Alcohol License Overview for Chippewa County

Chippewa County, Wisconsin, and United States Data on Alcohol Licensing

Municipal governments in Wisconsin have the ability and authority to control the number and location of alcohol outlets in their community. This report provides a summary of current research on outlet density and a numerical overview of the number of alcohol outlets by municipality and county. The number and location of alcohol outlets has a significant impact on the social and economic welfare of the community.

Produced by: the State of Wisconsin Department of Health Services, Division of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services, Bureau of Prevention Treatment and Recovery and the University of Wisconsin Law School, Resource Center on Impaired Driving, Wisconsin Alcohol Policy Project.
Available at: http://www.dhs.wisconsin.gov/substabuse/alcdensity.htm

[July, 2012]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Outlet Density: Limiting the Concentration of Retailers Selling & Serving Alcohol in Your Community 1

Glossary of Terms 8

Alcohol License Overview for Wisconsin 9

Alcohol License Overview for Chippewa County 17

Alcohol License Overview for Chippewa County Municipalities 20

Appendix 1: Alcohol License Overview for the United States 25

Appendix 2: Regulation of Alcohol Outlet Density Summary Evidence Table 29

Endnotes 38

Outlet Density: Limiting the Concentration of Retailers Selling & Serving Alcohol in Your Community

In Wisconsin, municipalities control many of the factors shaping the local alcohol environment. Because municipalities issue alcohol licenses, municipal government has control over the number and type of establishments selling and serving alcohol, as well as whether sales are concentrated in one area or spread throughout the community. Issues relating to the number and location of alcohol outlets are often referred to as "outlet density" issues or "density" issues.[i] In this report, alcohol outlet density refers to the number of licensed locations selling alcohol beverages within a municipality or other defined area. A glossary of terms found on page 8 defines several terms used in this document.

Overview of alcohol outlet density:

The number, size and location of the retailers that sell alcohol for consumption elsewhere (known as off-premises or Class A licenses in Wisconsin) or consumption within the location the alcohol is purchased (known as on-premises or Class B licenses) have a significant impact on both the character and economic future of a community.

Independent research documents a relationship between a high concentration of licensed outlets selling alcohol and levels of alcohol-related crime and disorder.[ii] This research has evolved into detailed analyses of outlet concentration in different nations, states and communities and the range of predictable consequences (for a list of research that has been done in this area, see Appendix 2). In 2007, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommended communities limit alcohol outlet density in an effort to reduce alcohol related harm.[iii]

Increases in civic disorder, crime and violence resulting from over-concentrations can occur even when all licensees are responsible businesses. While poorly managed licensees can exacerbate alcohol related problems, an over concentration of alcohol licensees, even well operated establishments, can result in alcohol related problems. The municipal procedures and guidelines, or the lack of guidelines, used to award licenses will impact community character and municipal finances. Law enforcement, emergency responders and jail costs are major factors in most municipal budgets: alcohol-related disorder contributes to higher municipal costs.

Even recognizing the different measures and systems involved, it is clear Wisconsin has a significantly higher number of alcohol outlets than other states. There are approximately 330 residents for each alcohol outlet, based on reports from the Wisconsin Department of Revenue. National estimates show approximately one outlet for every 1,400 residents.[iv] Overall, Wisconsin has more outlets than the average by a factor of four.

Wisconsin also leads the nation, or ranks near the top, in several measures of alcohol consumption including; the number of adults who report binge drinking in the past month, the number of drinks consumed per binge drinking occasion[v] and the number of adults (18 and older) reporting that they consumed alcohol and drove at least once in the past year.[vi]

Alcohol Licensing and Density

All alcohol use occurs within the larger context of the community. The number, location and operation of licensees have a dramatic impact on the community alcohol environment. It is more prudent and economical for a community to deny an application than address the consequences of over-concentration or poor operation. Reducing outlet density is difficult and time consuming. Community safety and economic development are well served by planning and the careful review of all license applicants.

The cities of Madison and Racine have partial density limits targeting their local alcohol related problems. Each community approach targeted a specific concern; in Madison, the proliferation of alcohol outlets near the UW Madison campus and in Racine, the large number of locations licensed for off-premises alcohol sales. In both communities, limitations on additional alcohol outlets were part of broader plans to prevent and reduce alcohol related problems. Both communities adopted ordinances to prevent or limit the number of additional outlets recognizing a municipal ordinance establishing a ceiling or a numerical limit on the number of licensees is more stable than political agreement.

What problems do density limits address?

Researchers have documented the relationship between concentrations of alcohol retail outlets and social problems such as drunk driving, alcohol related injuries, violence, and property crime.[vii] Over-concentrations of alcohol outlets also create quality of life concerns, sometimes called amenity issues, such as late night noise, garbage, public urination, and minor vandalism. This is especially true where residential areas are adjacent to licensees. Some research indicates off-premises outlets (Class A outlets in Wisconsin) may be a factor in domestic violence.[viii]

How does a density limit work?

Wisconsin Statutes do not limit the number of off-premises (Class A) retail licenses or Class B on-premises licenses limited to beer. The statutory license “quota” sets the number of on-premise licenses for beer, wine and distilled spirits, informally referred to as “Class B Combination” licenses to approximately 500 residents per license with numerous exceptions and special circumstances.

Limiting the number of outlets that sell and serve alcohol avoids two related situations. First, reducing the overall availability of alcohol reduces the overall amount of alcohol consumed, even among heavy drinkers.[ix] Second, limiting the number of retailers reduces the likelihood of drink specials or other price cutting promotional strategies that encourage dangerous drinking. Price cutting is a likely result of over-concentration which forces retailers to compete through aggressive pricing. Drink specials featuring discounted alcohol are known to contribute to dangerous drinking, sometimes called binge drinking.[x]

Even if a community froze the number, size, and location of outlets immediately, reductions in alcohol related problems would be gradual. Limitations on outlet density can achieve results over time. Like many alcohol related problems, no single policy or remedy can resolve all the problems associated with an over concentration of alcohol outlets.

Critical situations requiring an immediate response may respond to lower density but cannot replace immediate interventions. In 2006, Madison experienced several high profile incidents on and near State Street that were resolved by both the increased presence of law enforcement and the adoption of an ordinance placing strict limits on additional alcohol licenses in the area. Madison intervened to resolve the immediate issue at significant municipal expense and then took further steps to address the underlying over concentration of alcohol outlets.

Define the density problem in your community.

Communities will experience alcohol related problems when a large number of licensed establishments sell and serve within a confined geographic area. Density problems will occur in a community even in the absence of "problem" licensees. Local information can help you determine whether your community has reached a concerning concentration of alcohol outlets.

1. Before beginning, ask local police if crime and violence maps for the community are available. Many police departments have access to mapping software. Community coalitions can create a Google map of all the licensed establishments in your community. Designate Class A (retail outlets) licensees differently than Class B licensees (taverns and restaurants that serve alcohol) on the map (for example: red vs. blue dots). If you have access to arrest/crime and crash maps, combine or create overlays to consider the relationship between outlet density and law enforcement involvement.

2. Ask local law enforcement agencies about the amount and location calls for service or disturbances for issues such as underage drinking, impaired driving, property destruction, robbery, and assaults. For example: how many local police calls for service are alcohol-related?

3. Ask police to identify “hot spots” that have both a disproportionate number of alcohol outlets and a disproportionate number of alcohol related problems.

4. Review traffic reports or speak with law enforcement officers familiar with local traffic patterns to determine if motor vehicle incidents occur in that area, and if alcohol is a contributing factor.

As you conduct this research, be alert for trends in police, emergency room admissions, and other data indicating your community is at a saturation point for alcohol outlets. Be prepared to demonstrate how you determined a density problem exists in your community - or a portion of your community - and a compelling argument for swift action.

Will reducing outlet density reduce alcohol related problems?

There is ample evidence that increasing outlet density increases alcohol related problems. Studies conducted in Norway (2000), California (2005), New Jersey (2001), Boston (2003), and Baton Rouge (2001) indicate a general relationship between the presence of a large number of establishments that sell and serve alcohol and increased levels of harmful alcohol related consequences.

Experts believe capping and then reducing the number of alcohol outlets in your community will reduce the number of alcohol related problems. It is important to pair practices that can address the results of over-concentration -- such as increased police presence, saturation patrols, or age compliance checks -- with community efforts to reduce outlet density. Limiting density alone will not resolve many immediate situations; it is a long term strategy.

How should a community approach limiting outlet density?

There is no right to an alcohol license in Wisconsin. A municipality may deny a new application for any reason that is not discriminatory or arbitrary, as long as the rationale is provided in writing to the applicant.[xi] Municipalities may establish a numerical ceiling by ordinance, a moratorium, or simply refrain from issuing additional licenses. A moratorium on new licenses would lower density over time as licenses are surrendered, moved to a new location within the community, non-renewed or revoked.

For example, if an over-concentration of retail alcohol outlets triggers an increase (or perceived increase) in underage drinking, the community may wish to limit or cap the number of Class A licenses. If recent experience suggests problems result from an over-concentration of “Class B” licenses, a moratorium on additional licenses or similar limits on new licensees using license conditions may work best.

Why limit alcohol outlet density through ordinance and not a political agreement or adopting an internal policy?

Adopting or modifying a municipal ordinance is more time consuming and difficult than political or organizational agreements but, it is far less vulnerable to repeal or amendment in the long run.

Political agreements will reflect changes in the political climate and composition of the governing body, changing over time. Once an ordinance is enacted, it becomes part of the status quo, and change requires a majority vote of the governing body (city council or village board).

How does a community construct a density ordinance; what are the options?

A community may adopt broad or very narrow limitations on additional alcohol licenses. State statutes require municipalities to provide the reason for license denials in writing but do not establish any criteria for that determination.

For example, a municipality can:

- Create a numerical cap on the number of off-premise outlets in a specific geographic area. Convenience stores, gas stations, and drug stores often sell alcohol, as an additional source of revenue. Such outlets often employ young, low-wage workers who may be susceptible to requests from friends and other youth looking to purchase alcohol illegally.

- If your community believes the sale of gasoline and alcohol at a single location is incompatible, the municipality may adopt guidelines or an ordinance prohibiting the sale of gasoline by Class A licensees or adopt guidelines against issuing alcohol licenses to locations selling gasoline.

- Create a numerical cap on the total capacity (occupancy) for licensed establishments within a geographic area, that is, a ceiling on the maximum number of patrons the community wants to be in all licensed Class B establishments at one time. Clearly four licensees with a licensed occupancy of 500 each will generate more problems than four licensees limited to 100 customers each.

- Communities may establish a maximum occupancy for any Class B license when it is issued. Often, communities use the maximum number of patrons determined by the fire inspector to establish a maximum occupancy, but communities may set lower limits on capacity when issuing an alcohol license.

Ask local law enforcement about the total number of people allowed in licensed establishments. Is local law enforcement able to handle the level of calls for service in the area or are other jurisdictions regularly called upon for assistance? A barometer of total capacity might be the number and type of police calls at closing hour (bar time) when multiple outlets close simultaneously. Is there sufficient sidewalk capacity for the departing patrons or are individuals forced into the streets?

- Cease issuing or limit the number of Class B on-premise licenses, but allow additional licenses to be issued to restaurants. It is essential to define restaurants clearly, perhaps by the percentage of annual revenue generated from food sales as a condition of all licenses, then assign responsibility for making that determination to a specific agency or individual. There is a national trend in restaurants turning their establishments into a bar or club after food service ends. Remember, a club and a restaurant require the same alcohol licensing, "morphing" from restaurant to club is easy.

- Require a specific portal to portal distance between licensed outlets. For example, amend municipal ordinances to require a distance of 1,000 feet between the entrances of licensed establishments. (1000 feet = 0.189393 mi)

- Enforce existing statute 125.68(3)(b) which prohibits licensed outlets within 300 feet of a school, hospital or church building.

How can a coalition initiate the public dialog on outlet density?

Effective advocacy on alcohol licensing issues requires a thorough understanding of local licensing procedures. The first step is learning how your community issues, renews and disciplines alcohol licenses. While municipalities have the statutory authority to issue alcohol licenses, each community creates its own system for reviewing, approving, and disciplining licenses. The Wisconsin Alcohol Policy Project has a checklist to guide your research on local license procedure available at:

http://law.wisc.edu/wapp/index.html?iSec=dffb632116d8cf63798ed551e260926f&iNetID=jsherman2&iTime=1325865007 {Wisconsin Alcohol Policy web site}

It is important to determine the committees, governing bodies and individuals who review license applications, the role of local law enforcement and finally, the timing of each step. These discussions are open public meetings under the requirements of Wisconsin's open meetings and open records laws. The internet makes keeping abreast of meetings and agendas much easier, but regular review of pending applications is essential to learning and monitoring the process.

Often a committee of the Village Board or City Council conducts the initial review before making a recommendation to the full Council or Board. Some communities appoint citizen members to license review committees, and some governing bodies choose to conduct all aspects of review themselves. Regardless, these meetings are public and bound by open meeting and open record laws.

Once you understand the local licensing system and gather the data and the maps described earlier, you are prepared to work with local elected officials and other concerned residents to consider the over-concentration of alcohol outlets. A carefully considered outlet density policy and ordinance can support responsible local licensees while enhancing the community quality of life.

Glossary of Terms

Alcohol Outlet: A business licensed by the municipality for either on-premise or off-premise consumption. Any entity providing alcohol *to the public* must be licensed in Wisconsin even if alcohol sales are not the primary business or alcohol provided without charge to customers.

Alcohol Outlet Concentration/Clustering: A significant number of alcohol outlets within a small defined area in comparison to other measures.

Alcohol Outlet Density: The number of physical locations in which alcoholic beverages are sold or served within a community, usually measured as outlets per population, land mile, or road mile.

Outlet Capacity: The number of patrons allowed in an establishment at one time. Local building codes will limit the number of individuals that can safely occupy a building. Alcohol licensees may have a lower occupancy number established at the time of issuance.

Class A Licenses: Class “A” beer fermented malt beverage licenses allow retail sale of fermented malt beverages (beer) for consumption off the premises (examples: grocery or convenience stores). “Class A” alcohol licenses allow retail sale of distilled spirits (including wine) for consumption off the premises (examples: liquor stores or grocery stores selling both beer and distilled spirits), and Class A beer/Class A liquor (includes wine) – off-premises sales.

Class B Licenses: Class "B" fermented malt beverage licenses allow retail sale of fermented malt beverages (beer) for consumption on premises and limited off premises sales by local ordinances. (Examples: restaurants, "beer bars."), "Class B" licenses allow retail sale of distilled spirits (including wine) for consumption on the premises.

Class C Licenses: "Class C" wine (on-premises sale), licenses allow the sale of wine for consumption only on the premises and allow the carryout of a single opened (resealed) bottle if sold with a meal.

Alcohol License Overview for Wisconsin

Data in this section are taken from multiple data sources. The most recent data is presented for 2011-2012. Population estimates are from the Wisconsin Department of Administration (DOA) and are based on 2011 estimates.

Land area in square miles estimates are from the U.S. Census Bureau 2010 http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55000.html. Land area does change from year to year, but usually not by significant amounts. Therefore, data is presented from the most reliable data taken in the Census year.

Municipal clerks annually report the number of alcohol licenses to the Wisconsin Department of Revenue (DOR). There is a difference between the number of licenses issued and the number of establishments issued licenses. Some establishments may be issued more than one type of license and some clerks do not provide information on the license type issued to an establishment. Analysis based on license number alone will inflate the number of establishments' serving or selling alcohol in the area. **For the purposes of this report, "Alcohol Licenses Issued" refers to the number of establishments holding a license.**

Alcohol licenses in Wisconsin are issued at the municipal level. Data is presented here on a county-wide basis, using the municipal information provided to the DOR for all 72 Wisconsin counties.

Table 1: People per License by Wisconsin County

County	2011 Population	Population rank w/i state	2011 - 2012 Licenses issued	People per License	Ppl/Lic rank w/i state*
Adams	20,935	50	100	209.4	27
Ashland	16,064	60	115	139.7	10
Barron	45,925	30	163	281.7	40
Bayfield	15,036	64	150	100.2	4
Brown	249,192	4	662	376.4	59
Buffalo	13,620	67	84	162.1	14
Burnett	15,448	62	97	159.3	13
Calumet	49,109	29	128	383.7	60
Chippewa	62,610	24	228	274.6	38
Clark	34,719	41	141	246.2	36
Columbia	56,850	26	179	317.6	48
Crawford	16,600	58	96	172.9	17
Dane	489,331	2	1,110	440.8	69

County	2011 Population	Population rank w/i state	2011 - 2012 Licenses issued	People per License	Ppl/Lic rank w/i state*
Dodge	88,789	17	277	320.5	49
Door	27,765	45	248	112.0	7
Douglas	44,176	33	210	210.4	28
Dunn	43,787	34	109	401.7	63
Eau Claire	99,012	16	241	410.8	66
Florence	4,337	71	43	100.9	5
Fond du Lac	101,740	15	307	331.4	52
Forest	9,180	68	83	110.6	6
Grant	51,280	28	202	253.9	37
Green	36,884	39	108	341.5	56
Green Lake	19,091	55	89	214.5	30
Iowa	23,720	48	101	234.9	33
Iron	5,828	70	89	65.5	1
Jackson	20,475	53	99	206.8	24
Jefferson	83,794	20	277	302.5	44
Juneau	26,725	46	136	196.5	22
Kenosha	166,632	8	400	416.6	67
Kewaunee	20,594	52	104	198.0	23
La Crosse	114,919	13	324	354.7	57
Lafayette	16,880	57	81	208.4	25
Langlade	19,901	54	116	171.6	16
Lincoln	28,668	44	154	186.2	20
Manitowoc	81,406	21	288	282.7	41
Marathon	134,414	10	410	327.8	51
Marinette	41,719	36	227	183.8	18
Marquette	15,392	63	71	216.8	31
Menominee	4,202	72	14	300.1	43
Milwaukee	948,369	1	1,960	483.9	70
Monroe	44,877	31	132	340.0	55
Oconto	37,723	38	196	192.5	21
Oneida	35,962	40	259	138.8	9
Outagamie	177,455	6	491	361.4	58
Ozaukee	86,530	18	215	402.5	64
Pepin	7,461	69	47	158.7	11
Pierce	41,085	37	121	339.5	54
Polk	44,244	32	159	278.3	39
Portage	70,370	23	227	310.0	46
Price	14,000	66	102	137.3	8

County	2011 Population	Population rank w/i state	2011 - 2012 Licenses issued	People per License	Ppl/Lic rank w/i state*
Racine	195,225	5	504	387.4	61
Richland	18,045	56	54	334.2	53
Rock	160,287	9	326	491.7	71
Rusk	14,703	65	90	163.4	15
Sauk	61,951	25	277	223.6	32
Sawyer	16,600	59	201	82.6	2
Shawano	41,954	35	228	184.0	19
Sheboygan	115,569	12	369	313.2	47
St. Croix	84,503	19	198	426.8	68
Taylor	20,681	51	99	208.9	26
Trempealeau	28,905	43	137	211.0	29
Vernon	29,849	42	102	292.6	42
Vilas	21,444	49	240	89.4	3
Walworth	102,485	14	334	306.8	45
Washburn	15,900	61	100	159.0	12
Washington	132,206	11	322	410.6	65
Waukesha	390,267	3	760	513.5	72
Waupaca	52,392	27	214	244.8	35
Waushara	24,531	47	102	240.5	34
Winnebago	167,245	7	426	392.6	62
Wood	74,669	22	232	321.8	50
Totals	**5,694,236**		**17,298**	**329.4**	

*Ranked from 1-72, the county ranked #1 has the fewest people per license in the state (65.5). The county ranked #72 has the most people per license in the state (513.5).

Table 2: Licenses Issued per 500 People by Wisconsin County

County	2011 Population	2011 - 2012 Licenses issued	Licenses/ 500 People	Lic/ 500 Ppl rank w/i state*
Adams	20,935	100	2.4	24
Ashland	16,064	115	3.6	8
Barron	45,925	163	1.8	38
Bayfield	15,036	150	5.0	4
Brown	249,192	662	1.3	59
Buffalo	13,620	84	3.1	11
Burnett	15,448	97	3.1	11
Calumet	49,109	128	1.3	59
Chippewa	62,610	228	1.8	38

County	2011 Population	2011 - 2012 Licenses issued	Licenses/ 500 People	Lic/ 500 Ppl rank w/i state*
Clark	34,719	141	2.0	35
Columbia	56,850	179	1.6	45
Crawford	16,600	96	2.9	16
Dane	489,331	1,110	1.1	69
Dodge	88,789	277	1.6	45
Door	27,765	248	4.5	6
Douglas	44,176	210	2.4	24
Dunn	43,787	109	1.2	63
Eau Claire	99,012	241	1.2	63
Florence	4,337	43	5.0	4
Fond du Lac	101,740	307	1.5	51
Forest	9,180	83	4.5	6
Grant	51,280	202	2.0	35
Green	36,884	108	1.5	51
Green Lake	19,091	89	2.3	30
Iowa	23,720	101	2.1	33
Iron	5,828	89	7.6	1
Jackson	20,475	99	2.4	24
Jefferson	83,794	277	1.7	42
Juneau	26,725	136	2.5	22
Kenosha	166,632	400	1.2	63
Kewaunee	20,594	104	2.5	22
La Crosse	114,919	324	1.4	57
Lafayette	16,880	81	2.4	24
Langlade	19,901	116	2.9	16
Lincoln	28,668	154	2.7	18
Manitowoc	81,406	288	1.8	38
Marathon	134,414	410	1.5	51
Marinette	41,719	227	2.7	18
Marquette	15,392	71	2.3	30
Menominee	4,202	14	1.7	42
Milwaukee	948,369	1,960	1.0	70
Monroe	44,877	132	1.5	51
Oconto	37,723	196	2.6	21
Oneida	35,962	259	3.6	8
Outagamie	177,455	491	1.4	57
Ozaukee	86,530	215	1.2	63

County	2011 Population	2011 - 2012 Licenses issued	Licenses/ 500 People	Lic/ 500 Ppl rank w/i state*
Pepin	7,461	47	3.1	11
Pierce	41,085	121	1.5	51
Polk	44,244	159	1.8	38
Portage	70,370	227	1.6	45
Price	14,000	102	3.6	8
Racine	195,225	504	1.3	59
Richland	18,045	54	1.5	51
Rock	160,287	326	1.0	70
Rusk	14,703	90	3.1	11
Sauk	61,951	277	2.2	32
Sawyer	16,600	201	6.1	2
Shawano	41,954	228	2.7	18
Sheboygan	115,569	369	1.6	45
St. Croix	84,503	198	1.2	63
Taylor	20,681	99	2.4	24
Trempealeau	28,905	137	2.4	24
Vernon	29,849	102	1.7	42
Vilas	21,444	240	5.6	3
Walworth	102,485	334	1.6	45
Washburn	15,900	100	3.1	11
Washington	132,206	322	1.2	63
Waukesha	390,267	760	1.0	70
Waupaca	52,392	214	2.0	35
Waushara	24,531	102	2.1	33
Winnebago	167,245	426	1.3	59
Wood	74,669	232	1.6	45
Totals	**5,694,236**	**17,298**	**1.5**	

*Ranked from 1-70, the county ranked #1 has the most licenses per 500 people in the state (7.6). The counties ranked #70 has the fewest licenses per 500 people in the state (1.0).

Table 3: Square Land Miles per Alcohol License by Wisconsin County

County	Sq. land miles	2011 - 2012 Licenses issued	Sq. Mile/Lic.	Sq. Mi./Lic. rank in State*
Adams	646	100	6.5	51
Ashland	1,045	115	9.1	63
Barron	863	163	5.3	38
Bayfield	1,478	150	9.9	65
Brown	523	662	0.8	5
Buffalo	672	84	8.0	59
Burnett	822	97	8.5	60
Calumet	318	128	2.5	19
Chippewa	1,008	228	4.4	34
Clark	1,210	141	8.6	62
Columbia	766	179	4.3	32
Crawford	571	96	5.9	45
Dane	1,197	1,110	1.1	7
Dodge	876	277	3.2	22
Door	482	248	1.9	14
Douglas	1,304	210	6.2	48
Dunn	850	109	7.8	56
Eau Claire	638	241	2.6	20
Florence	488	43	11.4	69
Fond du Lac	720	307	2.3	18
Forest	1,014	83	12.2	70
Grant	1,147	202	5.7	42
Green	584	108	5.4	40
Green Lake	349	89	3.9	31
Iowa	763	101	7.6	54
Iron	758	89	8.5	61
Jackson	988	99	10.0	66
Jefferson	557	277	2.0	15
Juneau	767	136	5.6	41
Kenosha	272	400	0.7	3
Kewaunee	343	104	3.3	23
La Crosse	452	324	1.4	12
Lafayette	634	81	7.8	57
Langlade	871	116	7.5	53
Lincoln	879	154	5.7	43

County	Sq. land miles	2011 - 2012 Licenses issued	Sq. Mile/Lic.	Sq. Mi./Lic. rank in State*
Manitowoc	589	288	2.0	16
Marathon	1,545	410	3.8	29
Marinette	1,399	227	6.2	47
Marquette	456	71	6.4	50
Menominee	358	14	25.5	72
Milwaukee	241	1,960	0.1	1
Monroe	901	132	6.8	52
Oconto	998	196	5.1	37
Oneida	1,113	259	4.3	33
Outagamie	638	491	1.3	9
Ozaukee	233	215	1.1	8
Pepin	232	47	4.9	36
Pierce	574	121	4.7	35
Polk	914	159	5.7	44
Portage	801	227	3.5	26
Price	1,254	102	12.3	71
Racine	333	504	0.7	2
Richland	586	54	10.9	68
Rock	718	326	2.2	17
Rusk	914	90	10.2	67
St. Croix	722	198	3.6	28
Sauk	831	277	3.0	21
Sawyer	1,257	201	6.3	49
Shawano	893	228	3.9	30
Sheboygan	511	369	1.4	11
Taylor	975	99	9.8	64
Trempealeau	733	137	5.4	39
Vernon	792	102	7.8	55
Vilas	857	240	3.6	27
Walworth	555	334	1.7	13
Washburn	797	100	8.0	58
Washington	431	322	1.3	10
Waukesha	550	760	0.7	4
Waupaca	748	214	3.5	25
Waushara	626	102	6.1	46

County	Sq. land miles	2011 - 2012 Licenses issued	Sq. Mile/Lic.	Sq. Mi./Lic. rank in State*
Winnebago	435	426	1.0	6
Wood	793	232	3.4	24
Totals	**54,158**	**17,298**	**3.2**	

*Ranked from 1-72, the county ranked #1 has the fewest square land miles per license in the state (0.1 miles/license). The county ranked #72 has the most square land miles per license in the state (25.5 miles/license).

Alcohol License Overview for Chippewa County

Data in this report are taken from multiple data sources. Population estimates for each year range are from Wisconsin Department of Administration (DOA) and are based on the first year in the year range. The 2010-2011 population estimates are from the U.S. Census Bureau. Land area in square miles estimates are from the U.S. Census Bureau 2010 http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/55000.html. Land area does change from year to year, but usually not by significant amounts. Therefore, data is presented from the most reliable data taken in the Census year.

Municipal clerks annually report the number of alcohol licenses to the Wisconsin Department of Revenue (DOR). There is a difference between the number of licenses issued and the number of establishments issued licenses. Some establishments may be issued more than one type of license and some clerks do not provide information on the license type issued to an establishment. **For the purposes of this report, "Alcohol Licenses Issued" refers to the number of establishments holding a license.**

Table 4: County Overview

Year	Population	Square Land Miles	Alcohol Licenses issued
2003-2004	57,358	1,008	198
2004-2005	59,466	1,008	199
2005-2006	60,367	1,008	207
2006-2007	60,893	1,008	209
2007-2008	61,604	1,008	215
2008-2009	61,872	1,008	215
2009-2010	62,286	1,008	222
2010-2011	62,415	1,008	221
2011-2012	62,610	1,008	228

Table 5: County People/License and Rank within the State

Year	Co. Ppl/Lic	State Ppl/Lic (Ave.)	Co. Rank w/i state*
2003-2004	289.7	348.7	41
2004-2005	298.8	342.2	43
2005-2006	291.6	337.8	41
2006-2007	291.4	334.5	40
2007-2008	286.5	329.3	42
2008-2009	287.8	329.5	42
2009-2010	280.6	332.8	40
2010-2011	282.4	329.0	42
2011-2012	274.6	329.4	38

*Ranked from 1-72, the county ranked #1 has the fewest people per license in the state (65.5). The county ranked #72 has the most people per license in the state (513.5).

Fig. 1: County People/License vs. State Average People/ License by year



Table 6: County Licenses/ 500 People Rank within the State

Year	Co. Lic/500 Ppl	State Lic/500 Ppl (Ave.)	Lic/500 ppl Rank w/i State*
2003-2004	1.7	1.4	41
2004-2005	1.7	1.5	40
2005-2006	1.7	1.5	40
2006-2007	1.7	1.5	40
2007-2008	1.7	1.5	42
2008-2009	1.7	1.5	42
2009-2010	1.8	1.5	38
2010-2011	1.8	1.5	39
2011-2012	1.8	1.5	38

*Ranked from 1-72, the county ranked #1 has the most licenses per 500 people in the state (7.6). The county ranked #72 has the fewest licenses per 500 people (1.0).

Table 7: County Square Land Miles/License and Rank within the State

Year	Co. Sq. Mile/Lic.	State Sq. Mile/ Lic. (Ave.)	Co. Rank w/i state
2003-2004	5.1	3.4	34
2004-2005	5.1	3.3	35
2005-2006	4.9	3.3	34
2006-2007	4.8	3.2	34
2007-2008	4.7	3.2	34
2008-2009	4.7	3.1	34
2009-2010	4.5	3.2	33
2010-2011	4.6	3.1	33
2011-2012	4.4	3.1	34

*Ranked from 1-72, the county ranked #1 has the fewest square land miles per license in the state (0.1 miles/license). The county ranked #72 has the most square land miles per license in the state (13.2 miles/license).

Table 8: Licenses Issued by License Type

Note: the number of licenses by type will not add up to the number of establishments issued licenses due to reporting omissions and establishments that receive more than one license type. See Glossary of terms on page 8 for definitions of each license type.

Year	# Establishments Issued Lic	# Class A	# Class B	# Class C
2003-2004	198	13	58	0
2004-2005	199	40	159	6
2005-2006	207	28	85	2
2006-2007	209	35	119	2
2007-2008	215	37	136	2
2008-2009	215	35	137	2
2009-2010	222	41	144	3
2010-2011	221	47	158	4
2011-2012	228	48	181	3

Alcohol License Overview for Chippewa County Municipalities

Table 9: Percent of County Municipalities Issued Alcohol Licenses

Year	# Mncp in Co.	# Mncp Issued Lic	% Mncp Issued Lic
2003-2004	31	30	97%
2004-2005	32	31	97%
2005-2006	32	31	97%
2006-2007	32	30	94%
2007-2008	32	31	97%
2008-2009	32	31	97%
2009-2010	32	32	100%
2010-2011	32	32	100%
2011-2012	32	31	97%

Table 10: Municipalities Not Issuing Alcohol Licenses by Year

Year(s)	Municipality	Population
2003-2004 2004-2005 2005-2006	Eau Claire – City*	1,985
2006-2007	Eau Claire – City *	2,006
	New Auburn – Village*	551
2007-2008 2008-2009	Eau Claire – City*	1,981
2011-2012	Lake Hallie - Town	163

* Municipality is located in more than one county.
Note: Population data shown are an average for the years in the “years” column.

Table 11: Municipality Licenses/500 People Rank within County and State

Municipality	Year	Population	Lic. Issued	Lic/ 500 Ppl	Rank w/i Co.	Rank w/i State^	Class A	Class B
Anson - Town	2007-2008	2,108	6	1.4	20	1,017	1	5
	2008-2009	2,114	5	1.2	24	1,152	1	4
	2009-2010	2,134	6	1.4	21	1,023	1	5
	2010-2011	2,076	6	1.4	20	1,052	1	5
	2011-2012	2,084	6	1.4	18	1,040	1	5
Arthur - Town	2007-2008	755	5	3.3	7	426	1	4
	2008-2009	758	5	3.3	7	423	1	4
	2009-2010	761	5	3.3	7	416	1	4
	2010-2011	759	6	4.0	5	331	2	4
	2011-2012	761	6	3.9	5	341	2	4
Auburn - Town	2007-2008	695	2	1.4	20	1,017	0	0
	2008-2009	717	2	1.4	20	1,022	0	0
	2009-2010	733	2	1.4	21	1,023	0	0

Municipality	Year	Population	Lic. Issued	Lic/ 500 Ppl	Rank w/i Co.	Rank w/i State^	Class A	Class B
	2010-2011	697	4	2.9	9	515	0	4
	2011-2012	696	6	4.3	4	297	0	6
Birch Creek - Town	2007-2008	533	4	3.8	4	349	0	0
	2008-2009	533	4	3.8	4	356	0	0
	2009-2010	535	5	4.7	4	24	1	4
	2010-2011	517	5	4.8	4	253	1	4
	2011-2012	518	5	4.8	2	252	1	4
Bloomer - City	2007-2008	3,488	22	3.2	8	448	6	16
	2008-2009	3,473	21	3.0	9	484	5	16
	2009-2010	3,475	20	2.9	9	494	5	15
	2010-2011	3,539	19	2.7	11	564	5	13
	2011-2012	3,541	21	3.0	9	499	6	14
Bloomer - Town	2007-2008	1,013	4	2.0	17	771	0	4
	2008-2009	1,028	4	1.9	18	800	0	4
	2009-2010	1,043	4	1.9	18	786	0	4
	2010-2011	1,050	4	1.9	17	812	0	4
	2011-2012	1,049	4	1.9	16	791	0	4
Boyd - Village	2007-2008	635	7	5.5	2	193	1	5
	2008-2009	625	8	6.4	2	143	1	7
	2009-2010	625	9	7.2	2	106	2	7
	2010-2011	552	9	8.2	2	95	2	7
	2011-2012	551	9	8.2	1	96	1	8
Cadott - Village	2007-2008	1,393	8	2.9	10	512	3	5
	2008-2009	1,391	8	2.9	10	502	3	5
	2009-2010	1,400	8	2.9	9	494	3	5
	2010-2011	1,437	7	2.4	14	649	2	5
	2011-2012	1,437	8	2.8	10	536	3	5
Chippewa Falls - City	2007-2008	13,515	29	1.1	27	1,211	0	11
	2008-2009	13,410	29	1.1	27	1,207	0	11
	2009-2010	13,470	29	1.1	27	1,203	0	11
	2010-2011	13,661	29	1.1	27	1,217	1	22
	2011-2012	13,688	28	1.0	30	1,207	0	27
Cleveland - Town	2007-2008	1,008	2	1.0	28	1,268	0	2
	2008-2009	1,027	2	1.0	29	1,261	0	2
	2009-2010	1,037	2	1.0	29	1,258	0	2
	2010-2011	864	2	1.2	26	1,162	0	2
	2011-2012	866	2	1.2	23	1,155	0	2
Colburn - Town	2007-2008	788	6	3.8	4	349	1	5
	2008-2009	792	6	3.8	4	356	1	5
	2009-2010	796	6	3.8	5	343	1	5
	2010-2011	856	6	3.5	6	409	1	5
	2011-2012	862	6	3.5	7	419	1	5
Cooks Valley - Town	2007-2008	684	3	2.2	14	698	0	3
	2008-2009	699	3	2.1	14	724	0	3

Municipality	Year	Population	Lic. Issued	Lic/ 500 Ppl	Rank w/i Co.	Rank w/i State^	Class A	Class B
	2009-2010	698	3	2.1	14	715	0	3
	2010-2011	805	3	1.9	17	812	0	3
	2011-2012	818	2	1.2	23	1,155	0	2
Cornell - City	2007-2008	1,454	9	3.1	9	473	4	5
	2008-2009	1,449	9	3.1	8	464	3	5
	2009-2010	1,459	9	3.1	8	447	4	5
	2010-2011	1,467	10	3.4	7	422	5	5
	2011-2012	1,468	10	3.4	8	430	5	5
Delmar - Town	2007-2008	970	2	1.0	28	1,268	0	2
	2008-2009	972	2	1.0	29	1,261	0	2
	2009-2010	979	2	1.0	29	1,258	0	2
	2010-2011	936	2	1.1	27	1,217	0	2
	2011-2012	944	2	1.1	28	1,207	0	2
Eagle Point - Town	2007-2008	3,186	16	2.5	12	596	2	14
	2008-2009	3,257	16	2.5	12	593	2	14
	2009-2010	3,154	16	2.5	13	590	2	14
	2010-2011	3,053	16	2.6	13	593	2	14
	2011-2012	3,066	16	2.6	13	584	2	14
Eau Claire – City*	2009-2010	2,050	3	0.7	31	1,431	2	1
	2010-2011	1,981	3	0.8	31	1,388	1	2
	2011-2012	1,980	3	0.8	31	1,382	1	2
Edson - Town	2007-2008	1,077	3	1.4	20	1,017	0	3
	2008-2009	1,094	3	1.4	20	1,022	0	3
	2009-2010	1,104	3	1.4	21	1,023	0	3
	2010-2011	1,089	3	1.4	20	1,052	0	3
	2011-2012	1,088	3	1.4	18	1,040	0	3
Estella - Town	2007-2008	503	2	2.0	17	771	1	1
	2008-2009	498	2	2.0	17	767	1	1
	2009-2010	508	2	2.0	17	752	1	1
	2010-2011	433	2	2.3	15	683	1	1
	2011-2012	430	1	1.2	23	1,155	0	1
Goetz - Town	2007-2008	744	2	1.3	24	1,083	0	2
	2008-2009	753	2	1.3	23	1,087	0	2
	2009-2010	769	2	1.3	25	1,091	0	2
	2010-2011	762	2	1.3	23	1,106	0	2
	2011-2012	765	2	1.3	21	1,097	0	2
Howard - Town	2007-2008	695	2	1.4	20	1,017	0	2
	2008-2009	693	2	1.4	20	1,022	0	2
	2009-2010	712	2	1.4	21	1,023	0	2
	2010-2011	798	2	1.3	23	1,106	0	2
	2011-2012	797	2	1.3	21	1,097	0	2
LaFayette - Town	2007-2008	5,911	14	1.2	25	1,147	3	11

Municipality	Year	Population	Lic. Issued	Lic/ 500 Ppl	Rank w/i Co.	Rank w/i State^	Class A	Class B
	2008-2009	5,935	14	1.2	24	1,152	3	11
	2009-2010	5,983	14	1.2	26	1,149	3	11
	2010-2011	5,765	13	1.1	27	1,217	3	10
	2011-2012	5,778	14	1.2	23	1,155	4	11
Lake Hallie - Town	2007-2008	156	7	22.4	1	10	0	7
	2008-2009	160	7	21.9	1	10	0	7
	2009-2010	161	7	21.7	1	7	0	7
	2010-2011	161	7	21.7	1	10	0	7
Lake Hallie - VILLAGE	2007-2008	6,132	6	0.5	31	1,545	6	0
	2008-2009	6,320	6	0.5	31	1,542	6	0
	2009-2010	6,463	6	0.5	32	1,537	6	0
	2010-2011	6,448	6	0.5	32	1,539	6	0
	2011-2012	6,534	16	1.2	23	1,155	7	9
Lake Holcombe - Town	2007-2008	1,110	12	5.4	3	200	0	0
	2008-2009	1,126	12	5.3	3	209	0	0
	2009-2010	1,178	12	5.1	3	210	0	0
	2010-2011	1,031	12	5.8	3	190	2	3
	2011-2012	1,031	10	4.8	2	252	3	7
New Auburn – Village*	2007-2008	548	3	2.7	11	556	1	2
	2008-2009	554	3	2.7	11	553	1	2
	2009-2010	558	3	2.7	12	544	1	2
	2010-2011	528	3	2.8	10	537	1	2
	2011-2012	527	3	2.8	10	536	1	2
Ruby - Town	2007-2008	470	2	2.1	15	727	1	1
	2008-2009	471	2	2.1	14	724	1	1
	2009-2010	477	2	2.1	14	715	1	1
	2010-2011	494	2	2.0	16	777	1	1
	2011-2012	489	2	2.0	14	751	1	1
Sampson - Town	2007-2008	914	7	3.8	4	349	0	7
	2008-2009	930	7	3.8	4	356	0	7
	2009-2010	945	7	3.7	6	353	0	7
	2010-2011	892	6	3.4	7	422	0	6
	2011-2012	895	7	3.9	5	341	0	7
Sigel - Town	2007-2008	855	2	1.2	26	1,147	0	0
	2008-2009	842	2	1.2	24	1,152	0	0
	2009-2010	842	3	1.8	19	829	1	2
	2010-2011	1,044	3	1.4	20	1,052	1	2
	2011-2012	1,043	3	1.4	18	1,040	1	2
Stanley – City*	2007-2008	3,389	14	2.1	15	727	5	9
	2008-2009	3,374	14	2.1	14	724	5	9
	2009-2010	3,381	14	2.1	14	715	5	9
	2010-2011	3,602	14	1.9	17	812	5	9

Municipality	Year	Population	Lic. Issued	Lic/ 500 Ppl	Rank w/i Co.	Rank w/i State^	Class A	Class B
	2011-2012	3,606	14	1.9	16	791	5	9
Tilden - Town	2007-2008	1,336	5	1.9	19	801	0	5
	2008-2009	1,343	5	1.9	18	800	0	5
	2009-2010	1,368	5	1.8	19	829	0	5
	2010-2011	1,485	4	1.3	23	1,106	0	4
	2011-2012	1,493	6	2.0	14	751	0	6
Wheaton - Town	2007-2008	2,670	5	0.9	30	1,340	1	5
	2008-2009	2,677	6	1.1	27	1,207	1	5
	2009-2010	2,632	6	1.1	27	1,203	1	5
	2010-2011	2,701	6	1.1	27	1,217	2	5
	2011-2012	2,707	6	1.1	28	1,207	2	6
Woodmohr - Town	2007-2008	857	4	2.3	13	664	0	0
	2008-2009	855	4	2.3	13	657	0	0
	2009-2010	856	5	2.9	9	494	0	0
	2010-2011	932	5	2.7	11	564	2	0
	2011-2012	935	5	2.7	12	563	1	4

^ Rank is based on the total number of state municipalities issued licenses in each year: 1,630 for 2007-2008; 1,626 for 2008-2009; 1,623 for 2009-2010; 1,626 for 2010-2011 and 1,618 for 2011-2012.

* Municipality is located in more than one county.

Appendix 1: Alcohol License Overview for the United States

Since 1933 (the repeal of prohibition), states have had the primary authority for determining whether alcohol could be sold legally and, if so, how. Since that time, numerous different alcohol control systems (in each state, the territories, and the District of Columbia) have evolved. While each alcohol distribution system is unique, each state and/or territory typically falls within one of two general classifications: *control states* and *license states*.

Both control states and license states regulate alcohol industry members through licensure. Alcohol beverage licenses are treated as a privilege rather than a right, and their issuance is conditioned on a set of restrictions and qualifications. Each state has developed its own licensing method.[xii]

Since every state licenses alcohol differently, comparisons across states can be problematic. The following data is provided as an overview of the most recent data available. Alcohol license counts are from the National Beverage Handbook 2009 Fact Book and population data is based on U.S. Census Bureau estimates for 2009.

Table 1: People per Alcohol License by State

State	2009 Population	2009 Total Alcohol Licenses	2009 Total Ppl/ License	2009 Rank by Pop. ^
Alabama*	4,708,708	12,091	389.4	17
Alaska	698,473	1,605	435.2	22
Arizona	6,595,778	11,142	592.0	36
Arkansas	2,889,450	4,708	613.7	38
California	36,961,664	79,488	465.0	24
Colorado	5,024,748	12,784	393.0	18
Connecticut	3,518,288	7,212	487.8	29
Delaware	885,122	1,141	775.7	43
District of Columbia	599,657	1,216	493.1	30
Florida	18,537,969	39,302	471.7	27
Georgia	9,829,211	14,041	700.0	41
Hawaii	1,295,178	2,380	544.2	33
Idaho*	1,545,801	6,192	249.6	3
Illinois	12,910,409	21,732	594.1	37
Indiana	6,423,113	9,433	680.9	40
Iowa*	3,007,856	8,868	339.2	11
Kansas	2,818,747	2,995	941.2	47
Kentucky	4,314,113	5,466	789.3	44
Louisiana	4,492,076	12,654	355.0	13
Maine*	1,318,301	4,009	328.8	8
Maryland	5,699,478	7,922	719.4	42
Massachusetts	6,593,587	10,002	659.2	39

State	2009 Population	2009 Total Alcohol Licenses	2009 Total Ppl/ License	2009 Rank by Pop. ^
Michigan*	9,969,727	17,168	580.7	35
Minnesota	5,266,214	9,889	532.5	32
Mississippi*	2,951,996	10,067	293.2	5
Missouri	5,987,580	12,569	476.4	28
Montana*	974,989	3,321	293.6	6
Nebraska	1,796,619	4,674	384.4	15
Nevada**[a]	2,643,085	1,420	1,861.3	51
New Hampshire*	1,324,575	4,445	298.0	7
New Jersey	8,707,739	7,929	1,098.2	48
New Mexico	2,009,671	2,522	796.9	45
New York	19,541,453	46,615	419.2	21
North Carolina*	9,380,884	22,871	410.2	19
North Dakota	646,844	1,384	467.4	25
Ohio*	11,542,645	26,084	442.5	23
Oklahoma	3,687,050	2,349	1,569.6	49
Oregon*	3,825,657	10,713	357.1	14
Pennsylvania*	12,604,767	30,218	417.1	20
Rhode Island	1,053,209	1,928	546.3	34
South Carolina	4,561,242	16,701	273.1	4
South Dakota	812,383	4,197	193.6	2
Tennessee**	6,296,254	3,528	1,784.7	50
Texas	24,782,302	46,730	530.3	31
Utah***	2,784,572	3,432	811.4	46
Vermont*	621,760	3,455	180.0	1
Virginia*	7,882,590	16,841	468.1	26
Washington*	6,664,195	18,866	353.2	12
West Virginia*	1,819,777	5,380	338.2	10
Wisconsin	5,654,774	16,764	337.3	9
Wyoming*	544,270	1,410	386.0	16
Total	**307,006,550**	**629,853**	**487.4**	

^Ranked 1-51 (the District of Columbia is included). The state ranked #1 has the fewest people per alcohol license and the state ranked number 51 has the most people per license.

*Control States

**Licenses issued at the local level - data incomplete

*** Utah is a control state; some licenses issued locally, data incomplete.

Table 2: Square Miles per Alcohol License by State

State	2009 Area (sq. mile)	2009 Alcohol Licenses	Sq. mi./ License	Rank^
Alabama*	51,718	12,091	4.3	25
Alaska	587,878	1,605	366.3	50
Arizona	114,007	11,142	10.2	36
Arkansas	53,183	4,708	11.3	37
California	158,648	79,488	2.0	12
Colorado	104,100	12,784	8.1	32
Connecticut	5,006	7,212	0.7	2
Delaware	2,026	1,141	1.8	10
Florida	58,513	39,302	1.5	7
Georgia	58,390	14,041	4.2	24
Hawaii	6,459	2,380	2.7	17
Idaho*	83,574	6,192	13.5	39
Illinois	56,343	21,732	2.6	16
Indiana	36,185	9,433	3.8	23
Iowa*	56,276	8,868	6.3	30
Kansas	82,282	2,995	27.5	43
Kentucky	40,411	5,466	7.4	31
Louisiana	47,720	12,654	3.8	22
Maine*	33,128	4,009	8.3	33
Maryland	10,455	7,922	1.3	6
Massachusetts	8,262	10,002	0.8	3
Michigan*	58,513	17,168	3.4	20
Minnesota	84,397	9,889	8.5	34
Mississippi*	47,695	10,067	4.7	27
Missouri	69,709	12,569	5.5	28
Montana*	147,047	3,321	44.3	45
Nebraska	77,359	4,674	16.6	40
Nevada**	110,567	1,420	77.9	49
New Hampshire*	9,283	4,445	2.1	13
New Jersey	7,790	7,929	1.0	4
New Mexico	121,599	2,522	48.2	46
New York	49,112	46,615	1.1	5
North Carolina*	52,672	22,871	2.3	14
North Dakota	70,704	1,384	51.1	47
Ohio*	41,328	26,084	1.6	9
Oklahoma	69,903	2,349	29.8	44
Oregon*	97,052	10,713	9.1	35
Pennsylvania*	45,310	30,218	1.5	8
Rhode Island	1,213	1,928	0.6	1
South Carolina	31,117	16,701	1.9	11
South Dakota	77,122	4,197	18.4	41
Tennessee**	42,146	3,528	11.9	38
Texas	266,874	46,730	5.7	29
Utah***	84,905	3,432	24.7	42

State	2009 Area (sq. mile)	2009 Alcohol Licenses	Sq. mi./ License	Rank^
Vermont*	9,615	3,455	2.8	18
Virginia*	40,598	16,841	2.4	15
Washington*	68,126	18,866	3.6	21
West Virginia*	24,231	5,380	4.5	26
Wisconsin	56,145	16,764	3.3	19
Wyoming*	97,818	1,410	69.4	48
Total	**2,537,948**	**629,853**	**4.0**	

^Ranked 1-50. The state ranked #1 has the fewest square miles per alcohol license and the state ranked number 50 has the most square miles per license.

*Control States

**Licenses issued at the local level - data incomplete

*** Utah is a control state; some licenses issued locally, data incomplete.

Appendix 2: Regulation of Alcohol Outlet Density Summary Evidence Table

Author, year **Design suitability** **Quality of execution (limitations)** **Study type**	**Location** **Study period** **Population**	**Intervention**	**Outcome**	**Findings**	**Analysis**
LICENSING					
Blose/Holder, 1987 Greatest Good (1) Panel Cross-Sectional Time Series	North Carolina 1973–1982 Counties implementing Liquor-by-the-Drink (LBD). Three counties (Early Change Counties) implemented LBD in Nov 1978 and eight counties (Late Change Counties) implemented LBD in Jan 1979. Groups of counties chosen as unit of analysis	Change to licensing regulation in 1978 allowing the sale of spirits for on-premises consumption. Number of establishments where spirits could be purchased increased from 344 to 900 between 1977 and 1980. Change impacts on-premises outlets	Spirit sales	+ 8.3% (Early change counties) + 4.2% (Late change counties)	Interrupted Time-Series Analysis using ARIMA technique. The time of issuance of licenses used as the intervention point and not the time that legislation was passed. Each LBD county was matched on % change in per capita income (1970–1980), and % change in population (1970–1980) with an appropriate non-LBD county
			Alcohol-related crashes <u>LBD counties</u> - Had been drinking - Male single vehicle nighttime crashes (SVNC) ≥21 years - Male SVNC <21 years <u>Non-LBD Counties</u> - Had Been Drinking - Male Single Vehicle Nighttime Crashes (SVNC) ≥21 years - Male SVNC <21 years	 +23.6% +15.7% – 0.9% +15.8% – 0.1% –5.6%	Interrupted Time Series using ARIMA modeling

Author, year **Design suitability** **Quality of execution (limitations)** **Study type**	**Location** **Study period** **Population**	**Intervention**	**Outcome**	**Findings**	**Analysis**
Makela, 2002 Moderate Fair (2) Before-and-After	Finland 1968–1969 Cohort of 1720 men and women 15–69 years of age	1969 legislation ending the monopoly of state owned retail stores on selling medium strength (<4.7% alcohol by volume) beer. Medium strength beer became available in grocery stores and cafes. Additionally, the ban on Alko stores (state-operated retail stores) in the rural countryside ended. The number of state-owned Alko stores increased 22% from **132** to **161** stores. The number of restaurants licensed to sell medium strength beer increased 46%, from **940** to **1372**. Additionally medium strength beer could be sold in **17,431 grocery stores** and **2716 cafes.** It also became easier to establish new licensed restaurants	Annual volume of alcohol consumed	Consumption category (cl of alcohol) BL Change 0 26 1–49 67 50–199 184 200+ 103 All 85 Findings represent absolute change in consumption from baseline (BL) by baseline consumption category	Change in ethanol consumed by baseline consumption level
Wagennar, 1995 Greatest Moderate (3) Time Series, no control	New Zealand 1983–1993 (7 years pre-intervention) (3 years post-intervention) National population	The New Zealand Sale of Liquor Act of 1989. This legal policy change allowed for the introduction of table wine to be sold in grocery stores. In first 27 months after intervention 608 newly licenses off-premises alcohol outlets opened	Percent change in: - Total ethanol - Wine ethanol - Spirits ethanol - Beer ethanol	–1.6 ($CI_{95\%}$ –7.3, 4.6) 15.6 ($CI_{95\%}$ 6.7, 25.2) –7.9 ($CI_{95\%}$ –19.8, 5.7) –4.1 ($CI_{95\%}$ –8.9, 1.0)	Box-Jenkins intervention-analysis with ARIMA model for each dependent time-series variable. Intervention model adjusted for the effects of economic conditions as measured by the unemployment rate
Olafsdottir, 2002 Moderate Good (1) Before-and-After	Iceland Sales Data: 1950–1999 Self-report Consumption: 1988, 1989, 1992 Sample of 15–69-year-olds for three different years (N = 1195, N = 1118, N = 1163)	In 1989 Iceland allowed the sale of medium strength beer in grocery stores. Number of monopoly stores increased from 6 to 12 in Reykjavik, liquor license increased 49% in Reykjavik and 16% in rural areas	Alcohol sales Percent of population by sex who changed self- reported level of consumption between 1988–1992	+24% ($CI_{95\%}$ 9.4, 40.6) Low-moderate consumers (0.1–351cl pure alcohol per 6 mo) Men –4.8% Women +0.8% High consumers (>351cl pure alcohol per 6 mo) Men +42.6% Women –7.3%	Two analyses. One modeling changes in sale of alcohol and the other measuring changes in self-reported consumption. ARIMA Time Series analysis. The model adjusts for legalization of beer (dummy coded as 0 from 1950–88 then 1 thereafter) and disposable income. It assesses the impact on alcohol sales after beer was introduced into state monopoly stores Descriptive statistics (i.e. Averages) used for three self-report cross-sectional surveys stratifying by age, gender, education, region, and drinking habits

Author, year **Design suitability** **Quality of execution (limitations)** **Study type**	**Location** **Study period** **Population**	**Intervention**	**Outcome**	**Findings**	**Analysis**
Gruenewald, 2006 Greatest Good (1) Panel Cross-Sectional Time Series	California 1995–2000 581 zip code areas Descriptive Statistics zip code means - Population n = 23,340 - Percentage male: 50.09 - Median Household Income: $41,280 - Median age: 34.71 yr - African American: 6.83% - Hispanic: 27.17% - Asian: 10.31%	The study examines the temporal association between changes in alcohol outlet density and violence and theoretical formulations of the social processes that support violence in these community settings that include alcohol outlets. Overall during the six year period off-premise outlets decreased 0.43%, restaurants increased 5.3%, and bars decreased 4.0%.	Assaults requiring hospitalization per 1000 total population	A 1% increase in the outlet types below is associated with a given percent change in assault rates in a given local setting and in neighboring settings: Local off-premises 0.167% Local restaurants –0.074% Local bars 0.064% Neighboring off-premises ns Neighboring restaurants ns Neighboring bars 0.142%	Two random-effects models (one taking into account spatial relations between adjacent zip codes, the other not) produced - To address the possibility of cross-sectional differences between units biasing coefficient estimates of the longitudinal relationships, a comparison was made between a LSDV regression model and the REM model. Hausman test results were non-significant meaning that the REM model coefficients could be interpreted as an unbiased estimate. -The Non-Spatial REM model controlled for spatial auto-correlated error. - The Spatial REM model controlled for group heteroskedasticity
Hoadley, 1984 Greatest Good (1) Panel Cross-Sectional Longitudinal Design	48 U.S. states 1955–1980 284 cases (48 states X 6 5-year study periods, minus 4 cases of totally dry states) A study period consisted of a 5 year increment between 1955 and 1980 U.S. population	This study looked at a variety of state regulation and control measures and their impact on distilled spirits consumption.	Per capita spirits consumption	No. of alcohol outlet licenses per 1000 was significantly associated with spirits consumption b = .027 (p<.01)	A pooled regression model with dummy variables for regional and time differences allowing for a uniform shift (upward or downward) for any particular region or year. Four geographical regions were created (South, Midwest, Northeast, West). Change in time was assessed every five years between 1955–1980
McCornac, 1984 Greatest Good (1) Panel Cross-Sectional Longitudinal Design	50 US states and DC 1970–1975 Population not described, but study is population based	The study examines the association across time between alcohol outlet density, other societal variables, and spirits consumption	Per capita spirits consumption	A 1% increase in outlet density was associated with a 0.14% (p<.01) increase in spirits consumption	OLS regression

Author, year **Design suitability** **Quality of execution (limitations)** **Study type**	**Location** **Study period** **Population**	**Intervention**	**Outcome**	**Findings**	**Analysis**
Markowitz, 2003 Greatest Good (1) Panel Cross-Sectional Longitudinal Design	50 US states and DC 1976–1999 Study population consisted of youth 10–24 years of age. Multiple demographic, policy, and price variables	Study analyzes the impact of changes in alcohol policy and social factors over a 24 year period. Hypothesis tested is whether or not alcohol regulatory policies are associated with youth suicides	Suicide rates for population aged 10–24 years	A 1% increase in the outlet density was associated with a given percent change in suicide rates: Male suicide 10–14 years 0.121 ns 15–19 years 0.098 (p<.05) 20–24 years 0.051 ns Female suicide 10–14 years 0.104 ns 15–19 years –0.014 ns 20–24 years –0.029 ns	Negative Binomial Regression based on a simple demand model of the demand for health with an imbedded health production function with alcohol as a negative input in the production of health with suicide the outcome of interest. A linear specification of the reduced form demand function specifies that suicides for each gender-age group, in a state, at a point in time is a function of state alcohol regulatory variables, other state characteristics, state effects, year effects, and an error term. T-Statistics adjusted for effect of suicide clustering by year
Blake, 1997 Greatest Good (1) Panel Cross-Sectional Longitudinal Design	United Kingdom 1952–1992 Population not described, but study is population based	The study assesses the association between on- and off-premises density and its impact along with other economic and non-economic variables	Alcohol consumption	A 1% increase in the outlet types below is associated with a given percent change in alcohol consumption On-premises cider +3.1% Off-premises cider –4.1% Beer 2.4%	The AIDS (Almost Ideal Demand System) model using OLS regression analysis that relates alcohol expenditure to economic and non-economic variables assuming separate budgeting procedures
Xie, 2000 Greatest Good (1) Panel Cross-Sectional Longitudinal Design	Canada 1968–1986 Population described on a variety of social and economic variables	The study assesses the association between changes in alcohol availability, rates of AA membership, economic and demographic measures with liver cirrhosis rate.	- Alcohol consumption - Alcohol liver cirrhosis mortality	The number of retail outlets or agencies per 10,000 adult population was significantly associated with alcohol consumption. b = 0.19 (p<.01) but not significantly associated with liver cirrhosis mortality b = –0.85 (p>.05) when controlled for alcohol consumption	Least squares dummy variables regression model. Provincial dummy variables included to control for differences between provinces and year dummy variables used to control for differences over time

Author, year **Design suitability** **Quality of execution (limitations)** **Study type**	**Location** **Study period** **Population**	**Intervention**	**Outcome**	**Findings**	**Analysis**
McCarthy, 2003 Greatest Fair (2) Panel Cross-Sectional Longitudinal Design	111 small cities in California with populations not exceeding 50,000 during eight year study period 1981–1989 mean population 9014	The study examines the association across time between changes in alcohol outlet density and other exposure variables and its association with alcohol related traffic crashes and fatalities	Alcohol-related traffic crashes	1% increase in the outlet types below are associated with a given percent change in total alcohol related crashes: General off-premise density –12.6% General on-premise density +11.2% Mean outlet density for both on and off-premise is 2.2 outlets per square mile	Negative binomial regression models. Each model includes a set of county-specific and month-specific dummy variables in order to reduce the effects of cross-section heterogeneity and serial correlation
McCarthy, 2005 Moderate Good (0) Time-Series, no control	California 1981–1989 Drivers ≥60 years of age	The study examines the association across time between changes in alcohol outlet density and other exposure variables and its association to crashes in drivers aged >60 years	Alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes	1% increase in outlet density associated with changes in: Fatality +1.70% Injury –0.81 ns Total 0.11 ns	Autoregressive models estimated to analyze monthly crashes involving older drivers. Assuming multiple degrees of autocorrelation the general model specification uses a vector of explanatory variables, a serially correlated error term, a normally distributed error term and explanatory variables to predict traffic accidents
Norstrom, 2000 Moderate Fair (2) Time-Series, no control	Norway 1960–1995 Population based study of individuals ≥15 years of age	The study examines the change in on-premises outlet density over time and its relation to violent crime. Outlet density increased slowly from 1960 to 1982, then rapidly from 1983 to 1995	- Violent crime investigations (preferred measure) - Violent crime convictions	One unit increase in outlet density associated with a 0.51% increase in violent crime convictions (p=.057) and a 0.45% increase in violent crimes investigated (p=.028)	ARIMA time series analysis. Analysis performed on the differenced series (yearly changes analyzed as opposed to raw series data). Model includes outlet density and adjusts for a noise term. Box-Ljung test for residual autocorrelation and Chow test to determine if the parameter estimates are stable during the study period
BANS					
Baughman, 2001 Greatest Fair (2) Panel Cross-Sectional Longitudinal Design	All 254 counties in Texas 1975–1996 Study is a comparison between dry and wet counties and counties that implemented change to alcohol policy during study period	At the start of 1975, 87 of Texas' 254 counties were dry; 33 of these legalized some type of alcohol sales by 1996. There were 32 other changes in which already non-dry counties liberalized alcohol control policies	Alcohol-related motor vehicle crashes	A 1% decrease in outlet density is associated with a 5.3% (p<.05) increase in alcohol-related MVCs	Linear mean regression model that accounts for observed and unobserved county-specific characteristics

Author, year **Design suitability** **Quality of execution (limitations)** **Study type**	**Location** **Study period** **Population**	**Intervention**	**Outcome**	**Findings**	**Analysis**
Berman, 2000 Least Fair (2) Before-and-After	Alaska 1980–1993 97 small communities with predominantly Alaska Native population. All had 1990 population of less than 5000 and all but two had fewer than 1000 residents	Alaska communities that used the state local option law to restrict alcohol (went "dry" or "damp") at some point between 1980 and 1993"	- Injury - Suicides - Homicides	Percent change: Injury –9.0% Suicide –0.5% Homicide –58.8%	Percent change
Bowerman, 1997 Least Fair (NR) Before-and-After	Barrow, Alaska 1992–1995 Jan 1992– Apr 1994 (pre-ban) Nov 1994– Mar 1995 (post-ban) Pregnant women in Barrow Alaska in both the pre and post ban era. Both groups received the same standard prenatal care with fetal alcohol syndrome education	A local option was passed banning the possession of alcohol in Barrow, Alaska making it the largest community in Alaska to prohibit the possession of alcohol. Prior to this legislative change, alcohol was banned in all regional villages surrounding Barrow	Self-report alcohol and substance use	% alcohol abuse during pregnancy Pre-ban / Post-ban Trimester 1 43% vs 11% Trimester 2 17% vs 7% Trimester 3 14% vs 5% Only the trimester 1 change was significant: –75%, $CI_{95\%}$ –93, –6 Prenatal alcohol abuse in surrounding regional area Pre-ban / Post-ban 42% vs 9%	Percent change and relative risk
Chui, 1997 Moderate Fair (NR) Before-and-After with Retrospective Time Series	Barrow, Alaska 1993–1996 61% Inupiat, 24% Anglo, 15% other ethnic groups mostly Asian or Asian- American	Ban on alcohol sale, importation, and possession was: Enacted on November 1, 1994 Repealed on November 1, 1995 Re-imposed importation ban on March 1, 1996 Re-imposed possession ban Apr 1, 1996	Average monthly number of alcohol-related outpatient visits	Nov 1993– Oct 1994 90 Nov 1994 – Oct 1995 16 (ban1) Nov 1995 – Feb 1996 62 Mar 1996 – Jul 1996 17 (ban 2) After implementation of ban 1, visits decreased 82% and after implementation of ban 2, visits decreased 72%	Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) time-series analysis. Internal parameters at lags 1 and 12 months. The ban was 0 during baseline and 1 during first ban, reset to zero ban being repealed, and reset to one when re-enacted

Author, year **Design suitability** **Quality of execution (limitations)** **Study type**	**Location** **Study period** **Population**	**Intervention**	**Outcome**	**Findings**	**Analysis**
May, 1975 Moderate Fair (3) Before-After-Before, no control	Great Plains, US 1969–1971 Border county: 7285 residents, 95% White. Only 4.3% of residents in border county are Native American, consequently it is assumed that the Native Americans in the border county were there primarily on transient business	Legalization of the sale of beer, wine, and liquor in June 1970 that lasted until the end of July 1970	Native American arrests in border counties and by tribal police	Native American arrests in the border county were 47% higher during ban period and arrests by tribal police were 20% higher in ban period relative to period without ban	Z-test for proportion and chi-square
Smart, 1976 Greatest Fair (2) Natural Experiment with control community	Owen Sound, Ontario 1970–1974 Owen Sound population 18,469 (experimental population) Collingwood population 9775 (control population)	First lounge (on-premises establishment) opened in Owen Sound Jan 15, 1973, and three more lounges opened during that same year. This was the last "dry" city in Southern Ontario	Alcohol impaired motor vehicle crashes (BAC $\geq$.08)	114% ($p<.05$) increase in alcohol-involved crashes after the removal of the ban of on-premises establishments	Methods not described Chi Square test in results section
PRIVATIZATION					
Holder, 1990 & 1991 Greatest Fair (2) ARIMA Time Series with Control	Iowa & West Virginia 1968–1989 (Iowa) 1968–1987 (WV) NR	Iowa privatized retail wine sales in 1985 and spirits sales in 1987 West Virginia privatized retail wine sales in 1981	Alcohol consumption	Effect of wine privatization on consumption (Iowa): Spirits –5.4% (±4.7) Wine +93.1% (±24.8) Beer –3.1% (±5.0) Effect of spirits privatization on consumption (Iowa) Spirits +9.5% (±6.0) Wine –12.1% (±8.5) Beer +1.3% (±16.3) Effect of wine privatization (West Virginia) Spirits –13.8 (±5.9) Wine +48.2 (±12.3) Beer +12.0 (±3.7)	Multiple Time Series Analysis - To control for national patterns of change in consumption of beer, wine, and spirits over time, monthly nationwide sales figures (less Iowa sales) were included as a covariate in the time-series models for each beverage when estimating intervention effects - Used Auto Regressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) and intervention models to control for autocorrelation in alcohol sales and consumption data

Author, year **Design suitability** **Quality of execution (limitations)** **Study type**	**Location** **Study period** **Population**	**Intervention**	**Outcome**	**Findings**	**Analysis**
MacDonald, 1986 Moderate Fair (3) Time-Series without control	Idaho, Maine, Washington NR NR	Retail wine sales privatization in each of the four states occurring between 1961–1971	Wine consumption	Idaho (privatized in 1971) 190% increase (p<.05) Maine (privatized in 1971) 305% increase (p<.05) Washington (privatized in 1969) 26% increase	Regression Analysis Note that the type of regression analysis used would not account for seasonality or serial auto- correlation which can result in over-inflated confidence limit estimates
Mulford, 1992 Greatest Fair (NR) ARIMA time series with control	Iowa 1980–1990 Population not described, but study is population based	Retail wine privatization in 1985 and retail sprits privatization in 1987	Wine and spirits consumption	Wine +0.5% (±15.9) Spirits +0.7% (±5.3)	ARIMA time series, excluding alcohol content from wine coolers
Ramstedt, 2002 Moderate Fair (2) Time Series without control	Sweden 1973–1981 Population not described, but study is population based	Repeal of sales of medium strength beer in grocery stores in Sweden. Prior to intervention the product was available in 11,550 grocery stores to anyone aged ≥18 years. After intervention sales were restricted to slightly more than 300 retail monopoly stores and to individuals aged ≥20 years	Suicide, motor vehicle crashes, falls, and alcohol-related hospitalizations	Significant increases were reported for Alcohol-related hospitalization for those aged 10–19 years and motor vehicle crashes for all ages except 20–39 years	ARIMA model that includes variables adjusting for repeal of medium-strength beer, decriminalization of public drunkenness, and a noise term estimating other etiological factors. Box-Ljung Q-Stat used to test that no significant temporal structure remained after model estimation
Smart, 1986 Greatest Fair (2) Time Series with control	Quebec, Canada 1967–1983 NR	Introduction of wine to grocery stores increased the number of retail outlets from 353 to ~9000. At initial time of deregulation 30 locally produced wines were sold; this number increased to 55	Wine sales	Relative percent change (compared to Ontario-control province) in wine consumption = 2.7%. The increase was not significant	Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Regression model. Saturated model included three main effects and four related interaction terms 1. Phase of intervention 2. Time (a linear term measured in 0.5 increments and centered at the point of intervention 3. Province 4. Four interaction terms
Trolldal, 2005 Greatest Fair (2) Time Series with control population	Alberta, Canada 1950–2000 Population not described but study is population based. Rest of Canada used as control population	Privatization of wine and spirit retailing occurred in staged process between 1985 and 1994	Alcohol consumption	Spirits +12.7% (±10.5) Wine –1.0% (±17.6) Beer –1.0% (±7.4)	Time Series analysis. Variables used in analysis were differenced to remove long-term trends and avoid spurious relationships. Privatization variable given value between 0 and the value of this variable was raised incrementally from 0 to 1 as larger parts of the market became privatized. Model also adjusts for price and disposable income

Author, year **Design suitability** **Quality of execution (limitations)** **Study type**	**Location** **Study period** **Population**	**Intervention**	**Outcome**	**Findings**	**Analysis**
Wagenaar, 1995 Greatest Fair (2) Time Series with Control	Alabama, Idaho, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire 1968–1991 Population not described but study is population based	Retail wine privatization in Alabama in 1980, Idaho eliminated public monopoly on wine in 1971, Maine privatized sale of wine in 1971, Montana privatized wine sales in 1979, New Hampshire privatized retail wine sales in 1978.	Wine consumption	Alabama 42.0 ($CI_{95\%}$ 13.4, 77.7) Idaho 150.1 ($CI_{95\%}$ 129.2, 172.9) Maine 136.7 ($CI_{95\%}$ 112.6, 163.5) Montana 75.3 ($CI_{95\%}$ 56.9, 96.0) New Hampshire 13.0 ($CI_{95\%}$ 1.2, 26.2)	Box-Jenkins with identification or specification of a parsimonious ARIMA model

AIDS Almost Ideal Demand System; ARIMA Autoregressive Integrated Moving Average; BAC blood alcohol concentration; cl centiliter(s); LBD liquor by the drink; LSDV Least Squares Dummy Variable; mo month(s); MVC motor vehicle crash; OSL Ordinary Least Squares; REM Random effects model; yr year(s)

Endnotes

[i] The titles given to Wisconsin's licenses to sell and serve alcohol are very similar, but the type of the licensed activity varies significantly. In general, Class A licenses are awarded to alcohol retailers who sell alcohol for consumption at another location. In some states these are called off-premises licenses. In Wisconsin a Class "A" license permits beer (and malt based cooler) sales for consumption elsewhere, and a "Class A" license permits the sale of, beer, wine, and distilled spirits (hard liquor) for consumption elsewhere. The varying placement of the quotation marks shows the distinction in the beverages for sale.

Similarly, "Class B" licenses and Class "B" licenses are issued for establishments selling and serving alcohol at that location, such as taverns, bars, and restaurants. In some states these are called on-premises licenses. Following the pattern set for Class A licenses, a Class "B" license authorizes the sale of beer for immediate consumption, and a "Class B" license authorizes the sale of beer, wine, and distilled spirits for consumption within that site. "Class C" wine licenses permit the sale of just wine by the glass or bottle for consumption on-site. For simplicity, licenses are listed by Department of Revenue titles, and quotation marks are omitted when referring to all types of alcohol beverages.

[ii] Thomas Babor, et al., *Alcohol: No Ordinary Commodity* 131-134, (2d ed., Oxford University Press 2010) (2003).

[iii] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Preventing Excessive Alcohol Consumption: Regulation of Alcohol Outlet Density.* Retrieved from: http://www.thecommunityguide.org/alcohol/outletdensity.html

[iv] Rick Romell, *Wasted in Wisconsin: Drinking Deeply Ingrained in Wisconsin's Culture*, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, October 19, 2008.

[v] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), *Vital Signs,* January, 2012. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/vitalsigns/BingeDrinking/

[vi] Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Office of Applied Studies. (April 10, 2008). *The NSDUH Report - State Estimates of Persons Aged 18 or Older Driving Under the Influence of Alcohol or Illicit Drugs*. Rockville, MD. Retrieved from http://oas.samhsa.gov/2k8/stateDUI/stateDUI.htm

[vii] Thomas Babor, et al., *Alcohol: No Ordinary Commodity* (1st ed., Oxford University Press 2003).

[viii] A Livingston, Michael. A longitudinal analysis of alcohol outlet density and domestic violence. Addiction, 106, 2011, p.919

[ix] Elissa R. Weitzman, Alison Folkman, M. P. H. Kerry Lemieux Folkman, Henry Wechsler, *The Relationship of Alcohol Outlet Density to Heavy and Frequent Drinking and Drinking-related Problems Among College Students at Eight Universities*, 9 Health & Place 1, 1-6 (2003).

[x] Thomas Babor, et al., *Alcohol: No Ordinary Commodity* 2d ed., Oxford University Press 2010).

[xi] Wis. Stat. § 125.12(3m).

[xii] U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, *the Role of Alcohol Beverage Control Agencies in the Enforcement and Adjudication of Alcohol Laws.* DOT HS 809 877 Revised July 2005. Retrieved from http://www.nhtsa.gov/people/injury/enforce/ABCRoleWeb/pages/index.htm