


# 2021 Community Risk Profile Summary

## Grant County

February 2021

### Indicators associated with substance use prevention and mental health promotion.

Presented at the State, County, and School District level for use by communities in directing their resources and in seeking additional funding.



### CONTRIBUTORS

DSHS Research and Data Analysis Division: Aaron Starks, MA | Grace Hong, PhD | Irina Sharkova, PhD

In collaboration with the HCA Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery, Substance Use Disorder Prevention and Mental Health Promotion Section:

Kasey Kates, MSW, Policy and Program Supervisor | Sandy Salivaras, MSc, MPH, Epidemiological Prevention Research and Evaluation Manager | Sarah Mariani, CPP, Section Manager

## **ABOUT THIS REPORT**

This summary report has been developed for the Community Prevention and Wellness Initiative (CPWI) to assist coalitions in their prevention strategic planning. We have included data from your county, presented by school district, for the assessment of problems associated with substance use. This report is intended to serve as a starting point for your planning and assessment work. Additional data that can only be collected locally will help with the interpretation of the data and in other ways enhance this assessment process.

The Community Prevention and Wellness Initiative is a project of the Health Care Authority's Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery (DBHR) in collaboration with the Office of the Superintendent of Schools (OSPI). The Department of Social and Health Services' Division of Research and Data Analysis is a key partner that leads the publication of this report and the associated data.

## **ABOUT THE DATA**

The CORE contains archival indicators (or social indicators) that are highly correlated with adolescent substance use, and the risk factors that predict substance use. There are currently 47 indicators, most of which originate from the Department of Health, Department of Social and Health Services, Uniform Crime Report/National Incident-Based Reporting System, and the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The data are published twice a year on a public website, and reported at the lowest feasible geography level: state, county, school district/community, and locale (a geography that incorporates more than one school district when the base population of the school district is too low for reliable reporting). See <https://www.dshs.wa.gov/ffa/research-and-data-analysis/community-risk-profiles>.

The Risk Rankings table(s) and maps have been developed using the data from CORE and Healthy Youth Survey (HYS). School district-level and more detailed HYS data are password protected and require a data sharing agreement with the Department of Health. State and county reports are available to the public at AskHYS.net.

## **FOR MORE INFORMATION**

Questions about this report or the Community Prevention and Wellness Initiative may be directed to the DBHR Training team at [PxTraining@hca.wa.gov](mailto:PxTraining@hca.wa.gov).

GRANT COUNTY		RISK RANKING		RISK CATEGORY RANK		CONTEXTUAL INDICATORS	
School District	Population: Age 10-17*	Rank for Variable	Indicators with Data	ATMO Consumption	Consequence	Economic Deprivation	Troubled Family
Coulee-Hartline	115	.	2	No Data	No Data	Average	Average
Ephrata	1,580	55	22	Average	Average	Average	Average
Grand Coulee Dam	355	.	3	No Data	No Data	Average	High
Moses Lake	5,558	91	22	Very High	High	High	Average
Quincy	1,901	73	22	Average	High	Average	Low
Royal	1,021	56	22	Average	Average	Average	Very Low
Soap Lake	309	91	22	High	Very High	Very High	High
Wahluke	1,266	72	22	High	Average	Average	Very Low
Warden	638	43	22	Low	High	Average	Average
Wilson Creek	54	.	2	No Data	No Data	No Data	Average

**NOTES:**

This risk profile reflects the risk levels of this county as of February 2021. School districts with no high schools are not included in this summary. Please note risk levels and risk rankings may change over time.

The ATMO consumption risk score is calculated from prevalence of alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, and prescription opioids use. The consequence risk score is calculated from school performance, youth delinquency, and mental health indicators. The overall risk ranking is not computed if either consumption or consequence score is missing.

A Risk Category Rank of "Very High" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the top 10% of School Districts in the risk category.

A Risk Category Rank of "High" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the top 25% of School Districts in the risk category.

A Risk Category Rank of "Average" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was between 25% and 75% of School Districts in the risk category.

A Risk Category Rank of "Low" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the bottom 25% of School Districts in the risk category.

A Risk Category Rank of "Very Low" indicates the referenced School District Risk Score was in the bottom 10% of School Districts in the risk category.

**Review Considerations**

1) To get an overall sense of risk severity for both consumption and consequence, examine the "Risk Percentile". It reflects what % of School District had a Risk Score LOWER than the referenced School District.


2) To ensure that the risk score is meaningful, examine the "Indicators with data" column. Risk scores based on few indicators should be interpreted with caution. In total, 21 indicators were used.

3) To consider other contextual information, examine the "Population: Age 10-17", "economic deprivation" indicator, and the "troubled family" indicator. Note the "Population 10-17 year olds" value may be greater than district enrollment as it accounts for kids not in school as well as those in private schools.

\* This is a 5-year average value.

# Marijuana Composite Ranking

by School District, Grant County



**Composite Risk Ranking**

Very High 90 - 99	High 75 - 89	Average 25 - 74	Low 10 - 24	No data	School Districts	Highways and Major Roads
		Very Low 0 - 9		Counties	Water Bodies	




**DATA NOTES:** The percentile of the composite risk scores. The composite risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in marijuana consumption and consequence. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth.

**SOURCE:** DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).



# Marijuana Consumption Ranking

by School District, Grant County




**Consumption Risk Ranking**

Very High 90 - 99	High 75 - 89	Average 25 - 74	Low 10 - 24	No data	School Districts	Highways and Major Roads
		Very Low 0 - 9		Counties	Water Bodies	

**DATA NOTES:** The percentile of the consumption risk scores. The composite risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in marijuana consumption based on the 2018 HYS data. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth.

**SOURCE:** DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).


# Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and Prescription Opioids Composite Ranking by School District, Grant County



**Composite Risk Ranking**

<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color: #8B4513; border: 1px solid black;"></span> Very High 90 - 99	<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color: #FF8C00; border: 1px solid black;"></span> High 75 - 89	<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color: #FFD700; border: 1px solid black;"></span> Average 25 - 74	<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color: #FFDAB9; border: 1px solid black;"></span> Low 10 - 24	<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background: repeating-linear-gradient(45deg, transparent, transparent 2px, gray 2px, gray 4px); border: 1px solid black;"></span> No data	<span style="border: 1px dashed gray; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 15px;"></span> School Districts	<span style="border-bottom: 2px solid red; width: 15px; display: inline-block;"></span> Highways and Major Roads	<span style="display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 15px; background-color: #ADD8E6; border: 1px solid black;"></span> Water Bodies	<span style="border: 2px solid gray; display: inline-block; width: 15px; height: 15px;"></span> Counties
--	---	--	--	---	---	--	--	--

# Alcohol, Tobacco, Marijuana and Prescription Opioids Consumption Ranking by School District, Grant County



**Consumption Risk Ranking**

<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:orange;"></span> High 75 - 89	<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:yellow;"></span> Low 10 - 24	<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background: repeating-linear-gradient(45deg, transparent, transparent 2px, gray 2px, gray 4px);"></span> No Data	<span style="border: 1px dashed black; width:15px; height:15px;"></span> School Districts	<span style="border-bottom: 2px solid red; width:15px;"></span> Highways and Major Roads
<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:darkbrown;"></span> Very High 90 - 99	<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:lightorange;"></span> Average 25 - 74	<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:lightyellow;"></span> Very Low 0 - 9	<span style="border: 2px solid gray; width:15px; height:15px;"></span> Counties	<span style="display:inline-block; width:15px; height:15px; background-color:lightblue;"></span> Water Bodies




**DATA NOTES:** The percentile of the consumption risk scores. The consumption risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in the alcohol, tobacco, marijuana and prescription opioids (ATMO) consumption based on the 2018 HYS. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth.

**SOURCE:** DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).



# Consequence Risk Ranking

by School District, Grant County



**Consequence Risk Ranking**

	Very High 90 - 99		High 75 - 89		Low 10 - 24		No Data		School Districts		Highways and Major Roads
	Average 25 - 74		Very Low 0 - 9		Counties		Water Bodies				

**DATA NOTES:** The percentile of the consequence risk scores. The consequence risk scores were calculated using standardized indicators in three sub-domains: school performance, youth delinquency, and mental health. Cartography: Irina Sharkova and Steve Leibenguth.  
**SOURCE:** DSHS Research and Data Analysis, Community Outcome and Risk Evaluation Geographic Information System (CORE GIS).