, letters, and other data sharing strategies to let the community know about the extent of the problem. Generating support through public education and awareness efforts was successful in that the communities not only became aware of the problems associated with underage drinking, but also learned that the Social Host Ordinance could be an effective tool for enhancing community safety and well being. Community organizing efforts generally were the result of VCBH/Ventura County Limits funded coalitions in Ojai and Fillmore. Key leaders and decision makers, working with VCBH/Ventura County Limits, took responsibility for community education and policy advocacy efforts relative to the Ventura County Social Host Ordinance. It was interesting to note that the core group of individuals involved in the passage of the Ojai and Ventura County Social Host Ordinances was made up of law enforcement, city officials and policy makers, and some community residents. In contrast, the Fillmore Family Coalition consisted of youth, community residents/parents, and leaders of community-based/faith-based organizations. Rather than including city officials in their initial community organizing efforts, the Fillmore Family Coalition brought information to the city and to law enforcement once initial community mobilization work had taken place. This difference is important, as both approaches were successful in their efforts despite those who led the data collection and community mobilization efforts.

Once initial community support was obtained, coalitions addressed local policymakers and requested that a Social Host Ordinance be developed and adopted. Providing data about the problem and coupling that with a tool to help address the problem appeared to make a serious impact on the ability of policy makers to agree relatively quickly about adopting a Social Host Ordinance. In each case study region, the use of the Model SHO provided by PIRE/VCBH was advantageous in helping the communities adopt an ordinance that incorporated lessons learned from other counties/regions. In fact, once the Model Ordinance was provided to attorneys responsible for finalizing the language comprising the ordinances, the actual completion of the final draft for the first reading and ultimately, adoption of the ordinance, occurred within a period of only a few months.

- *Were there any challenges or opposition encountered? If yes, what steps were taken to address/overcome them?*

Challenges and opposition to the Social Host Ordinance were similar across regions with one exception. Only in Fillmore was law enforcement reported as a challenge early on in the process, as the perception was that law enforcement was burdened with other serious crimes (e.g., gang violence) and could not participate in the process. However, law enforcement eventually came on board and once the Fillmore City Council was engaged in the process, law enforcement was in full support of the ordinance.

In all three case study regions, citizens and some policymakers initially voiced concerns about privacy and personal freedoms. Some believed that the Social Host Ordinance would allow law enforcement to infringe on their privacy rights. There also was a concern, particularly in Fillmore, that families could no longer celebrate traditions consistent with their culture. Despite these initial concerns, public education efforts letting communities know of the true purpose and intended outcomes of the Social Host Ordinance served to quiet most, if not all, of the opposition to the new policy. One additional shared challenge was development of the appropriate language for the ordinances. Those involved did not want to write an ordinance that could be challenged or that posed problems for enforcement. Having the Model Ordinance from PIRE/VCBH, along with extensive due diligence on the part of city and county attorneys, served to make sure that the ordinances were legally sound and reflective of local needs.

- *What related media activities/events took place to support community-wide awareness and acceptance of the policies?*

Common media activities included the use of newspaper articles and editorials to engage the community in a discussion about the Social Host Ordinance. In all three regions, newspaper print articles were used to document youth alcohol use, its negative consequences, and the need for the Social Host Ordinance. Also, presentations were made to school boards and City Councils about how the ordinance could address youth alcohol problems. Coalitions were encouraged to use the press as much as possible, and VCBH/Ventura County Limits created press kits and fact sheets that could be used to educate the community. Overall, data were typically incorporated into media to demonstrate the need for the ordinance. There is a continued need to educate the community about the Social Host Ordinance and VCBH/Ventura County Limits is in the process of developing a media campaign to further educate the community about the new ordinances.

- *Have agencies (e.g., law enforcement) accepted responsibility for enforcement? Has key staff been assigned for enforcement? Have operational steps/procedures been put in place for enforcement?*

The Ventura County Sheriff's Department served as a key participant in the passage of the Social Host Ordinances in each of the three case study regions. In fact, law enforcement was commonly referred to as one of the champions of the ordinance, particularly in Ojai and Ventura County. One of the most senior ranking law enforcement personnel within the Sheriff's Department is in full support of the ordinance, and has taken steps to ensure that the ordinance is enforced and that enforcement tracking/monitoring takes place locally (in each station for the Sheriff's Department contract cities) and countywide. Interviews with former and current Chiefs of Police in Ojai and Fillmore confirm that they understand and support responsible enforcement

of the Social Host Ordinance. All patrol officers are assigned to enforcement, meaning that every patrol officer can enforce the ordinance. Each of the case study regions (Ojai, Fillmore, and Ventura County unincorporated) have had at least one citation issued during the past seven months. Moreover, a total of 23 Social Host Ordinance violations have been issued between June 2006 and early January 2007 (i.e., across all eight of the municipalities/regions that have an adopted Social Host Ordinance in Ventura County). A Social Host Ordinance Enforcement Protocol was developed and distributed to communicate policies/procedures relative to enforcement of the ordinance. Additionally, the current Chiefs of Police in Ojai and Fillmore also have their own local protocols and enforcement monitoring processes in place.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are provided to facilitate the continued achievement of VCBH/Ventura County Limits stated goals and objectives, and are based on information gleaned through the Social Host Ordinance Case Study/Process Evaluation activities to date.

- **Develop and implement a targeted media plan to increase public awareness regarding adopted Social Host Ordinances.**

While the current study focused only on the three regions that were first to pass Social Host policies in the county, five other municipalities also have successfully adopted Social Host Ordinances in Ventura County. It is vital to provide continued education about the intent of the ordinance and its associated consequences if violated. Thus far, there have been no systematic messaging efforts to let the public know about adopted ordinances. The Social Host Ordinances were developed both as a tool to hold hosts accountable for underage drinking and as a deterrent to adults who provide alcohol to minors. In order to be a successful deterrent in the community, both adults and youth need to know about the consequences for hosting parties where youth are given access to alcohol.

VCBH/Ventura County Limits also should ensure that their media plan and corresponding collateral materials and events are available both in Spanish and English. VCBH/Ventura County Limits may also want to consider assessing public awareness of the ordinance prior to the implementation of a media campaign and again after the campaign is in place to determine the effectiveness of their efforts communicating Social Host related messages to the public.

- **Consider revising municipal ordinances so that they are consistent with the requirements of the countywide ordinance.**

Ventura County is comprised of 10 cities that are surrounded by large, rural unincorporated areas that fall under the jurisdiction of the Sheriff's Department. In addition, the Sheriff's Department is contracted with five municipalities to provide law enforcement services. Ventura County's Social Host Ordinance has the strictest criteria for violation of the ordinance (i.e., the presence of two underage youth). Municipalities, such as Ojai and Fillmore, require five youth in order to issue a violation. Modifications to municipal ordinances to make them more consistent with the requirements of the countywide ordinance may assist law enforcement with Social Host Ordinance enforcement, particularly among those police departments responsible for enforcing both the municipal and countywide ordinances.

- **Create additional opportunities and forums for peer learning in support of underage and binge drinking prevention.**

Over the past two years, VCBH/Ventura County Limits has provided peer-learning activities for community coalitions and others interested in addressing underage and binge drinking in Ventura County. They sponsored a local "Municipal Strategies Conference," funded coalition members and law enforcement to attend a national conference on the enforcement of underage drinking laws and youth alcohol use prevention, and gathered all of the conference attendees together for a post-conference briefing to share lessons learned and encourage continued collaboration among participants. These types of activities serve to foster an environment where individuals countywide (from varying perspectives and municipalities) can educate one another about effective alcohol prevention strategies and enforcement activities in their own

communities. Ideally, it is anticipated that these types of forums will support ongoing dialogue among elected officials, law enforcement, coalition members, and others from different areas within the county.

Providing an environment where members of the Ventura County Limits Collaboratives can learn from one another and perhaps inspire discussion of related issues (e.g., alcohol outlet density, alcohol retail policies, impaired driving, etc.) could lead to the development of additional policies to augment/support Social Host Ordinances already in place. Sharing information about the impact of Social Host Ordinances also would be important to validate efforts already expended and to assist in motivating communities to look for additional ways to prevent the harms associated with youth alcohol consumption. Moreover, these types of opportunities could assist key individuals in municipalities where responsible alcohol policies and practices may not yet exist. Peer learning events could take the form of conferences, workshops, trainings or presentations sponsored by VCBH/Ventura County Limits.

Appendix A. Key Informant Interview Protocol

Informed Consent and Overview

[THIS IS TO BE READ VERBATIM TO EACH INTEVIEWEE PRIOR TO THE START OF THE INTERVIEW]

Thank you in advance for your willingness to participate in this series of key informant interviews. This is one component of the evaluation of Ventura County's binge and underage drinking prevention efforts. Your time and input is greatly appreciated.

This evaluation is being carried out by EVALCORP Research & Consulting, an independent applied research firm contracted by the Ventura County Behavioral Health Department for the purpose of measuring the implementation and impact of Ventura County Limits/Ventura County Behavioral Health Department's strategic binge and underage drinking prevention initiative.

The project is funded through a grant from the state of California and Ventura County Behavioral Health Department's Alcohol and Drug Prevention Division.

Please note that your participation is voluntary. Also, all of the information collected through the interviews will be reported in aggregate form -- nothing you say will be quoted or attributed to you without your express permission.

The interview is expected to take about an hour to complete.

Do you have any questions of me before we begin?

Proceed to begin interview →

**Regional Social Host Policy Evaluation
Key Informant Interview Protocol**

Date: _____ Interviewer Initials: _____
 Respondent: _____ Title/Rank: _____
 Agency: _____ Department: _____

City/Region: ___ Fillmore ___ Ojai ___ Ventura County Unincorporated

I. Need/Intended Purpose of the Ordinance

1. From your perspective, why was there a need for a Social Host Ordinance in [name of city/region]?
2. As you understood it, what was the intended purpose of the Social Host Ordinance?
3. How much time do you think it will take to achieve that purpose?

II. Role and Involvement with the Passage of the Social Host Ordinance

1. How did you first become involved with the Social Host initiative? When did you first start participating in the development/passage of the Social Host Ordinance?
2. What motivated you to participate in efforts to pass a Social Host Ordinance in [name of city/region]?
3. What was your role or task in promoting passage of the Social Host Ordinance in [name of city/region]? (*probe: what are some examples of the types of things you did to support the development/passage of the SHO*)
4. What individuals/groups/agencies did you work with directly to develop and pass the Social Host Ordinance? (check all that apply)

- _____ Ventura County Behavioral Health Dept/Ventura County Limits
- _____ Law enforcement
- _____ Members of City Council
- _____ Elected Officials (County Supervisors, Mayor, etc.)
- _____ School district personnel
- _____ Concerned parents
- _____ Concerned youth
- _____ Community members (other than parents/youth)
- _____ Community-based organizations/agencies
- _____ Members of the media
- _____ Other (specify _____)

5. Were any of the above (that you worked with directly) members of either the Law Enforcement, Municipal, Higher Ed, or Community Collaboratives established through the Ventura County Limits partnership?
6. Who, or which agencies/groups, do you consider to be the strongest allies in the SHO policy development/adoption process in [name of city/region] ?
7. Were there any critics or opponents to the SHO? If yes, who? Why were they opposed?

III. Policy Process

1. Please describe the steps involved in the development/passage of the Social Host Ordinance in [name of city/region].
2. How long did it take from the time the ordinance was drafted to the time of passage?
3. Did you use/refer to the *Model Social Host Liability Ordinance* (i.e., developed by the Study of Law and Enforcement Policy, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 2005 for the Ventura County Behavioral Health Department/Ventura County Limits) in drafting the SHO in [name of city/region]? If yes, how useful was it?
4. What were the most critical factors in getting the SHO ordinance passed in [name of city/region]?
5. Who were the most influential persons/groups that affected the passage of the ordinance? What factors contributed to their level of influence?
6. Is there a particular person who you would describe as a champion of the SHO being developed and passed in [name of city/region]?
7. What obstacles/challenges were experienced in developing and passing the ordinance?
8. How were those obstacles/challenges overcome or what attempts were made to address them?
9. Is there anything you feel that could have made the policy development/adoption process proceed more smoothly? (*probe: need for greater resources, more coordination/cooperation, too much opposition, things were tried that didn't work, etc.*)

IV. Satisfaction with Outcomes

1. How similar is the ordinance that passed to the initial (or earlier) drafts?
2. Do you think that the language in the ordinance that was adopted reflects the original intent? If not, what is different?
3. Are you satisfied with the ordinance as it is written? Are you satisfied with the violation fee structure? If not, what changes do you recommend?

4. Do you have any evidence at this time that the ordinance is having its intended outcome/impact? Please explain.
5. Upon passage of the SHO, did the City Council/County Supervisors make enforcement of the ordinance a priority for the police/sheriff's dept?

V. Looking Ahead

1. Looking ahead, what factors do you believe are necessary for the Social Host Ordinance to be effective (i.e., achieve its intended purpose)?
2. Will you have a role in these factors? If so, what will your role be?
3. How will you know that the Social Host Ordinance is working or has made an impact?
4. What advice would you give to another city/county/region to help them pass the same or a similar ordinance?
5. Did you feel that the community had to be "prepared" to support the adoption of a Social Host Ordinance? If yes, what types of things needed to happen in order to help get the community "ready" to adopt the policy?

VI. Participation in Ventura County Limits Collaboratives

1. Do you (or did you) participate in the Ventura County Limits **Law Enforcement Collaborative**? If yes, what is the primary purpose of the collaborative? How often do you meet? Has this Collaborative contributed to the passage, implementation, and/or enforcement of the Social Host Ordinance in [name of city/region]? If yes, in what ways?
2. Do you (or did you) participate in the Ventura County Limits **Higher Education Collaborative**? If yes, what is the primary purpose of the collaborative? How often do you meet? Has this Collaborative contributed to the passage, implementation, and/or enforcement of the Social Host Ordinance in [name of city/region]? If yes, in what ways?
3. Do you (or did you) participate in the Ventura County Limits **Municipal Collaborative**? If yes, what is the primary purpose of the collaborative? How often do you meet? Has this Collaborative contributed to the passage, implementation, and/or enforcement of the social host ordinance in [name of city/region]? If yes, in what ways?
4. Do you (or did you) participate in the Ventura County Limits **Community Collaborative**? If yes, what is the primary purpose of the collaborative? How often do you meet? Has this Collaborative contributed to the passage, implementation, and/or enforcement of the Social Host Ordinance in [name of city/region]? If yes, in what ways?

Law Enforcement Addendum
[FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT KEY INFORMANTS ONLY]

1. Did your department support passage of the SHO? Please explain.
2. What operational steps or procedures have been, or will be, put in place for enforcement of the Social Host Ordinance? (*probe: ask if it is possible to review copies of any memos, briefs, etc. communicating about SHO*)
3. Has enforcement of the SHO been assigned to particular officers?
4. Have any SHO violations been issued? (*probe: how many to date, when did enforcement begin*)?
5. What might be some potential barriers to consistent/effective enforcement of the SHO?
6. How do you think the County will know whether enforcement is working?

Appendix B. Document Review

Sources Used to Inform Document Review

- Prevention File Magazine, Ventura County Edition, Spring 2005
- Prevention File Magazine, Ventura County Edition, Summer 2005
- Prevention File Magazine, Ventura County Edition, Fall 2005
- Prevention File Magazine, Ventura County Edition, March 2006
- Prevention File Magazine, Ventura County Edition, July 2006
- Prevention File Magazine, Ventura County Edition, October 2006
- *Underage and Binge Drinking: Selected Findings from a Telephone Survey of Ventura County Residents*, G. Robinson (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department Publication, 2005)
- *Circumstances of Drinking Prior to DUI Arrest Among Persons 18 to 25 Years of Age in Ventura County*, G. Robinson, S. Osborn, and D. Hicks (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department Publication, 2005)
- *Model Social Host Liability Ordinance with Legal Commentary*, Center for the Study of Law and Enforcement Policy, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department Publication, 2005)
- *Alcohol Use Among Community College Students: Selected Findings from the Ventura County Community College District Student Survey*, K. Donovan and J. Slay (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department Publication, 2006)
- Ventura County Sheriff's Department Patrol Services Division Standard Operating Procedure, Subject: Handling of Social Host Ordinance Calls (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Sheriff's Department, June 1, 2006)
- Ventura County Facts and Figures – Underage Drinking and Home Parties
- Ventura County Limits Fact Sheet: Underage Drinking in Ventura County
- Ventura County Limits Fact Sheet: Public Opinion in Ventura County on Underage Drinking and Policy Strategies
- "Adult Accountability for Underage Drinking: The Case for Social Host Laws" (Ventura County Limits Publication, June 2005)
- *Ventura County Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, Prevention Strategic Plan*, K. Staples and S. O'Hara (May, 1996)
- "The Community Leaders Conference: Selected Local Research Findings," G. Robinson (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department, PowerPoint presentation)

- “The Community Partnership to Prevent Binge and Underage Drinking,” K. Staples (Ventura, CA: Ventura County Behavioral Health Department, PowerPoint presentation)
- Ordinance No. 788 “An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Ojai, California Imposing Fines and Costs for Hosting Gatherings of Underage Drinkers”
- Ordinance No. 06-790 “An Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Fillmore, California Imposing Fines and Costs for Hosting Gatherings of Underage Drinkers”
- Ordinance No. 4343 “An Ordinance of the Ventura County Board of Supervisors Imposing Fines, Costs, and Other Consequences for Hosting Gatherings of Underage Drinkers”
- Ojai S.A.F.E. Coalition Monthly Reports to Ventura County Behavioral Health Department (December 2003 to June 2006)
- Fillmore Family Coalition Monthly Reports to Ventura County Behavioral Health Department (July 2003 to May 2006)
- SAMHSA Model Programs “Communities Mobilizing for Change on Alcohol,” U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Center for Substance Abuse Prevention
- Ventura County Limits State Incentive Grant Quarterly Progress Reports, Grant No. SIG 04-03 (October 1, 2005 to September 30, 2006)

Appendix C. Media Output Tracking

Type Code	Content Code	Name of Media Outlet	Date	Headline or Description	Placement (ex: columns)	Notes
8	8	Ojai Valley News	2002	Local doctor sees 'surprising increase' in OxyContin overdoses		Ojai Drug-related injury
8	8	Ojai Valley News	11/29/02	Family deals with drug-related havoc		Ojai Drug related injury
8	8	Ojai Valley News	11/29/02	Girl's path leads from OxyContin to rehab		Ojai Valley Underage Drug-use
2	8	Ojai Valley News	11/29/02	The truth about drugs and Ojai's youth		Ojai Valley Underage Drug-use
3	1	Ojai Valley News	12/02	Abuse denial weakening with recent drug-suspected deaths		Ojai Valley
4	8		12/16/03	Join the effort to end drug abuse		Ojai Valley Substance-abuse
8	8	Los Angeles Times Ventura County Edition	11/14/02	Apparent overdose death evidence of growing threat	B1, B9	Ojai Valley Drug-related death
8	1	Ojai Valley News	05/03/03	S.A.F.E. identifies drug hot spots		Ojai Valley
8	7,8	Ojai Valley News	04/07/04	Methamphetamine use a 'real shocker'	A-1, A-3	Illegal drug use
3	7	Ojai Valley News	04/09/04	Q&A with Ojai Police Chief Gary Pentis		Ojai, interview with G. Pentis
8	1	Fillmore Gazette	06/29/04	Fillmore Family Coalition addresses alcohol issue		Fillmore
8	1,7,8	Ojai Valley News	07/02/04	OUSD approves policy on drugs	A-1,A-3	Ojai, school district takes action against illegal drug use
8	1	Fillmore Gazette	08/26/04	Host ordinance shows history of success	A-1	Fillmore
8	9	Prevention File	Fall 2004	Playing it safe in Ojai	Pg. 7	Ojai drug death leads to community action
8	8	Ojai Valley News	09/03/04	Ojai joins national crime hotline	A-1,A-3	Ojai Valley, Community action
8	7	Ventura County Star	09/07/04	Ojai Valley crime tip hotline unveiled	B1, B2	Ojai Valley
8	1,8	Ojai Valley News	09/08/04	SAFE Coalition gears up for drug-reduction campaign		Ojai Valley, Community action
8	7,8	Ojai Valley News	09/10/04	Cops hope tips will stem drug crisis	A1,A4	Ojai Valley, drug overdose

Type Code	Content Code	Name of Media Outlet	Date	Headline or Description	Placement (ex: columns)	Notes
8	1	Join Together Online	09/20/04	Parents take risk in holding student drinking parties at home		Online Article for jointogether.org
8	7,8	Ventura County Star, Ventura Edition	09/20/04	Charges against teen's friends raise issue of responsibility	A1, A6	Ventura, illegal-drug related death
8	5,8	Ventura County Star	09/22/04	County earns funds to fight binge drinking		SIG funding
8	5,8	Ventura County Star	09/27/04	County gets grant to fight binge drinking	B1	SIG funding
8	2	Ventura County Star	10/14/04	Open container law ruled unconstitutional	B1,B2	Ventura Alcohol policy
8	8	Ventura County Star	10/31/04	Affluent teens' drug use up	B1,B2	
4	1	Ojai Valley News	11/01/04	Ojai youth making right choices		Ojai
8	4	Ventura County Star	11/02/04	Cooperation helps		Ojai Valley, Community Action
3	7,8	Ojai Valley News	11/05/04	Drug-sniffing dogs keep schools drug-free		Ojai Valley Law Enforcement, underage drug use
8	7,8	Ojai Valley News	11/12/04	Dogged Determination		Ojai Valley Law Enforcement, Underage drug use
8	7,8	Ventura County Star	12/18/04	Nordhoff High brings in drug-sniffing dogs	B1, B2	Law Enforcement, Underage Drug-use
9	6		2005	The easiest place for kids to get beer		
8	2	Ojai Valley News	2005	Ojai group seeks liability for party hosts of underage drinkers		Ojai
3	4	Los Angeles Times	2005	Reckless youths		13 year old Devin Brown stole a car and was shot by police
8	6	Ventura County Star	2005	County kids say booze is prevalent	B1	
8	6,8	Ventura County Star	2005	Group gathers ideas to curb drinking	B1,B2	
8	2	Ventura County Star	02/05	Ojai group seeks liability for party hosts of underage drinkers		Ojai
3	2	Ventura County Star	02/24/05	Taking aim at teen drinking	B8	Ojai Valley
8	6,7	Ojai Valley News	03/05	Council	A-3	Campus drinking

Type Code	Content Code	Name of Media Outlet	Date	Headline or Description	Placement (ex: columns)	Notes
4	2	Ojai Valley News	03/08/05	Ojai needs Social Host Ordinance		Ojai
8	7	Ojai Valley News	03/25/05	Council eyes law on parties		Gary Pentis departs
8	8	Ojai Valley News	04/01/05	Say it ain't so, Joe		Community Action
8	6,8	Ojai Valley News	04/27/05	SAFE successful in first two years		Community action
8	1	Fillmore Gazette	04/28/05	Fillmore youth attend alcohol awareness in Oxnard		Fillmore Family Coalition
4	6	Ojai Valley News	06/20/05	Lack of options invites disaster		Letter warning against SAFE approach
4	6	Ojai Valley News	07/06/05	Drinking Denial		
4	5,6	Ojai Valley News	07/06/05	Stern warning		Providing Alternatives for teenagers
4	5	Ojai Valley News	07/08/05	Alcohol abuse not right for minors		
4	5,6	Ojai Valley News	07/08/05	Alcohol abuse not right for minors		Parents need to wise up about the dangers of alcohol use
8	5	Ojai Valley news	07/08/05	SAFE warns parents about teen drinking		
4	2	Ojai Valley news	07/13/05	Drinking thinking change SHO goal		Ojai
4	6	Ojai Valley News	07/20/05	Addictions prey on Ojai youth		
8	1,7	Ojai Valley News	08/26/05	Alcohol sting nets four local arrests		Study about increase in favorable attitudes towards law enforcement
8	7	Ojai Valley news	09/23/05	Kids' best friend		Drug sniffing dogs
3	6	Ojai Valley News	10/12/05	Beyond our doorsteps	A-5	
8	2	Ojai Valley News	11/11/05	Teenage drinking targeted	A-1, A-3	Ojai
8	2	Ventura County Star	12/07/05	Strict law urged to fight alcohol parties	B1, B2	County Unincorporated
8	2	Los Angeles Times	12/24/05	Putting a cork in teen parties		Ojai
8	2	Los Angles Times	12/07/05	Study of 'Social Host' laws gets ok	B1	County Unincorporated

Type Code	Content Code	Name of Media Outlet	Date	Headline or Description	Placement (ex: columns)	Notes
8	2	Ventura County Star	04/05/06	Underage drinking party hosts face fines	B2	County Unincorporated
4	2	Ventura County Star	04/05/06	Support Social Host law	B13	County Unincorporated
3	2	Ventura County Star	04/09/06	Corking teens use of alcohol Social Host good measure	B9	County Unincorporated
4	2	Ojai Valley News	04/12/06	Fine examples set for violators		Ojai Valley
8	3	Ojai Valley News	04/14/06	Liquor clerks fare well in beer sting		Ojai Valley
4	2	Ventura County Star	04/14/06	Social Host Ordinance great	B9	County Unincorporated
1	2	Ventura County Limits Website	04/18/06	County house party law will help stop unruly underage drinking gatherings		Ojai, Fillmore, County Unincorporated
8	2	Ventura County Star	04/19/06	Hosts of underage drinkers face fines	B1	County Unincorporated
8	6,7	Ojai Valley News	05/17/06	Police curb preserve partying	A-1,A-8	Ojai Valley
9	6	Ojai Valley News	06/07/06 06/23/06 06/28/06	Did you know the party is at your house?		
8	2	Ventura County Star	06/30/06	Authorities cite hosts of underage drinking	B3	SHO Enforcement – Ojai
8	2,7	Ojai Valley News	07/05/06	Two social host cities issued	A-1,A-7	Ojai, Fillmore
3	2	Ventura County Star	07/19/06	Youth drinking ordinances save lives and money	B11	Ventura County
8	2	Ojai Valley News	03/31/06	Beer nearing end at softball games?		Ojai
8	2	Ventura County Star	03/29/06	County backs party-giver fines	B6	Ojai Valley
8	2	Los Angeles Times	03/29/06	Party may be over for 'cool' parents	B1	Ojai, Fillmore, County Unincorporated
8	2	Ventura County Star	02/12/06	Party may be over for Ojai teenagers	B1	Ojai
8	2	Ventura County Reporter	02/09/06	Ojai – bringing the smack down on underage drinking		Ojai
9	6,8			Ojai sees reduction in teen drinking parties		Ojai community action

Type Codes:	Content Codes
1 News release 2 Media advisory 3 Opinion piece 4 Letter to the Editor 5 Media event 6 Radio news story	7 TV news story 8 Print news story 9 Public Service Announcement 10 Other (note in summary) 1 General alcohol 2 Alcohol policy – party host (note city in Summary) 3 Alcohol policy – retail alcohol (note city in Summary) 4 Alcohol related injury 5 Binge drinking 6 Underage drinking 7 Law enforcement 8 Other (note in Summary)

Appendix D. Copies of Ordinances
