

**Title of Intervention:** Drinking and Driving Prevention in the Community

**Intervention Strategies:** Campaigns and Promotions, Provider Education, Environments and Policies

**Purpose of the Intervention:** To reduce alcohol-related crashes

**Population:** General population

**Setting:** Communities in Southern California, Northern California and South Carolina; community-based

**Partners:** Local community officials, law enforcement, citizens groups such as MADD, business leaders, licensed beverage industry representatives

**Intervention Description:**

- Campaigns and Promotions: This strategy included news coverage, sobriety check points, media events and DUI news coverage.
- Provider Education: Participants received training on assessing impaired drivers and/or media advocacy training.
- Environments and Policies: The communities increased enforcement of driving under the influence through increasing number and frequency of sobriety checkpoints and creating of special DUI patrols dedicated to apprehending impaired drivers.

**Theory:** Not mentioned

**Resources Required:**

- Staff/Volunteers: Local law enforcement
- Training: Not mentioned
- Technology: Not mentioned
- Space: Rooms for education sessions
- Budget: Not mentioned
- Intervention: Media, news coverage, sobriety checkpoints, DUI patrols, training materials
- Evaluation: Survey, telephones, traffic/accident data

**Evaluation:**

- Design: Cross sectional
- Methods and Measures:
  - Perceived risk of DUI arrest and self reported drinking and driving occurrences was obtained through random digit dialing telephone surveys of adults
  - Alcohol-related traffic crashes were recorded from accident reports

**Outcomes:**

- Short Term Impact: There was an increase in public perceived risk. Northern California and South Carolina sites had statistically significant reductions in drinking and driving reports.
- Long Term Impact: There was a reduction in alcohol-related crashes.

**Maintenance:** Not mentioned

**Lessons Learned:** The intervention was done in two different states with drastically different legislation concerning DUI violations, therefore the intervention cannot be generalized. Increased DUI news coverage and increased DUI enforcement levels brought about an increased perceived risk of arrest and decreased self-reports of drinking and driving.

**Citation(s):**

Voas, R. B., H. D. Holder, et al. (1997). "The effect of drinking and driving interventions on alcohol-involved traffic crashes within a comprehensive community trial." *Addiction* 92 Suppl 2: S221-36.

Voas, R. B. (1997). "Drinking and driving prevention in the community: program planning and implementation." *Addiction* 92 Suppl 2: S201-19.