

Wyoming Drug Assessment Project

Southwest Region

Final Report



February 7, 2008

Prepared for and Funded by:
Wyoming Mental Health and
Substance Abuse Services
Division

Prepared by:
P. Allison Minugh, Ph.D.
Susan Janke, M.S.
Nicoletta Lomuto, M.A.

DATA CORP
200 W. 17th Street
Cheyenne, WY 82001
Phone: (307) 634-1804
Fax: (307) 634-9676

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	v
Introduction	1
Social Indicators	1
Interviews and Focus Groups	3
Public Opinion Survey	3
Social Indicator results.....	4
Alcohol and Drug Problem Severity Indices	5
Family Indices.....	10
Interview Results.....	16
Perception of the Substance Abuse Problem	16
Potential Strategies for Addressing the Substance Abuse Problem	20
Perceived Hurdles to an Effective Substance Abuse Strategy	22
Potential Strategies to Reduce Hurdles.....	24
Cultural Norms that May Perpetuate Substance Abuse Problems	26
Public Opinion Results.....	28
Southwest Region Respondent Breakdown	28
Southwest Region Gender Breakdown.....	29
Southwest Region Age Breakdown	30
Southwest Region Respondents with Multiple Jobs	31
Southwest Region Perceptions of Substance Use	32
Southwest Region Perceived Threat of Substance Abuse	33
Southwest Region Perceived Substance Use Problem by Age	34
Southwest Region Perceived Substance use Problems by Age.....	35
Southwest Region Perception of Primary Substance Use Threat by Age	36
Southwest Region Top 10 Perceived Reasons for Substance Use	37
Southwest Region Top 10 Perceptions of Harm Due to Substance Use	37
Southwest Region Perceptions of Resource Allocation.....	38
Southwest Region Top 10 Activities Perceived as Effective in Combating Substance Use	39
Southwest Region Perceived Reasons for School Dropout.....	40
Southwest Region Perception of How Dropping Out Could Be Prevented	41
Southwest Region Perceived Reasons for Re-Arrest.....	42
Data Dashboard	43
Appendix A	A-1
Alcohol Indicators	A-1
Drug Indicators	A-7
Family Indicators	A-14
Appendix B	B-1
Wyoming Prevention Needs Assessment.....	B-1
Appendix C	C-1
Alcohol Factors in Custodial Arrests - 2006.....	C-1

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. 1999-2002 Alcohol Problem Severity Index.....	6
Figure 2. 2003-2005 Alcohol Problem Severity Index.....	6
Figure 3. 1999-2002 Drug Problem Severity Index.....	8
Figure 4. 2003-2005 Drug Problem Severity Index.....	8
Figure 5. Family Index 1: Families Living in a Stable, Healthy Environment.....	10
Figure 6. Family Index 2: Economic Diversity, Equality, and Sustainability	11
Figure 7. Family Index 3: Affordable, Accessible Healthcare and Insurance	12
Figure 8. Family Index 4: Prenatal and Early Childhood Health Outcomes	13
Figure 9. Family Index 5: Students Successfully Educated	14
Figure 10. Wyoming State	17
Figure 11. Southwest Region.....	18
Figure 12. Wyoming State	19
Figure 13. Southwest Region.....	19
Figure 14. Wyoming State	20
Figure 15. Southwest Region.....	21
Figure 16. Wyoming State	22
Figure 17. Southwest Region.....	23
Figure 18. Wyoming State	24
Figure 19. Southwest Region.....	25
Figure 20. Wyoming State	26
Figure 21. Southwest Region.....	27
Figure 22. Respondents by County.....	28
Figure 23. Gender.....	29
Figure 24. Age Groups Reported in the Southwest Region	30
Figure 25. Respondents in the Southwest Region Who Reported Having More Than One Job.....	31
Figure 26. Perceptions of the Percent of People in the Community Who Use Alcohol and Drugs	32
Figure 27. Drugs identified as Primary Threat to the Community	33
Figure 28. Age Group Perceived to Have Biggest Substance Use Problem.....	34
Figure 29. Perceived Substance Use Problems by Age	35
Figure 30. Regional Perception of Primary Substance Use Threat by Age.....	36
Figure 31. Uinta County Perception of Primary Substance Use Threat by Age ..	36
Figure 32. Regional Perception of the Optimal Distribution of Resources	38
Figure 33. Regional Perception of Reasons for School Dropout.....	40
Figure 34. Regional Ideas of How School Dropout Can Be Prevented	41

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Alcohol and Drug Problem Severity Index Scores	9
Table 2. Family Functioning Indices 2003-2005	15
Table 3. Number of Respondents by County	28
Table 4. Number of Respondents by Gender by County	29
Table 5. Age Groups Reported by County	30
Table 6. Respondents Who Reported Having More than One Job by County	31
Table 7. Perceptions of the Percent of People in the Community Who Use Alcohol and Drugs	32
Table 8. Drugs identified as Primary Threat to the Community	33
Table 9. Age Group Perceived to Have Biggest Substance Use Problem	34
Table 10. Top 10 Perceived Reasons for Substance Use in the Region	37
Table 11. Top 10 Perceived Reasons for Substance Use by County	37
Table 12. Top 10 Perceptions of Harm Due to Substance Use	37
Table 13. Top 10 Perceptions of Harm Due to Substance Use by County	38
Table 14. County Perception of the Optimal distribution for Resources	38
Table 15. Top 10 Perceived Activities that Effectively Combat Substance Use ..	39
Table 16. Top 10 Perceived Activities that Effectively Combat Substance use ..	39
Table 17. County Perception of Reasons for School Dropout	40
Table 18. Ideas by County of How School Dropout Can Be Prevented	41
Table 19. Regional Perception of Reasons for Re-Arrest	42
Table 20. County Perception of Reasons for Re-Arrest	42
Table 21. Alcohol-Related Hospitalizations Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-1
Table 22. Arrests for Drunkenness Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-2
Table 23. Arrests for DUI Rater Per 10,000 Population	A-3
Table 24. Arrests for Liquor Law Violations Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-4
Table 25. Direct Alcohol-Related Arrests Rater Per 10,000 Population	A-5
Table 26. Indirect Alcohol-Related Arrests Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-6
Table 27. Arrests for Drug Possession Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-7
Table 28. Arrests for Drug Sales Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-8
Table 29. Direct Drug-Related Arrests Rater Per 10,000 Population	A-9
Table 30. Drug-Related Hospitalizations Rater Per 10,000 Population	A-10
Table 31. Hepatitis B and C Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-11
Table 32. Indirect Drug-Related Arrests Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-12
Table 33. Sexually Transmitted Diseases: Chlamydia and Gonorrhea Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-13
Table 34. Child Abuse and Neglect Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-14
Table 35. Domestic Violence Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-15
Table 36. Divorce Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-16
Table 37. Fatal Motor Vehicle Accidents Ages Birth to 24 Years Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-17
Table 38. Suicide Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-18
Table 39. Average Annual Pay	A-19
Table 40. Job Growth Rate Per 10,000 Population	A-20
Table 41. Single Job Holder Rate Per 10,000	A-21

Table 42. Population with Health Insurance Rate Per 10,000.....	A-22
Table 43. Full Time Doctors Rate Per 10,000 Population.....	A-23
Table 44. Low Birth Weight Babies Rate Per 10,000 Births.....	A-24
Table 45. Mothers Who Did Not Receive Prenatal Care in the First Trimester Rate Per 10,000 Births	A-25
Table 46. Smoking During Pregnancy Rate Per 10,000 Births	A-26
Table 47. Teen Births Rate Per 10,000 Population.....	A-27
Table 48. WYCAS Math Progress Rate Per 10,000 Fourth-Grade Students ..	A-28
Table 49. WYCAS Reading Progress Rate Per 10,000 Fourth-Grade Students.....	A-29
Table 50. Percent of 6 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Days Alcohol Use	B-1
Table 51. Percent of 8 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Alcohol Use.....	B-2
Table 52. Percent of 10 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Alcohol Use.....	B-3
Table 53. Percent of 12 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Alcohol Use.....	B-4
Table 54. Percent of 6 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Cigarette Use	B-5
Table 55. Percent of 8 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Cigarette Use	B-6
Table 56. Percent of 10 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Cigarette Use	B-7
Table 57. Percent of 12 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Cigarette Use	B-8
Table 58. Percent of 6 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Inhalant Use.....	B-9
Table 59. Percent of 8 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Inhalant Use.....	B-10
Table 60. Percent of 10 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Inhalant Use.....	B-11
Table 61. Percent of 12 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Inhalant Use.....	B-12
Table 62. Percent of 6 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Marijuana Use	B-13
Table 63. Percent of 8 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Marijuana	B-14
Table 64. Percent of 10 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Marijuana Use.....	B-15
Table 65. Percent of 12 th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Marijuana Use.....	B-16
Table 66. Percent of Arrests That Were Substance Related	C-1
Table 67. Average Blood Alcohol Level for Alcohol Related Arrests.....	C-2

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Wyoming Community Prevention Assessment study represents the work of many. We wish to acknowledge those whose time and effort were invaluable to the creation of this comprehensive planning document. Most notably, we would like to thank all of the agency personnel who provided indicator data for social indicator component of this assessment. This includes staff persons from the Wyoming Department of Revenue, Liquor Division; Wyoming Department of Transportation, Highway Safety Program; Wyoming Department of Health, Vital Statistics; Wyoming Department of Health, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System Coordinator; Wyoming Department of Health, Substance Abuse Division; the Wyoming Department of Health, Preventive Health and Safety Division; the Department of Family Services; Bureau of Labor Statistics; Wyoming Department of Education; Wyoming Department of Employment, Research and Planning; and Wyoming Department of Health, Rural Health Division.

We also wish to thank the many agency, organization, and government officials for giving their time in our interviewing process. Their responses to our questions bring life to the data. Many staff in these settings also gave their time and assistance with data requests, and we thank them for that as well. Our on-line survey of community residents was a bigger success than we imagined. For that, we thank all of the citizens who took the time to complete the survey.

Our special appreciation goes to Rodger McDaniel, Deputy Director of the Wyoming Department of Health, Mental Health Services and Substance Abuse Division. It was his vision that data from the Divisions many efforts be brought together in one resource. We also thank him for his unwavering support. We also thank Ms. Mary Flanderka, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services, Administrator of Community Program Manager for coordinating this effort, and we wish to thank Ms. Marilyn Patton, Community Services Coordinator, and Dr. Mindy Dahl, Senior Researcher, for their support and assistance with the data collection effort.

Finally, we wish to thank the Datacorp staff for their technical advice, support, feedback, and superior production capabilities: Nicoletta A. Lomuto, M.A., Kirbie Brown, Susan Janke, M.S., Project Manager, and P. Allison Minugh, Ph.D. served as the Datacorp project director.

For further information, please contact:

Ms. Mary Flanderka

Administrator, Community Services

Wyoming Department of Health, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services

Quest Building, 6101 N. Yellowstone Road, Suite 220

Cheyenne, WY 82002

(307) 777-7094

mary.flanderka@health.wyo.gov

INTRODUCTION

The Wyoming Department Health, Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services Division contracted with Datacorp to conduct a statewide, comprehensive needs assessment to determine community-level prevention needs for all substances. The overarching goal of this needs assessment was to collect new data and data from existing sources to give a more comprehensive picture of substance use in Wyoming. The results from this assessment are intended for use by communities addressing three core substance-related outcomes that have been identified by the MHSASD.

- ⊕ Children in out-of-home placements
- ⊕ School dropouts
- ⊕ Criminal recidivism related to alcohol and drug use

Funding appropriated through Senate File 76 was made available to communities to address these core outcomes through a collaborative community effort.

This needs assessment involved using a multi-method approach to gather the new data for this assessment. This included county-level social indicators, interviews and focus groups, and a public opinion survey.

Social Indicators

Alcohol and Drug Problem Severity Indices

It is more and more common for communities to rely on social indicator data to get a pulse on substance use problems. Social indicators are archival data collected by state agencies for routine monitoring and reporting purposes. These data have been found to be extremely useful for monitoring substance use and its consequences. Wyoming has a long history of using social indicators to assess substance abuse needs and to make data driven decisions about its substance use problems. This assessment was timed in such a way that it allowed “new” data to be added to indicator data that had been collected in a previous needs assessment. The result is that Wyoming now has an Alcohol Problem Severity Index (APS-I) and Drug Problem Severity Index (DPS-I) that span six years, and for the first time comprehensive comparisons can be made across time points and geographic regions. The indices were developed from social indicators that were found to be reliable and valid in Wyoming (Minugh, Lomuto, & Breeden, 2005). Each index gives is a single number that indexes alcohol and drug problems. The utility in this method lies in the simplicity it brings to understanding multiple data sets. The alcohol index is comprised of alcohol-related arrests and alcohol-related hospital discharges. The drug index is comprised of drug-related crime, drug-related hospital discharges, sexually transmitted diseases, and Hepatitis B and Hepatitis C. The first set of indices were reported in 2004 and covered the years 2000, 2001, and 2002. The latest set of indices cover the years 2003, 2004, and 2005. The social

indicators can be reviewed in this report, and they are presented on-line in a data dashboard at www.mjdatacorp.com.

Family Functioning Indices

Families are severely affected by substance use. This was a key concern among the majority of the interviewees. In this round, the data were gathered from a wide variety of sources. In addition to the alcohol and drug indicators, indicators of family functioning were collected. Readers of this report may be familiar with the Wyoming Family Photo (2006). All of the agencies that contributed data to the 2006 issue of the *Wyoming Family Photo* were contacted. The goal was to gather county-level data reported in the *Family Photo* and then, similar to alcohol and drug indices, create indices that would consolidate the information in an easy-to-understand format. The indices presented in this report correspond to each of the “Results” in the *Family Photo*. That is, there is one index for each result that appears in the *Family Photo*. These indices are available in this report and they can be viewed in the data dashboard at www.mjdatacorp.com.

Other Data Sources

Alcohol Factors in Custodial Arrests

This report also contains data from other sources that document the substance use problem. In a collaborative effort, the Wyoming Department of Transportation, the Wyoming Association of Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police, and Johnson and Associates have produced a statewide comprehensive report, *Alcohol Factors in Custodial Arrests in the State of Wyoming 2007*. This innovative report is a detailed exploration of alcohol and, more recently, drug-related arrests. This report has brought to light how deeply and intensely alcohol is involved in Wyoming arrests. Summary data from this report are presented in this report and can be viewed in the data dashboard located at www.mjdatacorp.com.

The Wyoming Prevention Needs Assessment

Wyoming also has made great strides in prevention needs assessment with the biannual administration of its Prevention Needs Assessment youth survey. This survey has been conducted three times now, and as a result the State has a wealth of data on Wyoming youths’ substance use and their risk for and protection against substance use. Key substance use data are reported in this report and can be viewed in the data dashboard at www.mjdatacorp.com.

Interviews and Focus Groups

People who live in a community are always the best source of information about their community. With that in mind, several interviews and focus groups were conducted throughout the state. The majority of the interviews and focus groups were with sheriffs, Department of Family Services social workers, and Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentive Grant (SPF SIG) task forces. In some cases, these meetings led to interview leads where it was thought that additional, relevant information could be garnered. When such information was received, every effort to contact the person who had been named was made. Many times this was the drug court coordinator or a public health nurse who was well informed about the substance use issues in a particular community.

Public Opinion Survey

The public opinion survey was modeled after a similar survey that was used in the Cheyenne Laramie County Methamphetamine Assessment project (Janke & Minugh, 2007). This easy-to-complete online questionnaire asked concerned citizens a variety of questions about substance use in their community. Citizens reported whether they believe there are substance use problems, reasons they perceive for the problems, and ideas they have had for how these problems can be addressed by the local community.

SOCIAL INDICATOR RESULTS

Seven composite indices were developed in this assessment. Two were developed in 2005 and have been reconstructed in this report using more recent data. They represent the overall alcohol and drug problem severity relative to other geographic areas for the State of Wyoming. The first, the Alcohol Problem Severity Index (A-PSI) incorporates reliable and valid alcohol indicators. The second, the Drug Problem Severity Index (D-PSI) incorporates reliable and valid drug-related indicators. A new set of indices was created specifically for this assessment and incorporates measures of family functioning. These indices map onto data presented in the Wyoming Family Photo (2006). One index for each of the major results described in the Family Photo was created. These include the following: Families Living in a Stable, Healthy Environment; Economic Diversity, Equality, and Sustainability; Affordable, Accessible Healthcare and Insurance; Prenatal and Early Childhood Health Outcomes; Students Successfully Educated.

The alcohol and drug indices were constructed using the following steps. First, a rate per 10,000 people was created for each variable in the data set for each year of data. Second, a mean rate across the three years of data was created. For each indicator if there were multiple measures, they were summed within counties. For instance, all alcohol-related hospital discharges were summed creating a total within each county for each year. Of those, all normally distributed variables were then converted to z-scores. Only statically reliable and valid alcohol and drug indicator were used. The z-scores were then summed to get one alcohol composite and one drug composite, which resulted in the A-PSI and D-PSI indices. The z-scores were then rescaled to a range where the lowest possible score could 0 and highest possible score could be 100. This final rescaling step was done for convenience in interpreting the meaning of the scores. Counties with higher scores have greater problems. Data for newest set of alcohol and drug problem severity indices span 2003-2005. Also included were the indices created in 2005, which span the years 2000-2002. Data is presented in tabular and graphic format so that users of this report can compare the new results with the previous results. Elements of each index are described below.

Alcohol Problem Severity Index:

- ⊕ Direct alcohol-related arrests
- ⊕ Indirect alcohol-related arrests
- ⊕ Direct alcohol-related hospital discharges

Drug Problem Severity Index:

- ⊕ Direct drug-related arrests
- ⊕ Indirect drug-related arrests
- ⊕ STDs
- ⊕ Hepatitis B and C
- ⊕ Direct drug-related hospital discharges

The Family Functioning Indicators were grouped based the face validity established in the *Family Photo*. Therefore, these indices were not tested for statistical normality, reliability, and validity. With that exception, the steps followed to form these indices mirror those of the alcohol and drug problem severity indices. Data used to form these indices cover the years 2003-2005. Elements of the Family Functioning Indices follow.

Family Index 1: Families Living in a Stable, Healthy Environment

- ⊕ Child abuse and neglect
- ⊕ Domestic violence
- Divorce
- ⊕ Suicide
- ⊕ Car crash deaths (birth – 24 years)

Family Index 2: Economic Diversity, Equality, and Sustainability

- ⊕ Job growth rates
- ⊕ Individuals holding more than one job
- ⊕ Wyoming wages

Family Index 3: Affordable, Accessible Healthcare and Insurance

- ⊕ Uninsured residents
- ⊕ Health professional shortage areas

Family Index 4: Prenatal and Early Childhood Health Outcomes

- ⊕ Mothers receiving prenatal care in the first trimester
- ⊕ Teen births
- ⊕ Low birth weight
- ⊕ Maternal smoking during pregnancy

Family Index 5: Students Successfully Educated

- ⊕ Fourth-grade student progress: Math
- ⊕ Fourth-grade student progress: Reading

Alcohol and Drug Problem Severity Indices

The Alcohol Problem Severity Index measures the severity of alcohol problems. Three indicators comprise the index:

- ⊕ Direct alcohol-related arrests
- ⊕ Indirect alcohol-related arrests
- ⊕ Direct alcohol-related hospital discharges

The index ranges from 0 to 100. It is scored so that *higher* scores indicate *more alcohol related problems*. The map below displays county scores on the index. Darker shades of red indicate higher scores. For comparison, scores on the index from both the previous social indicator study and the current study are shown. Comparing maps gives a sense of how the relative rankings of counties have changed over time.

Figure 1. 1999-2002 Alcohol Problem Severity Index





Figure 2. 2003-2005 Alcohol Problem Severity Index



The Alcohol Problem Severity Index showed a pattern during this study that was very similar to the pattern shown in the previous study. The most noteworthy change was that Carbon and Campbell counties dropped from the highest tier to the second highest tier. The cluster of high scoring counties around Fremont County is slightly more

pronounced on the later map due to Sublette and Sweetwater moving to a higher tier on the map. It is also noteworthy that on the map, all of the counties in the lower tier are border counties, except for Johnson.

Scores on the Alcohol Problem Severity Index were mixed in the Southwest region, with some minor changes observed over time. Teton and Uinta counties were in the middle tier during both time periods. Lincoln County dropped from the second lowest tier to the lowest tier. Sweetwater and Sublette moved from the middle tier to the second highest tier.

The Drug Problem Severity Index measures the severity of drug problems. Five indicators comprise the index:

- ⊕ Direct drug-related arrests
- ⊕ Indirect drug-related arrests
- ⊕ STDs
- ⊕ Hepatitis B and C
- ⊕ Direct drug-related hospital discharges

The index ranges from 0 to 100. It is scored so that *higher* scores indicate *greater drug related problems*. The map below displays county scores on the index. Darker shades of blue indicate higher scores. As with the alcohol index, scores on the index from both the previous social indicator study and the current study are shown. Comparing maps gives a sense for how the relative rankings of counties have changed over time.

Figure 3. 1999-2002 Drug Problem Severity Index





Figure 4. 2003-2005 Drug Problem Severity Index



The Drug Problem Severity Index showed greater changes over time than the Alcohol Problem Severity Index. Most noteworthy, Sheridan dropped two tiers from the highest tier to the middle tier. Also worthy of mention is that Laramie County dropped from the highest tier to the second highest tier. Conversely, Carbon County moved into the

highest tier from the second highest tier. It is also interesting to note that most counties along the edges of the state either stayed in the same tier or dropped one tier.

The Southwest region showed a range of scores in both time periods. During both time periods, Sweetwater ranked in the highest tier. Uinta ranked in the second highest tier during the first study and dropped to the middle tier during this study's time period. Sublette stayed in the middle time period for both studies while Teton dropped from the middle tier to the second lowest tier. Lincoln was in the lowest tier for both time periods.

Table 1. Alcohol and Drug Problem Severity Index Scores

	Alcohol 1999-2002	Drug 1999-2002	Alcohol 2003-2005	Drug 2003-2005
Albany	53	41	43	35
Big Horn	14	16	10	15
Campbell	66	53	60	51
Carbon	66	58	62	64
Converse	39	39	23	30
Crook	22	12	13	15
Fremont	80	74	69	65
Goshen	31	12	24	11
Hot Springs	44	45	40	38
Johnson	13	13	10	9
Laramie	47	70	34	51
Lincoln	22	12	3	8
Natrona	62	65	50	62
Niobrara	10	10	7	34
Park	24	16	24	16
Platte	43	33	23	15
Sheridan	49	64	40	41
Sublette	42	31	49	35
Sweetwater	48	61	54	65
Teton	47	31	44	27
Uinta	46	59	34	38
Washakie	37	47	26	23
Weston	10	23	9	19

Indices range from 0 to 100: 0 = fewer alcohol or drug problems to 100 = greater alcohol or drug problems.

Family Indices


Family Index 1: Families Living in a Stable, Healthy Environment

Family Index Result 1 measures the extent to which the family environment is stable, safe, and supportive. Five indicators comprise the index:

- ⊕ Child abuse and neglect
- ⊕ Domestic violence
- ⊕ Divorce
- ⊕ Suicide
- ⊕ Car crash deaths (birth – 24 years)

The index ranges from 0 to 100. It is reverse scored so that *higher* scores indicate a *more* stable and supportive environment. The map below displays county scores on the index. Darker shades of green indicate higher scores and greater support.

Figure 5. Family Index 1: Families Living in a Stable, Healthy Environment



Two aspects of the Family Support Index are immediately apparent. First, counties in the highest tier of family support are scattered throughout the state. It is also interesting to note they are all counties that border other states. Second, radiating out from Fremont County is a cluster of counties that fall into the lowest two tiers of family support.

A strong north to south pattern was seen in the Southwest region. Teton was in the highest tier of counties, while Lincoln and Sublette fell into the second highest tier. Uinta was in the second lowest tier, and Sweetwater fell into the lowest tier.


Family Index 2: Economic Diversity, Equality, and Sustainability

Family Index Result 2 measures the strength and diversity of the economy. Three indicators comprise the index:

- ⊕ Job growth rates
- ⊕ Non-multiple job holders*
- ⊕ Wyoming wages

*These indicators are “reversed” from their respective family photo measures so that all indicators within an index would go in the same direction and could therefore be combined.

Figure 6. Family Index 2: Economic Diversity, Equality, and Sustainability



Counties with the highest scores on strong economy appear in a diagonal pattern across the maps. Four counties comprise the diagonal: Sweetwater, Sublette, Natrona, and Campbell. This pattern is a result of the energy boom in Wyoming.

Scores on the economic index ranged in the Southwest region. Sublette and Sweetwater were in the highest tier on economic growth, while Lincoln fell into the second highest. Teton and Uinta had lower scores on the economic index and fell into the lower two tiers on this index.


Family Index 3: Affordable, Accessible Healthcare and Insurance

Family Index Result 3 measures the accessibility of health insurance. Two indicators comprise the index:

- ⊖ Insured residents*
- ⊖ Full-time doctors

*These indicators are “reversed” from their respective family photo measures so that all indicators within an index would go in the same direction and could therefore be combined.

Figure 7. Family Index 3: Affordable, Accessible Healthcare and Insurance



The map for accessible and affordable healthcare shows a scarcity of health care in the southwest corner of the state. Healthcare appears to be most accessible in the more urban areas of the state. Albany, Laramie, Natrona and Teton counties all fall into the highest tier on the map.

A north to south pattern appears for healthcare index scores in the Southwest region. Teton County appears in the highest tier, while Sublette, Lincoln, and Sweetwater county appear in the second lowest tier. Uinta County fell into the middle tier.


Family Index 4: Prenatal and Early Childhood Health Outcomes

Family Index Result 4 measures pre-natal and early childhood health. Four indicators comprise the index:

- ⊖ Mothers not receiving prenatal care in the first trimester*
- ⊖ Teen births
- ⊖ Low birth weight
- ⊖ Maternal smoking during pregnancy

*These indicators are “reversed” from their respective family photo measures so that all indicators within an index would go in the same direction and could therefore be combined.

Figure 8. Family Index 4: Prenatal and Early Childhood Health Outcomes



Counties in the highest tier of prenatal outcomes are all in the northwestern and central western portions of the state, with the exception of Albany County. The map also shows a pattern along the diagonal running from northeast to southwest. Counties on and near the diagonal are often in the lowest two tiers on prenatal and health outcomes. It is also interesting to note that three of the counties in the highest tier on strong economy are in the lowest two tiers on prenatal outcomes (Natrona, Sweetwater, and Sublette).

The Southwest Region showed a north to south pattern on the prenatal care index. Teton and Lincoln were in the second highest tier. Sublette was in the middle tier. Uinta fell into the second lowest tier while Sweetwater was in the lowest tier.


Family Index 5: Students Successfully Educated

Family Index Result 5 measures student success in education. Two indicators comprise the index:

- ⊕ Fourth-grade student progress: Math
- ⊕ Fourth-grade student progress: Reading

The index is scored from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating better student outcomes. The map below displays county scores on the index. Darker shades of yellow indicate higher scores and better student outcomes.

Figure 9. Family Index 5: Students Successfully Educated



Counties in the highest two tiers of student achievement are all counties that border other states, with the exception of Washakie. Clusters of counties in the lowest two tiers appeared surrounding Fremont and Niobrara counties.

The Southwest region saw a range of index scores. Lincoln was in the highest tier while Teton was in the second highest tier. Uinta fell into the middle tier, while Sublette and Sweetwater fell into the second lowest tier.

Table 2. Family Functioning Indices 2003-2005

	Family 1	Family 2	Family 3	Family 4	Family 5
Albany	72	38	62	64	63
Big Horn	95	46	13	57	39
Campbell	54	74	49	28	71
Carbon	45	37	25	28	1
Converse	66	52	45	47	24
Crook	84	45	41	40	61
Fremont	57	36	49	15	14
Goshen	81	32	47	45	51
Hot Springs	49	15	13	35	23
Johnson	64	29	53	63	51
Laramie	60	49	66	46	41
Lincoln	80	49	30	61	77
Natrona	53	56	63	37	40
Niobrara	58	17	21	63	6
Park	60	39	51	65	100
Platte	51	36	29	28	32
Sheridan	61	42	44	52	74
Sublette	73	72	40	50	33
Sweetwater	47	72	36	19	31
Teton	82	24	100	58	67
Uinta	59	35	41	38	34
Washakie	66	43	53	63	80
Weston	75	39	21	30	18

Indices range from 0 to 100: 0 = least favorable family environment to 100 = most favorable family environment.

Family Index 1: Families Living in a Stable, Healthy Environment

Family Index 2: Economic Diversity, Equality, and Sustainability

Family Index 3: Affordable, Accessible Healthcare and Insurance

Family Index 4: Prenatal and Early Childhood Health Outcomes

Family Index 5: Students Successfully Educated

INTERVIEW RESULTS

Interviews and focus groups were conducted statewide in nearly every county, with the exceptions of Natrona and Laramie Counties, both of which recently completed in-depth assessments and strategies to address their methamphetamine problems. Interviews and focus groups were conducted with a variety of professionals who encounter people with substance abuse problems in their professions. Sheriffs, chiefs of police, task force members and drug court coordinators among others were met with. The purpose of the interviews was to cull qualitative data directly from people who work with substance abusers. That data could be used to supplement the Internet survey and quantitative data gathered in the social indicator component of this assessment.

The interview data were typed and entered into a qualitative software data analysis program. After coding the data, it was analyzed to identify common themes the interviewees reported during the interviews. The data that follows summarizes the key findings. Data are reported for the state as a whole, collapsing across all of the interviews and focus groups and they are reported for each region.


Perception of the Substance Abuse Problem

Is there a substance abuse problem?

Every group agreed that there was a problem.


How do you know there is a problem?

Figure 10. Wyoming State



Wyomingites throughout the state indicated they knew substance abuse was a problem due to drug availability, and the impact substance abuse has on the family and the legal system.

Figure 11. Southwest Region




"The numbers of calls for service related to alcohol, methadone, and methamphetamine is 25%."

Similar to other regions of the state, the Southwest region identified substance abuse as problematic due to the impact it has on the legal system and the family, and the availability of drugs.


Which Substance is the biggest problem in your community?

Figure 12. Wyoming State



Wyoming residents who were interviewed indicated that alcohol was the biggest problem in their community, followed by methamphetamine.

Figure 13. Southwest Region




Southwest Wyoming residents, similar to statewide respondents, indicated that alcohol was the biggest problem in their community followed by methamphetamine.

Potential Strategies for Addressing the Substance Abuse Problem


Oftentimes there is no trouble identifying problem areas, or identifying Wyomingite's opinions about which substances are causing trouble in their communities. What is more difficult is identifying potential strategies for addressing substance abuse problems and achieving a consensus on the priorities. The tables below demonstrate the wide varying opinions about where efforts should be focused. The ideas the respondents came up with suggest a comprehensive approach to tackling the substance abuse problem. In fact, research conducted at the Community Anti Drug Coalitions of America has found that multiple strategies can be more effective than implementing only one or two strategies (personal communication, Diane Galloway, PhD).

Figure 14. Wyoming State



Wyoming interviewees statewide identified myriad possibilities for addressing substance abuse problems. They placed more emphasis however, on expanding prevention programming, enhancing legal and treatment services, and focusing on family strengthening issues as mechanisms for addressing substance abuse problems in their community.

Figure 15. Southwest Region




“Develop a comprehensive, regionalized service system that will support family-focused treatment services.”

Southwest Wyoming interviewees identified strategies similar to respondents across the state. They would like to see a focus on prevention, treatment, and legal system enhancements.


Perceived Hurdles to an Effective Substance Abuse Strategy

Figure 16. Wyoming State



Although addressing attitudes wasn't identified as a priority in the strategy question, it was clearly identified as a barrier for addressing substance abuse problems. A second significant barrier includes employment and all the issues associated with hosting a large transient population that supplements the local workforce: pre-employment drug testing, employees failing drug tests, and individuals cheating on drug tests. High employment turnover, wages, stress among the working poor, and difficulty finding qualified employees contributed to the responses that were received on this critical issue.

Figure 17. Southwest Region




"Parents do not want their kids bothered about drinking but it puts law enforcement in a bad light – parents get mad when we address the issue, and they get mad if we ignore the issue and something bad happens."

As the graph in Figure 8 shows, perceptions in the Southwest region were similar to the attitudes expressed statewide about the barriers associated with addressing substance abuse problems.


Potential Strategies to Reduce Hurdles

Figure 18. Wyoming State



Interviewees had many thoughts and suggestions about how the barriers associated with addressing substance abuse could be reduced. Almost one-third of the interviewees thought that strengthening prevention efforts would help. Other potential possibilities for reducing hurdles included enhancing legal system services, coordinating services better, and increasing program funding and treatment availability.

Figure 19. Southwest Region




“Alcohol is the gateway drug, and we need to educate parents about this and about substance abuse in general.”

Southwest Wyoming respondents felt that the hurdles associated with addressing substance abuse could best be addressed by focusing on prevention, and enhancements to the legal and treatment systems.


Cultural Norms that May Perpetuate Substance Abuse Problems

Figure 20. Wyoming State



Statewide interviewees had many ideas about how the culture promotes substance abuse issues. Many indicated that alcohol is routinely served at community events, and alcohol advertisements are prominent at rodeos, fairs, and other community and family events. Many ideas about Wyoming's culture fell into the "other category". The most common responses included peer pressure, and pop culture. Some communities indicated that all parties involve alcohol, and almost all the parties happen at a bar. They reported that this communicates a message to kids that alcohol should be consumed in order to have a good time.

Figure 21. Southwest Region



The way people think about substance use has a significant impact on successful prevention intervention. When the participants were asked about how they felt their community perceived substance use, the following perception was brought up most frequently:

“People do not want to help the transients because they do not view them as contributing to the community. It goes back to the first energy boom – it is easy to blame all the outsiders for all of our problems instead of taking ownership.”

Southwest Wyoming respondents felt that the working environment, and community activities involving alcohol contribute most to a culture that supports heavy alcohol consumption.

PUBLIC OPINION RESULTS

The Wyoming Community Prevention Project used a multi-method approach to this needs assessment. Several data sources were compiled in attempt to obtain a comprehensive picture of community level substance abuse prevention needs. The results reported in this section of the report are from a Public Opinion Survey that was administered over the Internet. Several press releases were issued advertising the survey, and the data collectors disseminated flyers in each community. The data reported here represent the opinions of local citizens and individuals who work in fields that bring them into contact with substance users and their families. Data were suppressed in any case where there were fewer than ten respondents.

Southwest Region Respondent Breakdown

Figure 22. Respondents by County




Table 3. Number of Respondents by County

	Lincoln	Sublette	Sweetwater	Teton	Uinta
Respondents	33	5	9	7	26

Southwest Region Gender Breakdown

Figure 23. Gender




Table 4. Number of Respondents by Gender by County

	Lincoln	Sublette	Sweetwater	Teton	Uinta
Male	19	0	1	1	8
Female	14	5	8	6	18

Southwest Region Age Breakdown

Figure 24. Age Groups Reported in the Southwest Region




Table 5. Age Groups Reported by County

	Lincoln	Sublette	Sweetwater	Teton	Uinta
< 13 y/o	0	0	0	0	0
13-18	0	0	11	0	0
19-24	24	20	0	0	4
25-44	39	60	33	57	50
45-59	27	20	56	29	42
60+	9	0	0	14	4

Note: Values are presented in percents and may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Southwest Region Respondents with Multiple Jobs

Figure 25. Respondents in the Southwest Region Who Reported Having More Than One Job




Table 6. Respondents Who Reported Having More than One Job by County

	Lincoln	Sublette*	Sweetwater*	Teton*	Uinta
Yes	30	N/A	N/A	N/A	38
No	70	N/A	N/A	N/A	62

*Too few respondents to report data

Note: Values are presented in percents and may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Southwest Region Perceptions of Substance Use

Figure 26. Perceptions of the Percent of People in the Community Who Use Alcohol and Drugs




Table 7. Perceptions of the Percent of People in the Community Who Use Alcohol and Drugs

	Lincoln	Sublette*	Sweetwater*	Teton*	Uinta
Use Alcohol	57	N/A	N/A	N/A	65
Abuse Alcohol	36	N/A	N/A	N/A	29
Abuse Drugs	30	N/A	N/A	N/A	33

*Too few respondents to report data

Note: Values are presented in percents and may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Southwest Region Perceived Threat of Substance Abuse

Figure 27. Drugs identified as Primary Threat to the Community




Table 8. Drugs identified as Primary Threat to the Community


	Lincoln	Sublette*	Sweetwater*	Teton*	Uinta
Alcohol	43	N/A	N/A	N/A	24
Marijuana	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	4
Methamphetamine	40	N/A	N/A	N/A	60
Inhalants	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Tobacco	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	12
Other Prescription Medications	10	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

* Too few respondents to report data.

Note: Values are presented in percents and may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Southwest Region Perceived Substance Use Problem by Age

Figure 28. Age Group Perceived to Have Biggest Substance Use Problem



Note: The following age groups did not have any responses: 45-59, and 60+.

Table 9. Age Group Perceived to Have Biggest Substance Use Problem



	Lincoln	Sublette*	Sweetwater*	Teton*	Uinta
< 13yo	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
13-18	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	4
19-24	73	N/A	N/A	N/A	64
25-44	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	32
45-59	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
60+	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

*Too few respondents to report data.

Note: Values are presented in percents and may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Southwest Region Perceived Substance use Problems by Age

Figure 29. Perceived Substance Use Problems by Age



Southwest Region Perception of Primary Substance Use Threat by Age

Figure 30. Regional Perception of Primary Substance Use Threat by Age





Figure 31. Uinta County Perception of Primary Substance Use Threat by Age



Southwest Region Top 10 Perceived Reasons for Substance Use

Table 10. Top 10 Perceived Reasons for Substance Use in the Region

Southwest Region
1 Easy access
2 Peer Pressure
3 Violence or mental/physical abuse
4 Poor stress management
5 Pop culture/media influence
6 Boredom
7 Low socio-economic status
8 Low self-esteem
9 Increased stamina
10 Low education level

Also tied for 10th is Lack of recreation facilities/opportunities.

Table 11. Top 10 Perceived Reasons for Substance Use by County

Lincoln County	Uinta County
1 Easy Access	1 Violence or mental/physical abuse
2 Violence or mental/physical abuse	1 Easy Access
3 Peer Pressure	2 Peer Pressure
4 Boredom	3 Poor stress management
4 Poor stress management	3 Low cost of drugs and alcohol
5 Pop culture/media influence	4 Low socio-economic status
5 Low education level	4 Boredom
5 Lack of recreation facilities/opportunities	4 Low self-esteem
5 Low self-esteem among community	4 Pop culture/media influence
6 Unaware of risks	5 Presence of meth

Note: Also tied for Lincoln County 6th is High stamina. Also tied for Uinta 5th Lack of police visibility and Unaware of risks associated with drug/alcohol use.

Southwest Region Top 10 Perceptions of Harm Due to Substance Use

Table 12. Top 10 Perceptions of Harm Due to Substance Use

Southwest Region
1 Addiction
2 Physical health
2 Home life or marriage
3 Family relationships
3 Mental/emotional health
4 Accidents
5 Financial situation
5 Violence
6 Work, studies, or employment opportunities
7 Spread of infections diseases

Table 13. Top 10 Perceptions of Harm Due to Substance Use by County

Lincoln County	Uinta County
1 Addiction	1 Addiction
2 Physical health	2 Physical health
2 Home life or marriage	2 Mental/emotional health
3 Family relationships	3 Financial situation
4 Accidents	3 Accidents
4 Mental/emotional health	3 Home life or marriage
5 Violence	4 Work, studies, or employment opportunities
6 Financial situation	4 Family relationships
7 Work, studies, or employment opportunities	5 Violence
8 Friendships and social life	6 Spread of infections diseases

Note: Also tied for Lincoln County 8th is Spread of infectious diseases. Number repeated due to ties.

Southwest Region Perceptions of Resource Allocation

Figure 32. Regional Perception of the Optimal Distribution of Resources




Table 14. County Perception of the Optimal distribution for Resources

	Lincoln	Sublette*	Sweetwater*	Teton*	Uinta
Enforcement	13	N/A	N/A	N/A	8
Treatment	21	N/A	N/A	N/A	20
Education and Prevention	67	N/A	N/A	N/A	72

*Too few respondents to report data.

Note: Values are presented in percents and may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Southwest Region Top 10 Activities Perceived as Effective in Combating Substance Use

Table 15. Top 10 Perceived Activities that Effectively Combat Substance Use

Southwest Region	
1	Youth activities
2	Family support activities
3	Family activities
4	Community activities
5	School-based activities
5	Social support activities
6	Career-training programs
7	Awareness campaigns
8	Community prevention programs
9	Mental health activities

Also tied for 9th is Offering more local drug treatment facilities.

Table 16. Top 10 Perceived Activities that Effectively Combat Substance use

Lincoln County	Uinta County
1 Youth activities	1 Family support activities
2 Family activities	1 Social support activities
3 Family support activities	2 Youth activities
4 Community activities	2 Career-training programs
5 School-based activities	3 Social support activities
6 Social support activities	4 Family support activities
7 Mental health activities	4 Awareness campaigns
7 Alternative sentencing for drug offenders	4 Community prevention programs
8 Cultural activities	4 More local drug treatment facilities
8 Awareness campaigns	5 Community activities

Note: Also tied for Lincoln County 8th is Career-training programs, Community prevention programs and Offering more local drug treatment facilities. Also tied for Uinta County 5th is Mental health activities, Creating a community drug strategy and Increasing legal enforcement.

Southwest Region Perceived Reasons for School Dropout

Figure 33. Regional Perception of Reasons for School Dropout




Table 17. County Perception of Reasons for School Dropout

	Lincoln	Sublette*	Sweetwater*	Teton*	Uinta
Boredom	23	N/A	N/A	N/A	9
At-risk of high-risk behavior	38	N/A	N/A	N/A	48
Lack of Activities	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Gangs	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Pull to high-paying jobs	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Don't know	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Other	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	4

*Too few respondents to report data.

Southwest Region Perception of How Dropping Out Could Be Prevented

Figure 34. Regional Ideas of How School Dropout Can Be Prevented




Table 18. Ideas by County of How School Dropout Can Be Prevented

	Lincoln	Sublette*	Sweetwater*	Teton*	Uinta
Family strengthening	86	N/A	N/A	N/A	92
School Improvement	67	N/A	N/A	N/A	96
Economic stability	43	N/A	N/A	N/A	83
Reduce substance abuse	86	N/A	N/A	N/A	96
Improve attendance	82	N/A	N/A	N/A	88
Improve mental health services	62	N/A	N/A	N/A	83
Improve transportation	43	N/A	N/A	N/A	58
Reduce criminal involvement	64	N/A	N/A	N/A	96
Improve physical health	57	N/A	N/A	N/A	83
Alternative or Vo-tech education	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Student-teacher relationship	100	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
Help students with poor grades	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0

*Too few respondents to report data.

Note: Values are presented in percents and may not add up to 100 due to rounding.

Southwest Region Perceived Reasons for Re-Arrest

Table 19. Regional Perception of Reasons for Re-Arrest

Southwest Region
1 Substance abuse
2 Chronic criminal behavior
3 Lack of family support or family resources
4 Lack of employment/job training
5 Poor economic situation

Table 20. County Perception of Reasons for Re-Arrest

Lincoln County	Uinta County
1 Substance abuse	1 Substance abuse
2 Chronic criminal behavior	2 Lack of employment/job training
3 Lack of family support or family resources	2 Chronic criminal behavior
4 Lack of employment/job training	2 Lack of family support or family resources
5 Not enough mental health services	3 Poor economic situation

Data Dashboard

On the following pages are interactive county data dashboards that show the results for each county.

APPENDIX A

Alcohol Indicators

Table 21. Alcohol-Related Hospitalizations Rate Per 10,000 Population

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE						
<u>Central Region</u>						
<i>Converse</i>	41	31	27	24	40	22
<i>Fremont</i>	133	141	131	153	135	122
<i>Natrona</i>	49	46	42	53	54	67
<i>Niobrara</i>	9	21	32	28	16	11
<u>Northeast Region</u>						
<i>Campbell</i>	57	57	57	60	54	90
<i>Crook</i>	14	26	16	7	9	29
<i>Johnson</i>	6	6	11	7	8	10
<i>Sheridan</i>	51	67	70	72	56	50
<i>Weston</i>	19	16	20	15	21	19
<u>Northwest Region</u>						
<i>Big Horn</i>	49	56	29	22	19	20
<i>Hot Springs</i>	66	63	53	43	37	50
<i>Park</i>	16	36	23	46	45	50
<i>Washakie</i>	40	32	64	56	55	26
<u>Southeast Region</u>						
<i>Albany</i>	50	47	45	37	37	34
<i>Carbon</i>	67	60	54	69	76	69
<i>Goshen</i>	29	35	34	31	37	33
<i>Laramie</i>	58	58	47	44	55	43
<i>Platte</i>	46	55	29	28	32	31
<u>Southwest Region</u>						
<i>Lincoln</i>	10	17	12	16	7	11
<i>Sublette</i>	30	34	47	76	48	38
<i>Sweetwater</i>	43	55	53	63	55	49
<i>Teton</i>	45	50	65	72	76	89
<i>Uinta</i>	9	27	25	29	27	34

Table 22. Arrests for Drunkenness Rate Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	16	9	11	9	2	7	7
<i>Fremont</i>	111	107	28	19	36	50	72
<i>Natrona</i>	83	76	73	73	76	69	81
<i>Niobrara</i>	5	0	0	27	33	0	16
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	28	31	38	33	36	34	33
<i>Crook</i>	14	21	11	13	24	6	8
<i>Johnson</i>	32	39	40	19	20	21	24
<i>Sheridan</i>	32	16	6	24	18	14	19
<i>Weston</i>	17	10	12	10	15	9	13
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	1	4	6	5	4	13	19
<i>Hot Springs</i>	26	47	32	13	27	27	8
<i>Park</i>	8	8	16	17	20	12	26
<i>Washakie</i>	14	22	30	10	19	32	41
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	8	11	16	18	5	0	0
<i>Carbon</i>	24	15	19	8	3	5	11
<i>Goshen</i>	16	4	9	20	12	10	17
<i>Laramie</i>	27	18	20	18	29	33	36
<i>Platte</i>	6	8	2	0	1	9	1
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	28	10	24	8	14	10	6
<i>Sublette</i>	2	7	13	15	16	14	11
<i>Sweetwater</i>	70	58	83	56	85	110	142
<i>Teton</i>	173	80	97	114	94	68	50
<i>Uinta</i>	61	72	69	65	85	56	71

Table 23. Arrests for DUI Rater Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	108	108	101	115	97	88	126
<i>Fremont</i>	147	151	160	197	157	177	190
<i>Natrona</i>	87	121	136	95	108	116	112
<i>Niobrara</i>	33	38	38	82	72	27	59
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	167	174	182	153	131	149	170
<i>Crook</i>	110	123	153	126	175	123	74
<i>Johnson</i>	110	127	142	107	98	112	134
<i>Sheridan</i>	129	134	125	127	140	146	109
<i>Weston</i>	105	61	40	57	49	82	95
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	34	38	27	55	90	115	111
<i>Hot Springs</i>	58	47	71	43	113	171	119
<i>Park</i>	80	71	74	71	80	90	111
<i>Washakie</i>	75	114	118	72	123	102	82
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	137	121	79	101	84	103	148
<i>Carbon</i>	148	157	165	145	128	111	141
<i>Goshen</i>	88	116	81	87	111	93	86
<i>Laramie</i>	109	88	95	94	89	89	85
<i>Platte</i>	203	158	167	132	141	138	135
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	167	129	167	147	124	100	84
<i>Sublette</i>	171	143	104	125	172	213	213
<i>Sweetwater</i>	115	116	147	120	113	139	181
<i>Teton</i>	206	166	168	134	161	193	181
<i>Uinta</i>	203	190	207	171	173	137	156

Table 24. Arrests for Liquor Law Violations Rate Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	124	119	87	74	86	76	99
<i>Fremont</i>	123	116	101	97	33	48	33
<i>Natrona</i>	114	113	166	101	80	91	69
<i>Niobrara</i>	57	16	54	71	61	43	37
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	103	90	102	85	59	73	75
<i>Crook</i>	67	67	108	93	52	47	65
<i>Johnson</i>	28	75	65	59	57	66	46
<i>Sheridan</i>	80	101	165	137	131	127	112
<i>Weston</i>	33	67	49	34	34	37	54
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	39	43	67	16	22	29	58
<i>Hot Springs</i>	130	158	37	91	73	94	87
<i>Park</i>	132	108	95	80	99	90	76
<i>Washakie</i>	128	128	76	44	78	68	56
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	349	284	201	229	245	260	284
<i>Carbon</i>	136	130	142	157	107	82	86
<i>Goshen</i>	88	117	98	123	77	56	93
<i>Laramie</i>	108	108	84	61	92	54	38
<i>Platte</i>	79	90	77	22	40	26	25
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	45	32	31	35	12	8	6
<i>Sublette</i>	75	64	62	32	43	48	36
<i>Sweetwater</i>	80	64	38	48	41	46	50
<i>Teton</i>	30	10	18	24	24	25	31
<i>Uinta</i>	108	89	53	69	56	52	43

Table 25. Direct Alcohol-Related Arrests Rate Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	248	237	199	198	186	172	233
<i>Fremont</i>	381	374	288	313	226	275	295
<i>Natrona</i>	283	311	375	270	264	275	261
<i>Niobrara</i>	95	54	92	181	167	71	112
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	298	296	322	271	225	256	279
<i>Crook</i>	192	211	273	233	251	177	147
<i>Johnson</i>	171	241	247	185	175	199	204
<i>Sheridan</i>	241	251	297	288	289	287	240
<i>Weston</i>	155	139	101	101	98	129	161
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	74	84	100	75	115	157	187
<i>Hot Springs</i>	214	252	140	147	213	291	214
<i>Park</i>	221	187	185	168	199	193	213
<i>Washakie</i>	218	264	224	126	219	202	179
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	495	415	296	347	334	363	432
<i>Carbon</i>	308	302	326	310	238	198	237
<i>Goshen</i>	192	237	188	230	199	160	195
<i>Laramie</i>	244	214	199	173	211	176	160
<i>Platte</i>	288	256	245	155	183	174	161
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	240	171	221	189	150	118	95
<i>Sublette</i>	249	214	180	171	232	275	261
<i>Sweetwater</i>	266	237	268	224	239	295	373
<i>Teton</i>	409	255	284	272	278	286	262
<i>Uinta</i>	372	352	329	305	314	244	270

Table 26. Indirect Alcohol-Related Arrests Rate Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	24	18	35	18	17	18	20
<i>Fremont</i>	18	20	19	23	19	27	29
<i>Natrona</i>	34	36	31	30	28	27	28
<i>Niobrara</i>	12	10	0	16	18	15	12
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	30	37	34	40	37	36	39
<i>Crook</i>	10	9	13	11	17	10	10
<i>Johnson</i>	7	6	6	4	11	10	10
<i>Sheridan</i>	19	19	18	18	18	15	16
<i>Weston</i>	5	13	11	7	17	13	18
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	16	10	6	11	13	13	13
<i>Hot Springs</i>	18	21	31	30	31	28	18
<i>Park</i>	11	13	13	9	9	15	14
<i>Washakie</i>	9	25	29	9	14	18	14
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	16	14	17	16	14	13	11
<i>Carbon</i>	24	34	31	39	41	48	38
<i>Goshen</i>	17	9	16	22	16	18	24
<i>Laramie</i>	20	29	29	31	26	27	26
<i>Platte</i>	24	21	26	22	17	22	23
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	11	13	15	15	12	14	11
<i>Sublette</i>	16	26	30	23	20	33	36
<i>Sweetwater</i>	22	23	27	20	26	31	26
<i>Teton</i>	25	18	9	7	14	9	19
<i>Uinta</i>	18	24	19	23	17	18	21

Drug Indicators

Table 27. Arrests for Drug Possession Rate Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	56	64	41	67	68	76	92
<i>Fremont</i>	79	67	114	135	143	215	184
<i>Natrona</i>	269	282	385	282	401	503	453
<i>Niobrara</i>	0	0	0	6	6	1	3
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	99	100	129	182	164	171	243
<i>Crook</i>	18	18	14	18	17	21	23
<i>Johnson</i>	3	9	7	6	17	13	31
<i>Sheridan</i>	34	60	72	88	55	90	68
<i>Weston</i>	2	9	7	13	13	13	16
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	17	7	14	11	22	28	18
<i>Hot Springs</i>	9	12	27	18	23	25	30
<i>Park</i>	42	36	56	36	32	37	44
<i>Washakie</i>	24	80	15	27	9	14	30
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	152	102	88	96	114	144	132
<i>Carbon</i>	58	71	100	80	75	125	126
<i>Goshen</i>	16	11	6	5	9	14	18
<i>Laramie</i>	363	379	484	472	342	266	284
<i>Platte</i>	33	23	37	29	26	17	33
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	26	28	37	61	39	28	43
<i>Sublette</i>	21	14	13	14	36	33	65
<i>Sweetwater</i>	128	109	144	158	228	300	405
<i>Teton</i>	53	36	62	47	48	44	66
<i>Uinta</i>	75	77	85	129	122	79	124

Table 28. Arrests for Drug Sales Rate Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	2	3	5	21	9	9	9
<i>Fremont</i>	11	12	15	16	6	3	4
<i>Natrona</i>	19	19	15	14	36	22	33
<i>Niobrara</i>	2	1	0	1	1	0	3
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	17	9	11	19	48	32	63
<i>Crook</i>	0	1	2	4	0	5	4
<i>Johnson</i>	6	5	0	14	6	10	11
<i>Sheridan</i>	28	7	8	24	8	13	8
<i>Weston</i>	0	3	1	0	0	1	10
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	5	3	6	0	5	7	2
<i>Hot Springs</i>	0	2	9	7	7	3	7
<i>Park</i>	5	4	6	6	1	2	16
<i>Washakie</i>	12	39	3	3	10	30	9
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	9	1	3	4	1	1	1
<i>Carbon</i>	10	26	16	28	28	27	22
<i>Goshen</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Laramie</i>	36	56	60	70	36	30	24
<i>Platte</i>	27	3	2	2	4	16	10
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	2	2	5	3	9	17	13
<i>Sublette</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Sweetwater</i>	39	29	26	37	38	34	43
<i>Teton</i>	2	0	3	5	2	6	13
<i>Uinta</i>	10	11	8	7	6	7	6

Table 29. Direct Drug-Related Arrests Rater Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	66	78	52	96	83	89	102
<i>Fremont</i>	35	30	49	56	55	80	67
<i>Natrona</i>	61	61	80	59	85	100	91
<i>Niobrara</i>	9	5	0	33	39	5	32
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	53	47	57	78	80	75	110
<i>Crook</i>	41	44	34	47	37	55	55
<i>Johnson</i>	17	26	13	35	39	38	67
<i>Sheridan</i>	32	33	39	54	30	48	35
<i>Weston</i>	4	22	14	23	25	26	48
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	27	12	24	13	33	41	23
<i>Hot Springs</i>	26	37	95	67	81	75	98
<i>Park</i>	24	21	31	21	16	19	28
<i>Washakie</i>	58	197	30	50	32	73	64
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	68	39	35	38	44	56	52
<i>Carbon</i>	58	82	99	91	86	125	122
<i>Goshen</i>	17	12	6	5	9	15	20
<i>Laramie</i>	67	72	89	87	60	46	47
<i>Platte</i>	93	40	59	46	45	49	63
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	29	29	40	60	43	39	47
<i>Sublette</i>	48	32	29	30	74	64	120
<i>Sweetwater</i>	61	52	64	72	97	119	156
<i>Teton</i>	48	25	44	35	33	32	51
<i>Uinta</i>	66	67	70	99	93	61	91

Table 30. Drug-Related Hospitalizations Rater Per 10,000 Population

	2000	2001	2002	2003*	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE						
<u>Central Region</u>						
<i>Converse</i>	13	12	7	18	16	15
<i>Fremont</i>	33	36	37	62	80	82
<i>Natrona</i>	14	18	15	29	37	46
<i>Niobrara</i>	9	5	11	22	11	27
<u>Northeast Region</u>						
<i>Campbell</i>	10	33	29	45	54	60
<i>Crook</i>	5	5	9	24	45	20
<i>Johnson</i>	0	4	14	7	2	14
<i>Sheridan</i>	23	45	46	49	57	67
<i>Weston</i>	6	6	4	8	28	19
<u>Northwest Region</u>						
<i>Big Horn</i>	12	12	13	18	22	22
<i>Hot Springs</i>	26	29	13	41	59	53
<i>Park</i>	7	15	11	20	29	31
<i>Washakie</i>	22	28	25	29	18	16
<u>Southeast Region</u>						
<i>Albany</i>	14	23	16	26	22	25
<i>Carbon</i>	17	17	18	32	34	45
<i>Goshen</i>	4	6	16	23	24	22
<i>Laramie</i>	14	21	19	32	37	25
<i>Platte</i>	15	24	23	24	18	19
<u>Southwest Region</u>						
<i>Lincoln</i>	0	8	10	9	10	16
<i>Sublette</i>	14	23	18	53	39	53
<i>Sweetwater</i>	18	20	24	48	40	46
<i>Teton</i>	15	33	26	47	38	58
<i>Uinta</i>	3	3	7	17	19	31

*Refinements to the hospital discharge calculation caused the rates to increase after 2002. Use caution when comparing rates in 2003.

Table 31. Hepatitis B and C Rate Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	6	8	7	9	11	6	8
<i>Fremont</i>	11	10	11	16	13	11	14
<i>Natrona</i>	7	8	7	11	29	14	14
<i>Niobrara</i>	15	0	0	9	36	48	48
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	6	8	5	7	6	8	10
<i>Crook</i>	0	0	2	8	3	2	2
<i>Johnson</i>	3	6	4	11	3	5	6
<i>Sheridan</i>	22	7	9	13	8	10	23
<i>Weston</i>	6	9	11	15	29	13	8
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	4	5	4	10	4	10	2
<i>Hot Springs</i>	11	4	2	11	9	11	13
<i>Park</i>	2	3	4	5	6	5	7
<i>Washakie</i>	2	10	9	1	11	5	8
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	7	4	3	3	1	2	4
<i>Carbon</i>	16	9	5	12	30	35	41
<i>Goshen</i>	6	2	3	4	6	1	3
<i>Laramie</i>	5	9	7	8	9	9	14
<i>Platte</i>	3	5	5	7	3	6	8
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	3	1	3	5	3	1	2
<i>Sublette</i>	0	10	5	8	6	3	3
<i>Sweetwater</i>	14	7	5	9	11	7	9
<i>Teton</i>	8	5	2	4	2	5	7
<i>Uinta</i>	22	6	28	11	10	11	14

Table 32. Indirect Drug-Related Arrests Rate Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	9	10	13	9	6	11	7
<i>Fremont</i>	17	15	15	16	14	18	23
<i>Natrona</i>	26	25	21	24	23	21	22
<i>Niobrara</i>	6	2	0	12	13	7	7
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	21	21	21	18	19	22	17
<i>Crook</i>	7	7	7	5	7	5	4
<i>Johnson</i>	3	4	6	4	7	8	6
<i>Sheridan</i>	14	15	18	17	14	11	10
<i>Weston</i>	3	10	10	5	10	5	6
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	10	7	5	3	5	8	8
<i>Hot Springs</i>	11	12	17	15	14	10	6
<i>Park</i>	10	7	10	7	6	7	8
<i>Washakie</i>	8	28	21	12	10	6	8
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	16	10	14	12	13	13	14
<i>Carbon</i>	19	23	17	28	22	25	26
<i>Goshen</i>	11	8	11	8	10	8	6
<i>Laramie</i>	19	25	25	24	20	20	24
<i>Platte</i>	12	10	10	7	6	9	7
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	7	9	9	6	6	6	6
<i>Sublette</i>	10	15	12	14	9	14	16
<i>Sweetwater</i>	35	22	18	22	20	32	22
<i>Teton</i>	11	9	10	8	8	8	13
<i>Uinta</i>	20	15	16	23	16	14	17

Table 33. Sexually Transmitted Diseases: Chlamydia and Gonorrhea Rate Per 10,000 Population

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE							
<u>Central Region</u>							
<i>Converse</i>	15	7	10	13	22	20	9
<i>Fremont</i>	24	33	27	39	29	39	31
<i>Natrona</i>	24	23	28	31	26	27	35
<i>Niobrara</i>	7	8	4	0	9	4	13
<u>Northeast Region</u>							
<i>Campbell</i>	14	12	11	16	15	15	20
<i>Crook</i>	3	7	3	2	3	8	10
<i>Johnson</i>	12	3	8	11	5	3	8
<i>Sheridan</i>	12	16	17	20	24	23	13
<i>Weston</i>	0	8	18	25	8	12	11
<u>Northwest Region</u>							
<i>Big Horn</i>	4	8	7	3	11	7	16
<i>Hot Springs</i>	11	20	15	2	11	9	2
<i>Park</i>	11	7	8	8	13	12	15
<i>Washakie</i>	1	5	11	4	15	15	11
<u>Southeast Region</u>							
<i>Albany</i>	15	21	21	31	38	32	27
<i>Carbon</i>	6	13	7	7	10	9	8
<i>Goshen</i>	6	6	6	7	6	11	12
<i>Laramie</i>	27	29	35	29	30	33	46
<i>Platte</i>	7	7	13	3	1	8	5
<u>Southwest Region</u>							
<i>Lincoln</i>	6	3	4	5	5	6	6
<i>Sublette</i>	3	3	3	8	5	8	4
<i>Sweetwater</i>	13	18	11	19	16	26	31
<i>Teton</i>	7	5	10	8	5	14	14
<i>Uinta</i>	13	12	10	12	13	22	16

Family Indicators

Families Living in a Stable, Healthy Environment

Table 34. Child Abuse and Neglect Rate Per 10,000 Population

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	310	140	250
<i>Fremont</i>	60	50	50
<i>Natrona</i>	130	140	130
<i>Niobrara</i>	20	70	140
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	20	50	160
<i>Crook</i>	0	10	0
<i>Johnson</i>	70	160	90
<i>Sheridan</i>	160	110	120
<i>Weston</i>	40	0	20
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	20	40	40
<i>Hot Springs</i>	150	250	240
<i>Park</i>	100	60	50
<i>Washakie</i>	50	240	250
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	50	30	20
<i>Carbon</i>	60	130	230
<i>Goshen</i>	120	70	60
<i>Laramie</i>	80	50	60
<i>Platte</i>	430	110	240
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	20	30	60
<i>Sublette</i>	10	40	70
<i>Sweetwater</i>	110	90	140
<i>Teton</i>	10	10	10
<i>Uinta</i>	90	100	140

Table 35. Domestic Violence Rate Per 10,000 Population

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	30	40	50
<i>Fremont</i>	50	50	60
<i>Natrona</i>	60	70	60
<i>Niobrara</i>	10	20	10
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	100	110	130
<i>Crook</i>	40	20	30
<i>Johnson</i>	30	20	20
<i>Sheridan</i>	30	30	20
<i>Weston</i>	50	50	30
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	20	10	10
<i>Hot Springs</i>	80	60	30
<i>Park</i>	50	50	50
<i>Washakie</i>	10	10	10
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	70	80	70
<i>Carbon</i>	80	70	80
<i>Goshen</i>	40	0	30
<i>Laramie</i>	70	80	70
<i>Platte</i>	50	60	60
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	50	30	40
<i>Sublette</i>	10	50	90
<i>Sweetwater</i>	90	100	90
<i>Teton</i>	40	20	40
<i>Uinta</i>	40	40	40

Table 36. Divorce Rate Per 10,000 Population

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	40	47	60
<i>Fremont</i>	64	53	51
<i>Natrona</i>	59	59	55
<i>Niobrara</i>	58	44	35
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	60	62	50
<i>Crook</i>	30	43	44
<i>Johnson</i>	54	53	41
<i>Sheridan</i>	51	51	43
<i>Weston</i>	48	48	50
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	26	30	39
<i>Hot Springs</i>	76	55	63
<i>Park</i>	48	40	47
<i>Washakie</i>	59	49	44
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	34	38	36
<i>Carbon</i>	57	56	52
<i>Goshen</i>	34	46	49
<i>Laramie</i>	60	59	62
<i>Platte</i>	44	46	52
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	43	52	43
<i>Sublette</i>	43	44	55
<i>Sweetwater</i>	70	60	68
<i>Teton</i>	44	42	45
<i>Uinta</i>	63	60	60

Table 37. Fatal Motor Vehicle Accidents Ages Birth to 24 Years Rate Per 10,000 Population

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	1	0	0
<i>Fremont</i>	0	1	2
<i>Natrona</i>	0	1	1
<i>Niobrara</i>	13	0	9
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	1	1	2
<i>Crook</i>	5	0	2
<i>Johnson</i>	0	3	3
<i>Sheridan</i>	2	0	1
<i>Weston</i>	2	0	2
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	0	0	3
<i>Hot Springs</i>	0	2	2
<i>Park</i>	0	1	1
<i>Washakie</i>	0	1	0
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	2	2	1
<i>Carbon</i>	2	3	3
<i>Goshen</i>	0	1	0
<i>Laramie</i>	0	1	0
<i>Platte</i>	1	6	3
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	1	2	1
<i>Sublette</i>	2	2	0
<i>Sweetwater</i>	2	1	0
<i>Teton</i>	2	0	1
<i>Uinta</i>	1	0	2

Table 38. Suicide Rate Per 10,000 Population

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	2	1	0
<i>Fremont</i>	3	2	3
<i>Natrona</i>	3	2	2
<i>Niobrara</i>	0	0	4
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	2	1	1
<i>Crook</i>	3	0	0
<i>Johnson</i>	1	4	1
<i>Sheridan</i>	3	1	4
<i>Weston</i>	0	3	2
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	3	0	0
<i>Hot Springs</i>	2	0	2
<i>Park</i>	4	3	3
<i>Washakie</i>	3	4	0
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	2	1	2
<i>Carbon</i>	2	3	2
<i>Goshen</i>	0	4	0
<i>Laramie</i>	2	1	2
<i>Platte</i>	2	0	1
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	1	2	1
<i>Sublette</i>	2	2	1
<i>Sweetwater</i>	1	3	1
<i>Teton</i>	1	1	3
<i>Uinta</i>	3	1	2

Economic Diversity, Equality and Sustainability

Table 39. Average Annual Pay

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	\$30,035	\$31,188	\$32,312
<i>Fremont</i>	\$24,988	\$26,454	\$28,103
<i>Natrona</i>	\$30,071	\$32,284	\$34,810
<i>Niobrara</i>	\$20,991	\$21,749	\$22,868
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	\$38,311	\$40,857	\$42,781
<i>Crook</i>	\$25,464	\$26,596	\$28,370
<i>Johnson</i>	\$23,232	\$24,054	\$25,870
<i>Sheridan</i>	\$26,637	\$28,087	\$29,619
<i>Weston</i>	\$24,986	\$25,446	\$25,994
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	\$28,275	\$28,756	\$30,380
<i>Hot Springs</i>	\$21,806	\$22,368	\$24,256
<i>Park</i>	\$24,833	\$26,124	\$27,313
<i>Washakie</i>	\$25,996	\$28,301	\$29,151
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	\$27,168	\$26,224	\$29,093
<i>Carbon</i>	\$25,948	\$27,106	\$28,903
<i>Goshen</i>	\$22,245	\$23,017	\$24,194
<i>Laramie</i>	\$29,699	\$31,007	\$32,208
<i>Platte</i>	\$27,179	\$28,777	\$29,453
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	\$31,582	\$31,099	\$31,524
<i>Sublette</i>	\$29,725	\$31,891	\$36,751
<i>Sweetwater</i>	\$37,577	\$38,922	\$42,088
<i>Teton</i>	\$30,554	\$31,431	\$32,994
<i>Uinta</i>	\$28,628	\$29,174	\$31,056

Table 40. Job Growth Rate Per 10,000 Population

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	176	99	195
<i>Fremont</i>	-90	31	80
<i>Natrona</i>	96	190	102
<i>Niobrara</i>	-13	22	-4
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	-111	126	389
<i>Crook</i>	52	214	151
<i>Johnson</i>	69	170	157
<i>Sheridan</i>	52	64	73
<i>Weston</i>	-209	10	84
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	49	154	63
<i>Hot Springs</i>	-267	9	-53
<i>Park</i>	112	54	32
<i>Washakie</i>	117	70	128
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	123	421	-49
<i>Carbon</i>	-98	42	90
<i>Goshen</i>	-70	-7	-26
<i>Laramie</i>	100	23	44
<i>Platte</i>	-72	81	-38
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	560	-132	-92
<i>Sublette</i>	411	612	935
<i>Sweetwater</i>	203	202	283
<i>Teton</i>	-87	102	147
<i>Uinta</i>	-72	-64	97

Table 41. Single Job Holder Rate Per 10,000

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	8,953	8,960	8,980
<i>Fremont</i>	8,940	8,898	8,968
<i>Natrona</i>	9,080	9,050	9,065
<i>Niobrara</i>	8,458	8,705	8,743
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	9,170	9,183	9,168
<i>Crook</i>	9,075	8,968	8,965
<i>Johnson</i>	8,725	8,655	8,688
<i>Sheridan</i>	8,980	8,973	8,945
<i>Weston</i>	9,168	9,143	9,098
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	9,045	8,903	8,995
<i>Hot Springs</i>	8,628	8,688	8,790
<i>Park</i>	8,960	8,925	8,963
<i>Washakie</i>	8,940	8,963	8,903
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	8,693	8,550	8,973
<i>Carbon</i>	8,978	8,923	8,918
<i>Goshen</i>	8,983	9,035	9,058
<i>Laramie</i>	9,070	9,010	8,998
<i>Platte</i>	8,915	8,880	8,883
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	8,950	8,965	8,865
<i>Sublette</i>	8,773	8,725	8,768
<i>Sweetwater</i>	9,088	9,043	9,010
<i>Teton</i>	8,365	8,335	8,298
<i>Uinta</i>	8,853	8,753	8,808

Affordable, Accessible Healthcare and Insurance

Table 42. Population with Health Insurance Rate Per 10,000

2001-2005	
WYOMING STATE	
<u>Central Region</u>	
<i>Converse</i>	8,260
<i>Fremont</i>	8,110
<i>Natrona</i>	8,220
<i>Niobrara</i>	8,070
<u>Northeast Region</u>	
<i>Campbell</i>	8,300
<i>Crook</i>	8,510
<i>Johnson</i>	8,380
<i>Sheridan</i>	7,890
<i>Weston</i>	7,950
<u>Northwest Region</u>	
<i>Big Horn</i>	7,810
<i>Hot Springs</i>	7,560
<i>Park</i>	8,010
<i>Washakie</i>	8,380
<u>Southeast Region</u>	
<i>Albany</i>	8,530
<i>Carbon</i>	7,970
<i>Goshen</i>	8,400
<i>Laramie</i>	8,480
<i>Platte</i>	8,120
<u>Southwest Region</u>	
<i>Lincoln</i>	8,110
<i>Sublette</i>	8,490
<i>Sweetwater</i>	8,310
<i>Teton</i>	9,000
<i>Uinta</i>	8,160

Table 43. Full Time Doctors Rate Per 10,000 Population

	2005
WYOMING STATE	
<u>Central Region</u>	
<i>Converse</i>	13
<i>Fremont</i>	19
<i>Natrona</i>	25
<i>Niobrara</i>	4
<u>Northeast Region</u>	
<i>Campbell</i>	15
<i>Crook</i>	5
<i>Johnson</i>	15
<i>Sheridan</i>	22
<i>Weston</i>	7
<u>Northwest Region</u>	
<i>Big Horn</i>	6
<i>Hot Springs</i>	12
<i>Park</i>	23
<i>Washakie</i>	15
<u>Southeast Region</u>	
<i>Albany</i>	17
<i>Carbon</i>	9
<i>Goshen</i>	11
<i>Laramie</i>	20
<i>Platte</i>	8
<u>Southwest Region</u>	
<i>Lincoln</i>	8
<i>Sublette</i>	5
<i>Sweetwater</i>	7
<i>Teton</i>	28
<i>Uinta</i>	14

Prenatal and Early Childhood Health Outcomes

Table 44. Low Birth Weight Babies Rate Per 10,000 Births

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	700	600	300
<i>Fremont</i>	1,000	1,000	700
<i>Natrona</i>	700	800	800
<i>Niobrara</i>	500		600
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	1,000	1,000	1,000
<i>Crook</i>	100	900	800
<i>Johnson</i>	1,200	600	700
<i>Sheridan</i>	800	900	800
<i>Weston</i>	1,000	800	400
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	800	900	500
<i>Hot Springs</i>	700	500	1,200
<i>Park</i>	1,000	800	600
<i>Washakie</i>	500	800	1,000
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	900	1,100	1,100
<i>Carbon</i>	1,400	1,000	800
<i>Goshen</i>	600	1,100	900
<i>Laramie</i>	800	800	800
<i>Platte</i>	900	1,500	900
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	500	800	800
<i>Sublette</i>	900	600	400
<i>Sweetwater</i>	1,200	800	700
<i>Teton</i>	1,000	600	900
<i>Uinta</i>	1,200	1,100	1,000

Table 45. Mothers Who Did Not Receive Prenatal Care in the First Trimester Rate Per 10,000 Births

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	1,034	1,370	1,852
<i>Fremont</i>	1,977	2,454	2,301
<i>Natrona</i>	931	1,146	1,023
<i>Niobrara</i>	2,500	1,333	1,765
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	1,308	1,689	1,841
<i>Crook</i>	1,944	2,059	1,406
<i>Johnson</i>	492	808	1,370
<i>Sheridan</i>	968	915	539
<i>Weston</i>	1,714	2,239	2,963
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	1,102	1,126	1,118
<i>Hot Springs</i>	1,667	1,860	1,163
<i>Park</i>	1,328	982	932
<i>Washakie</i>	1,358	465	991
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	987	1,126	1,531
<i>Carbon</i>	1,129	1,716	1,534
<i>Goshen</i>	2,105	1,890	1,280
<i>Laramie</i>	1,310	1,254	966
<i>Platte</i>	1,237	1,882	1,579
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	1,336	1,674	1,434
<i>Sublette</i>	1,714	2,326	2,055
<i>Sweetwater</i>	2,056	2,191	2,310
<i>Teton</i>	1,270	1,308	1,918
<i>Uinta</i>	994	993	764

Table 46. Smoking During Pregnancy Rate Per 10,000 Births

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	2,207	2,808	2,407
<i>Fremont</i>	2,074	2,214	2,234
<i>Natrona</i>	2,730	2,665	2,544
<i>Niobrara</i>	3,000	3,333	1,176
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	2,348	2,264	2,270
<i>Crook</i>	2,500	3,382	1,250
<i>Johnson</i>	1,803	1,414	1,507
<i>Sheridan</i>	2,317	1,951	2,365
<i>Weston</i>	2,000	3,284	3,148
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	1,890	1,391	1,250
<i>Hot Springs</i>	2,667	1,860	2,326
<i>Park</i>	1,411	1,345	1,447
<i>Washakie</i>	1,975	1,279	1,622
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	658	992	742
<i>Carbon</i>	1,452	2,549	2,169
<i>Goshen</i>	1,908	1,732	1,840
<i>Laramie</i>	1,211	1,454	1,442
<i>Platte</i>	2,474	2,353	1,974
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	1,290	1,322	1,474
<i>Sublette</i>	2,000	1,512	1,370
<i>Sweetwater</i>	2,962	2,739	2,171
<i>Teton</i>	328	338	274
<i>Uinta</i>	2,205	1,986	2,326

Table 47. Teen Births Rate Per 10,000 Population

	2003	2004	2005
WYOMING STATE			
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	370	300	520
<i>Fremont</i>	540	570	640
<i>Natrona</i>	470	450	480
<i>Niobrara</i>	250	0	140
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	490	370	400
<i>Crook</i>	670	290	240
<i>Johnson</i>	200	210	200
<i>Sheridan</i>	320	230	320
<i>Weston</i>	360	260	310
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	370	270	400
<i>Hot Springs</i>	150	230	920
<i>Park</i>	210	120	240
<i>Washakie</i>	110	230	380
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	160	90	170
<i>Carbon</i>	410	400	530
<i>Goshen</i>	420	160	200
<i>Laramie</i>	530	400	570
<i>Platte</i>	620	270	210
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	230	160	350
<i>Sublette</i>	370	300	260
<i>Sweetwater</i>	420	320	590
<i>Teton</i>	510	280	440
<i>Uinta</i>	460	260	350

Students Successfully Educated

Table 48. WYCAS Math Progress Rate Per 10,000 Fourth-Grade Students

2003-2005	
WYOMING STATE	
<u>Central Region</u>	
<i>Converse</i>	2,965
<i>Fremont</i>	2,772
<i>Natrona</i>	3,500
<i>Niobrara</i>	2,100
<u>Northeast Region</u>	
<i>Campbell</i>	4,800
<i>Crook</i>	4,500
<i>Johnson</i>	4,000
<i>Sheridan</i>	5,044
<i>Weston</i>	3,033
<u>Northwest Region</u>	
<i>Big Horn</i>	3,085
<i>Hot Springs</i>	3,200
<i>Park</i>	5,526
<i>Washakie</i>	5,126
<u>Southeast Region</u>	
<i>Albany</i>	4,600
<i>Carbon</i>	2,198
<i>Goshen</i>	4,400
<i>Laramie</i>	3,614
<i>Platte</i>	3,572
<u>Southwest Region</u>	
<i>Lincoln</i>	4,894
<i>Sublette</i>	3,220
<i>Sweetwater</i>	3,374
<i>Teton</i>	4,000
<i>Uinta</i>	3,630

Table 49. WYCAS Reading Progress Rate Per 10,000 Fourth-Grade Students

2003-2005	
WYOMING STATE	
<u>Central Region</u>	
<i>Converse</i>	4,062
<i>Fremont</i>	3,616
<i>Natrona</i>	4,500
<i>Niobrara</i>	3,700
<u>Northeast Region</u>	
<i>Campbell</i>	5,200
<i>Crook</i>	4,900
<i>Johnson</i>	4,700
<i>Sheridan</i>	5,187
<i>Weston</i>	3,656
<u>Northwest Region</u>	
<i>Big Horn</i>	4,794
<i>Hot Springs</i>	3,800
<i>Park</i>	6,218
<i>Washakie</i>	5,413
<u>Southeast Region</u>	
<i>Albany</i>	4,900
<i>Carbon</i>	3,393
<i>Goshen</i>	4,400
<i>Laramie</i>	4,479
<i>Platte</i>	3,980
<u>Southwest Region</u>	
<i>Lincoln</i>	5,450
<i>Sublette</i>	4,357
<i>Sweetwater</i>	4,077
<i>Teton</i>	5,600
<i>Uinta</i>	4,081

APPENDIX B

Wyoming Prevention Needs Assessment

Table 50. Percent of 6th Graders Reporting Past 30 Days Alcohol Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	4.8	6	6.7
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	11.11	5.66	14.29
<i>Fremont</i>	5.42	6.82	6.86
<i>Natrona</i>	4.59	5.26	6.60
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	6.17	7.83	7.10
<i>Crook</i>	3.90	6.41	7.04
<i>Johnson</i>	2.50	5.13	10.99
<i>Sheridan</i>	6.16	6.73	6.07
<i>Weston</i>	5.26	10.47	14.27
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	1.35	1.89	8.70
<i>Hot Springs</i>	13.64	9.52	9.52
<i>Park</i>	5.04	6.37	7.41
<i>Washakie</i>	9.27	8.02	4.97
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	4.53	2.75	4.55
<i>Carbon</i>	6.38	6.20	14.73
<i>Goshen</i>	6.20	9.68	7.50
<i>Laramie</i>	4.32	5.32	6.29
<i>Platte</i>	8.58	8.06	7.64
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	1.00	3.06	2.18
<i>Sublette</i>	4.00	2.27	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	3.12	3.80	6.38
<i>Teton</i>	2.72	16.54	2.10
<i>Uinta</i>	3.73	4.55	3.96

Table 51. Percent of 8th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Alcohol Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	20.50	23.90	27.10
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	25.71	36.17	26.83
<i>Fremont</i>	23.25	27.74	22.86
<i>Natrona</i>	21.70	24.44	31.98
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	20.45	30.07	32.55
<i>Crook</i>	22.47	13.33	32.91
<i>Johnson</i>	11.96	28.89	29.73
<i>Sheridan</i>	21.09	24.29	20.24
<i>Weston</i>	17.74	20.05	28.59
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	15.40	12.99	27.23
<i>Hot Springs</i>	22.03	18.18	33.33
<i>Park</i>	22.72	17.13	18.10
<i>Washakie</i>	27.35	26.51	36.36
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	16.80	18.60	12.64
<i>Carbon</i>	37.35	30.13	35.09
<i>Goshen</i>	28.77	24.60	30.60
<i>Laramie</i>	23.23	26.04	30.88
<i>Platte</i>	20.66	33.42	17.43
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	8.86	5.80	14.38
<i>Sublette</i>	16.67	10.87	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	22.37	29.89	29.16
<i>Teton</i>	14.20	25.17	33.61
<i>Uinta</i>	9.92	12.47	13.23

Table 52. Percent of 10th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Alcohol Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	40.50	40.70	39.90
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	46.55	43.73	43.29
<i>Fremont</i>	40.20	45.70	37.20
<i>Natrona</i>	44.56	42.75	41.20
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	42.92	42.29	47.75
<i>Crook</i>	48.24	41.89	38.81
<i>Johnson</i>	33.33	37.35	36.76
<i>Sheridan</i>	41.10	39.96	43.60
<i>Weston</i>	35.03	46.97	36.00
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	30.56	32.65	32.37
<i>Hot Springs</i>	26.09	49.02	35.71
<i>Park</i>	41.01	40.70	33.59
<i>Washakie</i>	38.26	44.98	43.10
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	42.79	38.10	39.18
<i>Carbon</i>	52.43	49.33	42.48
<i>Goshen</i>	39.34	44.70	49.26
<i>Laramie</i>	39.38	37.83	41.07
<i>Platte</i>	43.87	45.92	45.37
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	17.23	21.08	25.75
<i>Sublette</i>	48.08	47.62	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	52.49	41.16	68.00
<i>Teton</i>	46.72	56.59	49.57
<i>Uinta</i>	26.15	32.74	26.55

Table 53. Percent of 12th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Alcohol Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	51.10	53.00	48.20
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	50.81	62.93	48.49
<i>Fremont</i>	45.04	54.51	50.76
<i>Natrona</i>	47.84	57.03	52.83
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	58.50	52.38	60.27
<i>Crook</i>	67.86	51.19	57.69
<i>Johnson</i>	48.15	65.12	48.89
<i>Sheridan</i>	46.47	55.60	38.09
<i>Weston</i>	39.10	59.68	58.06
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	43.51	43.11	36.76
<i>Hot Springs</i>	38.10	42.86	56.52
<i>Park</i>	48.88	51.70	40.74
<i>Washakie</i>	43.35	51.02	50.31
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	50.51	53.53	58.18
<i>Carbon</i>	57.37	54.41	57.98
<i>Goshen</i>	55.75	60.22	58.88
<i>Laramie</i>	50.37	49.13	41.98
<i>Platte</i>	61.08	63.82	57.86
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	21.15	22.99	26.48
<i>Sublette</i>	71.43	68.09	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	81.33	64.14	64.15
<i>Teton</i>	64.41	74.70	61.03
<i>Uinta</i>	36.02	31.99	33.02

Table 54. Percent of 6th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Cigarette Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	2.40	3.60	2.70
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	1.92	5.66	0
<i>Fremont</i>	6.86	10.56	3.98
<i>Natrona</i>	2.04	3.59	3.38
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	3.33	3.31	2.46
<i>Crook</i>	3.90	1.28	0
<i>Johnson</i>	1.33	4.00	1.10
<i>Sheridan</i>	2.22	3.46	5.25
<i>Weston</i>	4.33	1.73	6.49
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	2.04	0.72	4.75
<i>Hot Springs</i>	2.27	2.44	2.44
<i>Park</i>	1.08	2.48	3.25
<i>Washakie</i>	2.27	3.52	1.24
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	3.06	0.40	1.53
<i>Carbon</i>	1.65	3.31	4.28
<i>Goshen</i>	4.72	9.68	2.68
<i>Laramie</i>	2.29	2.73	3.01
<i>Platte</i>	1.56	3.67	5.70
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	0.51	3.63	1.33
<i>Sublette</i>	0.00	8.51	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	0.24	1.35	0.47
<i>Teton</i>	1.37	2.42	0.00
<i>Uinta</i>	0.34	4.34	1.43

Table 55. Percent of 8th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Cigarette Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	11.40	11.10	11.70
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	11.11	22.73	12.20
<i>Fremont</i>	16.58	16.97	16.38
<i>Natrona</i>	10.71	11.48	13.68
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	8.21	14.67	15.37
<i>Crook</i>	20.69	5.26	8.86
<i>Johnson</i>	5.43	4.44	10.96
<i>Sheridan</i>	12.36	13.95	9.61
<i>Weston</i>	12.36	16.96	14.27
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	6.64	5.94	8.03
<i>Hot Springs</i>	11.86	4.35	6.98
<i>Park</i>	9.16	8.95	6.62
<i>Washakie</i>	16.85	12.10	7.96
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	9.80	6.67	5.20
<i>Carbon</i>	15.64	11.41	12.73
<i>Goshen</i>	16.67	11.90	16.54
<i>Laramie</i>	13.31	12.63	13.54
<i>Platte</i>	5.46	15.95	9.09
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	3.38	1.15	4.29
<i>Sublette</i>	2.78	0.00	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	16.32	12.06	13.37
<i>Teton</i>	2.44	6.16	6.84
<i>Uinta</i>	6.48	5.24	4.32

Table 56. Percent of 10th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Cigarette Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	22.10	21.20	18.70
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	27.42	17.99	31.25
<i>Fremont</i>	26.11	30.72	23.56
<i>Natrona</i>	19.62	23.75	21.16
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	21.90	24.50	26.97
<i>Crook</i>	39.29	32.47	16.42
<i>Johnson</i>	15.91	16.05	16.67
<i>Sheridan</i>	24.69	24.65	24.45
<i>Weston</i>	25.74	23.03	21.06
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	23.80	14.57	16.93
<i>Hot Springs</i>	8.51	13.73	3.57
<i>Park</i>	23.58	20.80	13.54
<i>Washakie</i>	17.11	20.08	16.60
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	20.44	15.98	15.70
<i>Carbon</i>	20.18	28.01	14.01
<i>Goshen</i>	30.89	22.56	34.31
<i>Laramie</i>	18.18	20.19	14.69
<i>Platte</i>	30.31	15.33	18.32
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	10.28	9.78	13.41
<i>Sublette</i>	13.46	9.52	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	39.63	15.87	37.50
<i>Teton</i>	17.50	19.84	16.38
<i>Uinta</i>	11.52	22.53	6.83

Table 57. Percent of 12th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Cigarette Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	32.80	25.40	23.80
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	36.23	31.12	18.84
<i>Fremont</i>	27.36	30.57	34.56
<i>Natrona</i>	29.52	28.74	22.82
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	36.79	23.35	31.19
<i>Crook</i>	50.59	43.53	44.23
<i>Johnson</i>	28.92	37.21	17.78
<i>Sheridan</i>	34.59	37.35	29.44
<i>Weston</i>	27.10	31.85	19.72
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	28.99	37.11	24.13
<i>Hot Springs</i>	15.87	19.05	28.26
<i>Park</i>	33.34	20.72	15.86
<i>Washakie</i>	27.34	21.21	21.94
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	23.98	24.26	23.42
<i>Carbon</i>	26.10	19.93	29.78
<i>Goshen</i>	44.25	25.77	41.90
<i>Laramie</i>	26.69	17.97	17.67
<i>Platte</i>	31.52	24.68	27.64
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	16.01	14.49	10.98
<i>Sublette</i>	37.93	20.83	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	68.88	26.47	42.59
<i>Teton</i>	36.70	33.73	21.48
<i>Uinta</i>	21.90	16.85	18.42

Table 58. Percent of 6th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Inhalant Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	2.90	4.90	4.30
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	1.85	4.00	2.04
<i>Fremont</i>	2.31	3.58	6.05
<i>Natrona</i>	2.29	3.94	4.88
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	3.29	4.86	1.77
<i>Crook</i>	7.89	10.53	4.23
<i>Johnson</i>	1.27	1.32	3.30
<i>Sheridan</i>	2.51	5.93	4.50
<i>Weston</i>	2.73	13.17	3.89
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	2.85	3.91	2.67
<i>Hot Springs</i>	2.27	2.33	0
<i>Park</i>	3.63	4.89	5.64
<i>Washakie</i>	3.22	9.26	1.24
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	4.12	2.76	6.09
<i>Carbon</i>	3.70	7.61	13.07
<i>Goshen</i>	1.55	10.99	5.17
<i>Laramie</i>	3.23	4.52	4.02
<i>Platte</i>	3.63	4.89	5.64
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	4.43	6.74	3.97
<i>Sublette</i>	2.00	6.67	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	1.73	4.05	3.59
<i>Teton</i>	0.68	6.30	3.50
<i>Uinta</i>	2.04	2.87	4.47

Table 59. Percent of 8th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Inhalant Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	4.50	5.90	6.70
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	0	8.51	2.38
<i>Fremont</i>	3.67	5.18	4.33
<i>Natrona</i>	3.61	6.69	9.45
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	3.67	8.19	6.21
<i>Crook</i>	2.25	5.26	8.86
<i>Johnson</i>	5.49	7.69	6.76
<i>Sheridan</i>	6.53	7.09	5.17
<i>Weston</i>	2.44	6.46	14.49
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	1.73	1.92	3.76
<i>Hot Springs</i>	3.45	0	4.55
<i>Park</i>	9.24	3.37	3.38
<i>Washakie</i>	11.05	6.21	7.96
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	2.45	4.28	2.86
<i>Carbon</i>	8.87	8.93	12.03
<i>Goshen</i>	10.88	6.35	11.85
<i>Laramie</i>	4.60	5.14	6.54
<i>Platte</i>	0	8.67	6.03
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	6.24	4.52	4.16
<i>Sublette</i>	0	4.55	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	4.90	8.16	8.01
<i>Teton</i>	3.61	5.48	5.04
<i>Uinta</i>	2.05	3.43	5.11

Table 60. Percent of 10th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Inhalant Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	2.60	3.50	3.00
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	3.95	3.65	3.87
<i>Fremont</i>	1.52	5.58	2.75
<i>Natrona</i>	1.52	3.75	3.01
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	1.31	2.83	5.07
<i>Crook</i>	3.53	1.28	1.45
<i>Johnson</i>	4.55	1.22	1.47
<i>Sheridan</i>	0.70	4.19	1.53
<i>Weston</i>	3.64	0	0
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	1.11	4.38	5.40
<i>Hot Springs</i>	2.13	2.00	10.71
<i>Park</i>	2.96	2.55	1.99
<i>Washakie</i>	2.26	4.46	5.67
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	3.11	1.18	3.49
<i>Carbon</i>	4.24	3.40	4.45
<i>Goshen</i>	0.83	3.73	4.38
<i>Laramie</i>	2.63	2.67	1.86
<i>Platte</i>	1.00	2.27	5.23
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	5.18	7.12	3.32
<i>Sublette</i>	1.92	2.38	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	4.73	1.99	4.00
<i>Teton</i>	2.46	4.72	1.71
<i>Uinta</i>	3.01	6.27	1.21

Table 61. Percent of 12th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Inhalant Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	1.70	2.40	2.30
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	3.73	0	3.59
<i>Fremont</i>	1.41	1.88	1.09
<i>Natrona</i>	1.28	3.52	1.43
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	1.81	3.55	2.74
<i>Crook</i>	2.35	1.19	1.85
<i>Johnson</i>	3.61	2.27	2.22
<i>Sheridan</i>	0.38	2.47	3.17
<i>Weston</i>	2.38	1.16	0
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	1.31	4.94	3.65
<i>Hot Springs</i>	3.17	0	2.17
<i>Park</i>	2.65	1.28	0.79
<i>Washakie</i>	0	0	5.49
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	1.03	3.53	4.55
<i>Carbon</i>	1.90	1.57	2.75
<i>Goshen</i>	2.65	1.04	1.87
<i>Laramie</i>	2.44	0.82	1.99
<i>Platte</i>	0	1.05	2.92
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	4.36	1.67	2.55
<i>Sublette</i>	0	4.17	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	0	5.01	1.85
<i>Teton</i>	0.88	0.00	0.73
<i>Uinta</i>	2.07	3.16	2.92

Table 62. Percent of 6th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Marijuana Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	0.90	1.50	1.20
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	0	0	0
<i>Fremont</i>	2.32	6.78	2.32
<i>Natrona</i>	0.54	1.58	1.26
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	1.16	1.54	1.32
<i>Crook</i>	0	0	1.41
<i>Johnson</i>	1.27	0	0
<i>Sheridan</i>	0.41	0.76	1.99
<i>Weston</i>	1.39	1.57	2.59
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	1.32	0	0
<i>Hot Springs</i>	2.38	0	0
<i>Park</i>	1.69	0.40	0.88
<i>Washakie</i>	0	2.37	0
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	0.41	0	0
<i>Carbon</i>	0	1.66	3.17
<i>Goshen</i>	0.78	1.08	0.83
<i>Laramie</i>	1.50	0.94	1.56
<i>Platte</i>	0.80	1.16	1.09
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	0	0.51	0.44
<i>Sublette</i>	0	0	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	0	0.22	1.54
<i>Teton</i>	0	1.59	0
<i>Uinta</i>	0.65	2.32	0

Table 63. Percent of 8th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Marijuana

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	7.20	8.40	8.90
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	0	10.64	4.76
<i>Fremont</i>	12.33	14.67	15.61
<i>Natrona</i>	7.34	12.36	13.03
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	5.91	8.65	8.41
<i>Crook</i>	5.62	1.30	6.33
<i>Johnson</i>	2.20	3.37	4.05
<i>Sheridan</i>	4.48	8.74	5.00
<i>Weston</i>	9.89	10.58	7.41
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	2.88	3.30	6.16
<i>Hot Springs</i>	1.69	0	6.82
<i>Park</i>	3.44	2.94	2.37
<i>Washakie</i>	6.03	6.00	4.60
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	8.13	1.93	3.43
<i>Carbon</i>	10.07	10.69	8.92
<i>Goshen</i>	6.25	2.38	8.21
<i>Laramie</i>	10.91	11.81	12.09
<i>Platte</i>	1.12	7.27	1.72
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	2.50	0.56	4.16
<i>Sublette</i>	0	2.22	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	12.34	10.10	10.18
<i>Teton</i>	1.20	7.59	8.40
<i>Uinta</i>	3.06	1.61	2.48

Table 64. Percent of 10th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Marijuana Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	16.90	15.80	15.40
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	13.55	5.08	9.90
<i>Fremont</i>	20.33	23.55	13.62
<i>Natrona</i>	14.21	20.30	16.81
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	20.04	14.20	20.12
<i>Crook</i>	23.26	14.29	8.70
<i>Johnson</i>	5.75	8.43	11.76
<i>Sheridan</i>	22.73	13.78	20.44
<i>Weston</i>	10.93	11.97	0
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	12.30	11.43	8.34
<i>Hot Springs</i>	6.52	7.84	3.57
<i>Park</i>	16.00	8.51	10.07
<i>Washakie</i>	7.54	14.50	12.43
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	18.75	19.41	20.47
<i>Carbon</i>	15.68	19.61	15.50
<i>Goshen</i>	17.07	12.50	20.30
<i>Laramie</i>	19.58	17.30	17.90
<i>Platte</i>	5.02	9.93	8.25
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	5.60	8.00	8.97
<i>Sublette</i>	25.00	19.05	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	27.33	17.89	32.00
<i>Teton</i>	22.13	23.44	34.48
<i>Uinta</i>	9.29	11.70	5.82

Table 65. Percent of 12th Graders Reporting Past 30 Day Marijuana Use

	2001	2004	2006
WYOMING STATE	19.70	19.80	14.80
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	15.61	15.49	4.17
<i>Fremont</i>	17.00	21.00	19.32
<i>Natrona</i>	17.65	23.62	13.40
<i>Niobrara*</i>			
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	22.00	16.17	13.24
<i>Crook</i>	15.48	14.12	18.52
<i>Johnson</i>	14.46	6.82	17.78
<i>Sheridan</i>	17.73	27.03	18.43
<i>Weston</i>	16.50	12.33	7.50
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	10.30	20.81	16.50
<i>Hot Springs</i>	3.17	7.14	17.39
<i>Park</i>	17.42	11.69	11.98
<i>Washakie</i>	23.99	11.34	12.20
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	19.69	20.83	18.18
<i>Carbon</i>	15.43	12.90	18.54
<i>Goshen</i>	15.04	14.58	14.95
<i>Laramie</i>	20.18	20.16	17.61
<i>Platte</i>	12.10	13.11	8.88
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	8.06	9.07	6.90
<i>Sublette</i>	23.08	25.53	
<i>Sweetwater</i>	46.89	32.36	26.42
<i>Teton</i>	47.01	46.99	26.12
<i>Uinta</i>	6.63	10.51	9.84

*Data from Niobrara County is not presented to protect confidentiality.

APPENDIX C

Alcohol Factors in Custodial Arrests - 2006

Table 66. Percent of Arrests That Were Substance Related

	Alcohol Involved	Meth Involved	Other Drug Involved
WYOMING STATE	62.96	2.67	7.59
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	65.55	4.31	7.66
<i>Fremont</i>	86.65	0.91	4.02
<i>Natrona</i>	60.38	3.13	6.27
<i>Niobrara</i>	66.67		4.17
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	64.84	1.49	5.84
<i>Crook</i>	71.29	3.96	5.94
<i>Johnson</i>	66.88	9.09	11.04
<i>Sheridan</i>	2.78	63.89	4.91
<i>Weston</i>		71.15	3.85
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	71.43	1.24	11.8
<i>Hot Springs</i>	87.06	3.53	12.94
<i>Park</i>	70.79	4.87	5.62
<i>Washakie</i>		98.68	2.63
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	71.91	0.97	7.75
<i>Carbon</i>	52.59	1.48	9.88
<i>Goshen</i>	62.22	4.44	9.63
<i>Laramie</i>	50.47	3.54	8.25
<i>Platte</i>	3.47	52.78	10.42
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	62.13	8.88	18.93
<i>Sublette</i>	2.01	61.74	8.05
<i>Sweetwater</i>	2.98	53.55	5.62
<i>Teton</i>	0.15	67.21	4.15
<i>Uinta</i>	1.41	60.42	3.18

Table 67. Average Blood Alcohol Level for Alcohol Related Arrests

	DUI	MIP	Minor DUI
WYOMING STATE	0.1593		
<u>Central Region</u>			
<i>Converse</i>	0.1495	0.1337	
<i>Fremont</i>	0.1683	0.1404	0.1574
<i>Natrona</i>	0.1662	0.1384	0.1481
<i>Niobrara</i>	0.2033	0.1	
<u>Northeast Region</u>			
<i>Campbell</i>	0.1625	0.1139	0.1186
<i>Crook</i>	0.1425	0.071	0.2197
<i>Johnson</i>	0.1726	0.2	0.15
<i>Sheridan</i>	0.1712	0.1196	0.1358
<i>Weston</i>	0.1583	0.19	
<u>Northwest Region</u>			
<i>Big Horn</i>	0.1399	0.0981	
<i>Hot Springs</i>	0.1336	0.1048	0.104
<i>Park</i>	0.1525	0.0908	0.1161
<i>Washakie</i>	0.1476	0.1265	0.1092
<u>Southeast Region</u>			
<i>Albany</i>	0.1677	0.1864	0.1579
<i>Carbon</i>	0.1569	0.1144	0.1456
<i>Goshen</i>	0.1554	0.115	
<i>Laramie</i>	0.1523	0.1143	0.1124
<i>Platte</i>	0.1464	0.1096	0.1135
<u>Southwest Region</u>			
<i>Lincoln</i>	0.1304	0.1048	0.1253
<i>Sublette</i>	0.1654	0.04	0.12
<i>Sweetwater</i>	0.1618	0.1183	0.1401
<i>Teton</i>	0.1564	0.106	0.1031
<i>Uinta</i>	0.1652	0.1381	0.1538