



Drink driving in Queensland

A discussion paper

Contents

Minister's Foreword	2	Part Four	
Introduction		What changes will be made?.....	24
What is this discussion paper for?.....	4	Alcohol ignition interlocks initiative	24
Structure of the paper	4	Who will be required to have an interlock condition on re-licensing?.....	25
Definitions.....	4	How will the interlock program work?.....	25
Guidelines for having your say.....	5	What are the issues relating to access and equity?.....	25
Next steps in the consultation process	5	What are the costs and will there be a discount for those with low incomes?.....	26
Part One		Have interlocks been considered before in Queensland?	26
The drink driving problem in Queensland.....	6	Do other Australian jurisdictions have interlock programs?	26
Profile of drink drivers involved in serious crashes in Queensland	7	Part Five	
Research on drink drivers.....	7	What changes could be made?.....	27
Drink driving offences	8	RBT and enforcement.....	27
The effects of alcohol on driving	10	Compulsory carriage of driver licence.....	30
Alcohol use in Queensland	10	Compulsory blood testing.....	31
Alcohol and crash risk.....	11	Lowering the general alcohol limit (0.05).....	33
Part Two		Designated driver programs	36
Framework for addressing drink driving in Queensland.....	12	Alternative transport options.....	38
Safe road users – a 'safe systems' approach	12	Liquor accords and responsible service of alcohol (RSA)	39
Framework for addressing drink driving.....	13	Restricted licences (work licences).....	40
Breakdown of target groups for potential interventions	14	Immediate licence suspensions	45
Profile of a drink driving offender in Queensland	15	Drink driving rehabilitation programs.....	46
Part Three		Vehicle impoundment	51
What has been done to address drink driving in Queensland?	17	Part Six	
Legal alcohol limits.....	18	Next Steps.....	55
Mass media and education campaigns.....	18	Part Seven	
Skipper program/trial.....	19	Community feedback form	56
Random breath testing.....	19	References	62
24 hour licence suspension.....	19		
Immediate licence suspension	20		
Queensland's penalty regime	20		
Cumulative disqualifications.....	22		
Offender education programs	22		
Vehicle impoundment	23		

Minister's Foreword



Despite the risks of crashing, receiving a fine or losing their licence, a growing number of people in Queensland are being caught drinking and driving. This can be seen in the steady increase in the number of drink driving offences recorded over the last several years¹.

Currently, Queensland's anti drink driving effort involves a range of measures that include random breath testing (RBT), legal alcohol limits, licensing penalties and fines, vehicle impoundment, public education and advertising campaigns, offender education programs and designated driver programs.

With the introduction of the 0.05 alcohol limit in 1985, and RBT in 1988, the Queensland road toll showed marked improvement. However, people tragically continue to be killed or injured on our roads because of drink driving. These crashes not only devastate families and friends but also have a significant impact on the wider community and health, emergency and support services.

Over 600 people have been killed as a result of crashes involving drink drivers in the eight years prior to 30 June 2009. This represents, on average, 22.9 per cent of all road fatalities in Queensland for that period. In the 12 months prior to 30 June 2009 alone, 84 people were killed in crashes that involved a driver over their legal alcohol limit².

The significant impact of drink driving can also be seen in the number of hospitalised casualties in Queensland. The percentage of all hospitalised casualties as a result of crashes involving drink drivers has remained between 8.7 and 10.6 per cent in the 15 years to 30 June 2007³.

As part of our commitment to working with the community to reduce drink driving, the Queensland Government is undertaking two major initiatives.

The first is the introduction of alcohol ignition interlocks for high risk drink drivers. An interlock is an in-vehicle breath test instrument that is connected to the ignition. The driver must blow into the interlock device every time they attempt to start their vehicle. If alcohol is detected, the interlock device prevents the vehicle from starting.

The Queensland Government is introducing interlocks as a mandatory re-licensing requirement for a range of high risk drink drivers, including first time offenders with a high blood/breath alcohol concentration (BAC) and repeat drink driving offenders.

The second initiative is a review of the current approach to tackling drink driving in Queensland and an important

part of this process is to gain input from the community on a range of potential interventions.

Consequently, this *Drink driving discussion paper* has been developed. This paper outlines a number of discussion points that I would like you to consider and provide comment on. Some of these initiatives have been adopted in other Australian jurisdictions and overseas while others are further enhancements to programs and policies currently being used in Queensland.

It is important to note the possible interventions outlined in this discussion paper are only ideas proposed for consultation at this stage and are not government policy. We are seeking the views of the community before considering the implementation and associated costs of any future anti drink driving initiatives.

The discussion paper provides a great opportunity for Queenslanders to have a voice about drink driving. This conversation with the community is about potential changes that could save lives. Although not all ideas may be feasible due to costs, rural and remote impacts

and other issues, the results of this community consultation process will help to inform the future direction of anti drink driving initiatives in Queensland.

Addressing drink driving is the responsibility of all road users. The government has a key role to play but the entire community needs to get involved in this important issue. We cannot tackle this problem alone.

I would encourage you to have your say by reading this discussion paper and completing the feedback form.

Road safety is vital for a stronger and safer Queensland.



Rachel Nolan MP
Minister for Transport

Introduction

What is this discussion paper for?

Queensland's current anti drink driving effort includes enforcement activities such as RBT, drink driving legislation including penalties and sanctions, public education campaigns, advertising campaigns and offender education programs. While there appears to be wide knowledge and acceptance by the community of these approaches, the fact that drink driving related fatalities still represent 22.9 per cent of all road fatalities in Queensland in the eight years prior to 30 June 2009, prompted a review of the current approach to drink driving in Queensland ⁴.

The objectives of this discussion paper are to advise the public about the introduction of alcohol ignition interlocks and to seek comment from the Queensland community on potential new programs or improvements to existing policies and programs that could be introduced to address this road safety problem.

The enhancements in this paper have been identified through an examination of: the benefits/limitations of existing programs and policies currently used

in Queensland; crash and offence data; recent academic research into drink driving; and the various approaches adopted in other Australian and international jurisdictions.

It should be noted that the enhancements and new programs outlined in *Part Five* of this discussion paper are not government policy and are for consultation purposes only. The government is seeking the views of the community before considering the implementation and associated costs of any new anti drink driving initiatives.

Reducing the occurrence of drink driving and thereby reducing alcohol related harm will contribute to the creation of a healthier Queensland. Healthy Queenslanders is one of the five goals of Q2, the government's plan to address the current and future challenges facing Queensland.

Structure of the paper

This discussion paper has been divided into seven parts.

- Part One** The drink driving problem in Queensland
- Part Two** Framework for addressing drink driving in Queensland
- Part Three** What has been done to address drink driving in Queensland
- Part Four** What changes will be made – an alcohol ignition interlocks initiative
- Part Five** What changes could be made
- Part Six** Next steps
- Part Seven** Community feedback form.

Definitions

Serious casualty crash: A road crash which results in a fatality or a person being hospitalised.

Drivers: In this paper refers to those operating, in charge or attempting to put in motion a vehicle (as per section 79 Transport Operations (Road Use Management Act) 1995. It may also include riders (for example of motorcycles).

Controller: A person who exercises control over their movements at the time of the crash (i.e. driver, rider or pedestrian). Passengers and pillions are not regarded as controllers.

Incapacitation: Physically separating the drink driving offender from their vehicle either through vehicle impoundment or forfeiture or imprisonment.

Key

≥ Greater than or equal to

≤ Less than or equal to

Guidelines for having your say

Everyone in the community is invited to comment on the issues covered in this discussion paper.

Part Seven of the discussion paper has questions relating to the discussion points raised throughout the paper.

Submissions can be made by:

- completing the online feedback form on the Queensland Government's *Get Involved* website **www.getinvolved.qld.gov.au**.
- written submission to:
Drink Driving Review Team
Department of Transport and Main Roads
PO Box 673 Fortitude Valley Qld 4006
Fax: (07) 3253 4960

Responses should be received by 9am Monday 17 May 2010.

If you need more time to make a submission, or would like further information about the initiatives proposed, please contact the Department of Transport and Main Roads on **13 23 80**.

Copies of the *Drink driving discussion paper* are also available on **www.getinvolved.qld.gov.au**.

Next steps in the consultation process

In addition to seeking feedback through the online feedback form and written submissions, the Queensland Government will also be undertaking a number of other community consultation activities. Further information on these activities will be provided through **www.getinvolved.qld.gov.au**.

The results from this community consultation process will be used to inform the Queensland Government's future direction in addressing the impact of drink driving on Queensland's road toll. Members of the community will be able to access the final outcomes from this process, once complete, through the Department of Transport and Main Roads' website **www.tmr.qld.gov.au**.

Part One

The drink driving problem in Queensland

Drink driving is a significant contributing factor to road crashes in Queensland with drink drivers involved in crashes resulting in 609 fatalities over the period 1 July 2001 to 30 June 2009⁵.


Drink driving continues to be a major cause of death and injury on Queensland's roads⁴. Dramatic decreases in alcohol related fatalities were achieved in the 1980s due to new drink driving laws and enforcement strategies such as RBT, along with public education activities⁶. However, significant improvements have not occurred since. In fact, the percentage of all road fatalities that were a result of crashes involving drink drivers* has recently risen (as shown in *Figure 1*).

In the six years to the end of June 2009 almost one in four (23.9 per cent) of all road fatalities were as a result of crashes that involved a drink driver⁷. This was an increase from the previous 11 years (1992–93 to 2002–03) where, on average, one in five (19.7 per cent) of all road fatalities were as a result of crashes involving a drink driver⁸.

Drink drivers continue to put their own lives and the lives of others at risk and this remains a real cause for concern for our community.

Figure 1

Fatalities as a result of crashes involving drink drivers* as a percentage of all fatalities within Queensland, 1 July 1992 to 30 June 2009 (trend over time).



Profile of drink drivers involved in serious crashes in Queensland

A recent analysis of serious crashes in Queensland between 2001–02 to 2007–08 showed that, compared to controllers (see *Definitions*) under their legal alcohol limit, drink drivers were more likely to be male, aged 20–29 years, have recent prior drink driving offences, and be driving above the speed limit, unlicensed, between the hours of 11pm to 2am, on Fridays, Saturdays, or Sundays outside the greater Brisbane area and other Queensland provincial cities⁹. Drink drivers were also more likely to be driving light vehicles (cars/station wagons) on locally controlled roads. Conversely, compared to light vehicle drivers, heavy vehicle drivers were less likely to be drink drivers when involved in a drink driving serious casualty crash¹⁰.

Research on drink drivers

Evidence suggests that drink drivers tend to be: male, single, have low self-esteem, possess drink driving, traffic and criminal offence histories and are from low to middle income socioeconomic backgrounds^{11, 12, 13, 14, 15}. Drink drivers have also been found to be younger (under 30–35 years of age) and more likely to participate in other high risk driving behaviours¹⁶. Unlicensed drivers are also likely to participate in high risk driving behaviours such as drink driving and speeding¹⁷.

⁹ Queensland does not systematically test all drivers/riders involved in crashes for alcohol. Therefore, drink driving crashes may be under-reported (see Compulsory blood testing on pages 31–32).

¹⁰ Crashes involving drink drivers refers to: Crashes involving drivers or riders aged 16 years and over with an illegal BAC, where the licence type was known. Known licence types are: Learner, Provisional or Probationary, Restricted and Open Licences as well as unlicensed drivers and riders.

Drink driving offences

Despite the dangers of drink driving, the number of drink driving offences detected per year continues to increase. During the period 2001–02 to 2007–08 drink driving offences increased by 25.5 per cent as seen in *Figure 2*¹⁸. As a comparison, the growth in the number of recorded licences has increased by 21.53 per cent from June 2001 to June 2008¹⁹. An increase in the number of offences may be as a result of various factors including more targeted enforcement practices. Data from the RBT program shows that the ratio of positive breath tests (where alcohol was detected in a breath sample and the driver was detained for further testing) to all breath tests increased from 1:102 in 2001–02 to 1:85 in 2007–08²⁰.

Figure 2

Drink driving offences in Queensland by financial year, 1 July 2001 to 30 June 2008 (trend over time).





Figure 3

Comparison of first time and repeat drink driving offenders in Queensland for 2007–08.



Figure 4

Comparison of offences for first time drink driving offenders 2007–08.



Over 32 000 drink driving offences were detected in Queensland in the 2007–08 financial year. These offences were committed by 29 909 drink drivers. Of these, 21 877 drink drivers (73.1 per cent) were either first time offenders or had no prior drink driving offences in the previous five years. The remaining 8 032 drink drivers (26.9 per cent) had one or more prior offences in the previous five years²¹. *Figure 3* shows the breakdown of first time and repeat drink driving offenders.

Figure 4 shows the breakdown of offences for first time drink driving offenders in 2007–08. The majority (80.4 per cent) of first time drink driving offenders were convicted of a drink driving offence with a blood/ breath alcohol concentration (BAC) less than or equal to 0.149. However, one in five (19.6 per cent) first time drink driving offenders were convicted of a high level offence, that is, with a BAC equal to or greater than 0.15, driving under the influence of liquor and failing to supply a specimen of breath²².

The effects of alcohol on driving

Alcohol reduces the brain's ability to function effectively as it takes longer for the brain to receive messages from the eye, process information and send instructions out to the rest of the body²³. Other reported results of alcohol consumption include reductions in the ability to see clearly, see distant objects, see at night, use peripheral vision, undertake two tasks at once and judge speed and distance²⁴. After consuming alcohol individuals may also feel overconfident and be prepared to take greater risks, thus diminishing their ability to make appropriate decisions relating to the continued consumption of alcohol and their ability to drive safely. As alcohol is a depressant, it can also make an individual sleepy²⁵.

Therefore, a driver experiencing the effects of alcohol has a significantly diminished ability to drive safely. It is evident that alcohol consumption impairs the skills and processes that are critical for safely undertaking the complicated task of driving a vehicle²⁶. Furthermore, long term alcohol consumption is likely to have a more permanent impact on an individual's cognitive abilities, thus even further reducing their ability to drive safely in the long term²⁷.

Alcohol use in Queensland

Alcohol plays a social role for many Australians. It is a familiar part of traditions and customs in this country, and is often used for relaxation, socialisation and celebration²⁸. Alcohol is also an important component of the Australian economy generating substantial employment, retail activity, export income and tax revenue²⁹. It is estimated that 83 per cent of Australians consume alcohol, with 1.4 million drinking at least once a day³⁰.

In Queensland alone drinking is a common behaviour in our community with 85 per cent of the population aged 14 years and older reporting they drink alcohol³¹. During 2007, the average age of consumption of the first full serve of alcohol was 16.8 years³². Given the prevalence of drinking alcohol, there are a large number of people (including adolescents) within the community that could potentially drink and drive unless motivated not to do so through enforcement, penalties, education and self held attitudes and beliefs.

Alcohol and crash risk


A clear relationship exists between a person's BAC level and crash risk. Research has demonstrated that crash risk, including the likelihood that these crashes result in a fatality, rises exponentially with increased BAC level^{33, 34, 35}. The risk rises steeply at higher levels of intoxication.

There is evidence that skills performance starts to deteriorate at levels below 0.05 BAC, especially in terms of divided attention and basic driving skills^{36, 37}.

Research has examined the likelihood of crash involvement for drivers with a certain BAC compared to drivers with no alcohol in their system³⁸. As *Figure 5* shows, the risk of a crash appears to rise for drivers with a BAC of 0.05 or greater³⁹. The crash risk of a driver with a BAC of 0.10 is almost five times that of a driver with no alcohol in their system⁴⁰. The crash risk continues to rise and is significantly elevated at BAC above 0.10. A driver with a BAC of 0.15 has a crash risk 22 times that of a driver with no alcohol in their system⁴¹. Due to this and other research, crash risk has been widely used to set the legal alcohol limits for driving.

Figure 5

Relative risk of crash involvement by BAC.



Adapted: Compton, R.P., Blomberg, R.D., Moskowitz, H., Burns, M., Peck, R.C. & Fiorentino, D. (2002) *Crash rate of alcohol impaired driving. Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS, Montreal*

Part Two

Framework for addressing drink driving in Queensland

Safe road users – a ‘safe systems’ approach

Road safety policy requires balanced attention to the road environment, vehicle safety, speed limits and the behaviour of road users.

This is summed up in the ‘safe system’ concept, which aims for safe road users travelling at safe speeds in safe vehicles on safe roads and roadsides. This concept includes:

- **Safe roads and roadsides** aims to improve the infrastructure of roads and the surrounding road environment to minimise both the likelihood of a crash happening and the severity of the crashes that do occur;
- **Safe vehicles** aims to increase the adoption of safety features in vehicles that prevent crashes and minimise the danger to vehicle occupants and other road users in the event of a crash;
- **Safe speeds** aims to encourage travel at speeds that are appropriate to the conditions and limit the physical impact forces of crashes to survivable levels; and
- **Safe road users** aims to influence alert and compliant road user behaviour through public education, enforcement, licensing and other means.

The safe system concept draws from the principles of the successful road safety policies adopted in countries such as Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, where road fatality rates are generally a little more than half that in Australia. Since the endorsement of the *National Road Safety Action Plan 2005 and 2006* by the Australian Transport Council in 2004, road safety policy across Australian jurisdictions has been based on safe system principles.

The approach allows jurisdictions to build on past road safety achievements and successful interventions. Adoption of the safe system framework has been recognised as essential for achieving ambitious reductions in road fatalities and injuries⁴².

This discussion paper is a component of the ‘safe system’ approach inherent in the *Queensland Road Safety Action Plan 2010–2011* and aims to reduce drink driving to deliver safe road users.


Framework for addressing drink driving

Drink driving is a highly complex social, economic, and public health issue and, as a result, a broad approach is required to address this road safety problem⁴³. This approach should not only include punishing the offender but should also seek to proactively prevent or deter drink driving from occurring, or re-occurring in the case of those who have already offended.

In choosing which measures to apply, it is important to understand who the target groups are and what measures are the most appropriate and effective to influence a reduction in drink driving in our community. This population based perspective considers the environmental and social determinants of drink driving and how they affect the health and well being of populations⁴⁴. As illustrated in *Figure 6* interventions that are applied to the overall population primarily aim to prevent and/or deter people from drink driving. If these measures fail and a person is detected drink driving the response changes focus and aims to punish, reform and/or incapacitate⁴⁵ individual offenders. Through these means it is intended that the offender is further prevented and/or specifically deterred from reoffending. This framework guides the way that drink driving is addressed and the target groups for potential interventions.

Figure 6

Target populations for drink driving countermeasures



Deterrence and drink driving

Most approaches used to address drink driving have primarily been built on the principles of deterrence theory⁴⁶. This theory suggests that a person's decision whether to engage in a particular illegal activity is determined by how they perceive the severity, swiftness and certainty of punishment. From a road safety perspective deterrence is either general and/or specific⁴⁷. Programs and policies predicated on general deterrence aim to alter the behaviour and attitudes of the general public, particularly those who have not offended. Specific deterrence primarily focuses on those who have offended and tries to prevent the person from repeating their actions by punishing, reforming and/or incapacitating the offender.

Breakdown of target groups for potential interventions

General Population

Prevention and general deterrence

More than 4.4 million people lived in Queensland as at 30 June 2009⁴⁸. For many Queenslanders, the consumption of alcohol is an accepted and common practice. In 2007, around 85 per cent of the population aged 14 years and older reported drinking alcohol in the 12 previous months⁴⁹. Between five and ten per cent of Queenslanders drink alcohol daily⁵⁰. Drinking behaviours in Queensland are amongst the riskiest in Australia⁵¹. Queenslanders have one of the highest rates of alcohol related deaths and hospitalisations in Australia (behind the Northern Territory and Western Australia)⁵². Alcohol continues to be linked with a large proportion of serious road crashes and violent crime. In 1999–2001, there were 812 deaths and 20 912 hospital admissions in Queensland due to alcohol misuse⁵³.

Drink Drivers

Specific deterrence, punishment, reform, and incapacitation

As at 31 December 2009, there were more than three million driver licences on register in Queensland. The vast majority (89.1 per cent) of these were open licences. Provisional (including P1 & P2) and learner licences account for 10.9 per cent of licences⁵⁴.

Under Queensland legislation, it is an offence to drive a vehicle with a BAC above the driver's legal alcohol limit*. Other drink driving offences include driving under the influence of liquor, and failing to provide a specimen of breath or blood for testing when requested by a police officer. The latter offences are considered high level offences and are dealt with by the law and the courts in the same way as if the person had a BAC reading over the high alcohol limit (≥ 0.15 BAC)*.

It is difficult to estimate the actual prevalence of drink driving, however self reported drink driving does provide some indication. Although most people claim to not drink drive, 14 per cent of respondents to a recent Department of Transport and Main Roads' survey did admit that they sometimes drive when they could be over their legal alcohol limit⁵⁵.

Despite very high levels of enforcement (approximately three million tests per annum) the Queensland Police Service (QPS) will only ever catch a proportion of all drink drivers. In the 2007/08 financial year, approximately one per cent of the total number of drivers that were randomly breath tested using various breath testing enforcement activities returned a positive result⁵⁶. In the same financial year, 29 909 drink drivers were detected committing over 32 000 drink driving offences^{57, 58}. These drink drivers represented less than one per cent of the total population at the time⁵⁹.

* See Part Three for more information on legal alcohol limits

Profile of a drink driving offender in Queensland

The drink driving offences detected in Queensland over the seven years prior to June 2008 were most frequently committed:

- by males
- by 20–29 year olds
- on Saturdays
- mostly in the 0.05–0.09 BAC range ⁶⁰.

Drink drivers though are not all alike. It is important to remember that drink drivers can be male or female, of all ages, and from any cultural and social background.

All drink drivers pose a risk on our roads. However, some drink drivers represent a greater risk than others. Drink drivers can be categorised according to the risk that they represent. Two types of offenders are outlined in this part. These two types of offenders will be targeted and further discussed in Parts Four and Five of the discussion paper.

Type 1 Offenders

17 586 offenders in 2007–08

Type One offenders are first time offenders (within a five year period) convicted of an offence ≤ 0.149 BAC (that is, below the high alcohol limit).

Type One offenders are generally considered to have a lower crash risk than Type Two offenders due to their lack of previous drink driving history and their lower BAC level at the time of the offence.

In the 2007–08 financial year, 17 586 drink drivers were convicted of an offence that is included in this category (includes offences 0.001–0.05 BAC) ⁶¹.

Type One offenders include:

- 1a) *First time offenders (within a five year period) convicted of an offence where the BAC was >0.00 and ≤ 0.09 .*

In the 2007–08 financial year, 11 570 drink drivers were detected and convicted of an offence that would fall into this category (includes offences 0.001–0.05) ⁶².

- 1b) *First time offenders (within a five year period) convicted of an offence where the BAC was ≥ 0.10 and ≤ 0.149 .*

In the 2007–08 financial year, 6 016 drink drivers were detected and convicted of an offence that would fall into this category ⁶³.

Type 2 Offenders

12 323 offenders in 2007–08

Type Two offenders are considered to pose a greater risk on the road due to a higher BAC level or because they have previously been caught drink driving and continue to drink drive placing other road users at risk.

A driver with a BAC of 0.15 has a crash rate 22 times that of a driver with no alcohol in their system⁶⁴. In Queensland, around half of the drink drivers involved in a crash where a person was killed or admitted to hospital had a BAC of 0.15 or greater⁶⁵.

In Queensland, a drink driver's traffic history in the previous five years is considered by a magistrate for the purposes of sentencing. A repeat drink driver is therefore a person convicted of two or more drink driving offences within a five year period. More than one in four detected drink drivers (26.9 per cent) in the 2007–08 financial year had committed another drink driving offence in the previous five years⁶⁶. Analysis of 2004 to 2007 crash data has also shown that controllers with prior drink driving offences were 5.44 times more likely to be a drink driver when involved in serious casualty crashes⁶⁷. Sanctions such as fines or licence disqualifications did not deter a proportion of drink drivers from committing another offence. Other research suggests that a significant number of repeat drink drivers are alcohol dependent⁶⁸.

Type Two offenders include:

- 2a) *First time offenders (within a five year period) convicted of a high level offence (≥ 0.15 , driving under the influence of liquor or fail to supply specimen).*

In the 2007–08 year, 4 291 offenders were convicted of a first time high level offence⁶⁹.

- 2b) *Repeat offenders (within a five year period), that is, a person convicted of two or more drink driving offences of any kind.*

In the 2007–08 financial year, 8 032 offenders convicted of a drink driving offence had also committed another drink driving offence in the previous five years⁷⁰.

Within the repeat offender cohort is a subset of drink drivers that is at a higher risk of crashing due to repeat high level offences (often at higher BACs):

- 2b) (i) *Repeat high level offenders (within a five year period), that is, a person convicted of two or more high level offences (≥ 0.15), driving under the influence of liquor or fail to supply specimen.*

In the 2007–08 financial year, 1 136 offenders convicted of a high level offence had also committed another high level offence in the previous five years⁷¹.

Part Three

What has been done to address drink driving in Queensland?

Decreases in alcohol related fatalities were achieved in the 1980s due to new drink driving laws (such as the introduction of 0.05 general alcohol limit in 1985) and enforcement strategies (particularly the introduction of the RBT program in 1988) along with public education activities ⁷².

This part describes the initiatives and policies that have been introduced in Queensland to address drink driving. The table below lists the initiatives and policies and shows which of the target populations (as outlined in *Part Two*) are affected by each initiative.

Table 1

Initiative	General Population	Drink Drivers	
	<i>Prevention and general deterrence</i>	Type One Offenders	Type Two Offenders
Legal alcohol limits	•	•	•
Mass media and education programs	•	•	•
Skipper – designated driver program	•		
RBT	•	•	•
24 hour licence suspensions	•	•	•
Immediate licence suspensions	•		•
Penalties (licence disqualifications, fines and imprisonment)	•	•	•
Cumulative disqualifications	•		•
Offender education programs		•	•
Vehicle impoundment			•

Overview of previous initiatives and policies introduced to address drink driving in Queensland.

Legal alcohol limits

In Queensland there are three alcohol limits:

- No alcohol limit – you will be over this limit if the concentration of alcohol in your blood or breath is more than zero
- General alcohol limit – you will be over this limit if the concentration of alcohol in your blood or breath is equal to or more than 0.05
- High alcohol limit – you will be over this limit if the concentration of alcohol in your blood or breath is equal to or more than 0.15.

Legal alcohol limits for drivers

Licence class, type and/or age	Legal BAC
Holder of learner, provisional or probationary licence and aged under 25 years	0.00
Holder of a restricted licence	0.00
Holder of a licence when driving or in charge of a truck, bus, articulated motor vehicle, B-double, road train, vehicle carrying dangerous goods, taxi, limousine, tow truck, pilot or escort vehicle escorting an oversize vehicle and public passenger vehicle or a vehicle while it is being used by a driver trainer to give driver training (but not a parent etc. supervising a learner driver)	0.00
Holder of a learner, provisional or probationary licence and aged 25 years and over*	Below 0.05
Holder of an open licence	Below 0.05

* Zero BAC for all provisional licence holders will be introduced in 2010.

Mass media and education campaigns

The Department of Transport and Main Roads' comprehensive approach to developing drink driving road safety campaigns involves extensive research to ensure the greatest impact on behaviour change. A social marketing framework is used for planning the majority of road safety public education campaigns. Social marketing campaigns attempt to tackle quite complex behaviours which can only be achieved over the long term. Market research demonstrates there are broad ranging motivations that drive people to act in various ways and just as many approaches that get them to reconsider their behaviour. All campaigns conducted by the department are informed by qualitative market research, including international and national research. Focus groups test concepts and key messages to determine those that have the best emotive appeal with the target audience and the most potential to encourage them to change their behaviour.

The Department of Transport and Main Roads regularly runs anti drink driving public education campaigns that are closely coordinated with QPS enforcement efforts (such as random breath testing).

Road safety research shows that public education campaigns have strong potential for behaviour change when complemented with enforcement which is why campaigns are planned with the QPS. The department recognises that long-term behaviour change can only be sustained with the combination of public education, enforcement and engineering improvements. Research confirms road safety advertising campaigns do have an impact on driver behaviour, especially when combined with enforcement and legislation.

The 2008–2009 anti drink driving public education campaign promoted the key message: 'Drink drive. You lose'. It consisted of television advertising, outdoor billboards and ambient advertising near bottle shops. Campaign activity was timed to coincide with holiday

periods and long weekends – statistics show a higher proportion of drink driving related crashes at these times.

Recent quantitative market research (June 2009) undertaken with 400 Queensland motorists revealed the anti drink driving campaign has been effective in generating high levels of awareness and message recall. Total awareness of the anti drink driving campaign was 86 per cent⁷³.

Skipper program/trial

In 2006/07, the Queensland Government developed an enhanced version of the designated driver program named 'Skipper' that was trialled in Mackay. The 'Skipper' program is an in-premises program in which patrons agree to have no alcohol in their system and drive their friends home in exchange for free soft drinks⁷⁴. A collaborative pro-active strategy targeting drinkers in hotels, clubs and other licensed premises to combat the incidence of alcohol related crashes, the program is designed to support and reward designated drivers and to increase the awareness of their social value to the broader community.

Random breath testing

RBT is the key drink driving enforcement activity in all Australian jurisdictions. In Queensland alone, breath testing drivers and riders has played a key role in reducing drink driving fatalities and hospitalisations by 11 per cent since the 1980's⁷⁵. Since 1988, the program has allowed the police to randomly test drivers and riders (at any time) without having observed any behaviour that indicates that the driver or rider may have been drinking and may have an illegal blood alcohol concentration⁷⁶.

Marketing and communication about the certainty of apprehension is a core ingredient for any RBT program, and has been delivered by mass media campaigns and publicity in local papers. Coupled with intensive media campaigns (alerting drivers to the potential of being detected at

any time), the RBT program has had a significant impact on further reducing drink driving related fatalities. The formula for the most successful RBT program must include high visibility of enforcement, giving the impression that offenders are likely to be caught if they drink and drive. RBT also creates a high level of awareness among drivers of its existence through formal and informal publicity campaigns as well as frequent interception of all drivers, regardless of the time of day or location.

Queensland's RBT program is one of the largest within Australia which operates with a current target of one test per licensed driver per annum, equating to approximately three million tests each year. The QPS is the responsible government agency for the operation of the program and conducts various operations around the state year round. The level of enforcement varies and is determined on a regional basis by local police accessing crash data, reviewing known places of drinking, and in consideration of other local policing requirements.

Each region conducts a significant number of tests via a number of enforcement strategies, including stationary deployment such as booze buses, and mobile deployment from patrol cars.

24 hour licence suspension

In Queensland, if a driver is charged with drink driving and over the no alcohol limit (0.00) or general alcohol limit (0.05) but under the high alcohol limit (0.15) their licence will be automatically suspended for 24 hours from the time their alcohol level is confirmed. This 24 hour suspension is targeted at the Type One offenders outlined in the framework section of the discussion paper. The 24 hour suspension is used to encourage those drivers charged with drink driving under the high alcohol limit to not drive for 24 hours, therefore taking away the possibility of those offenders driving while still affected by alcohol. When the 24 hour suspension period has ended, drivers may resume driving until their case is heard by a Court.

Immediate licence suspension

Queensland introduced immediate licence suspensions for certain drink driving offences on 15 December 2006. If a driver is charged with any of the offences listed below, their licence will be automatically suspended until their charge has been heard and determined by a court. The suspension takes effect once the person is charged. The offences are:

- Driving a motor vehicle with a BAC of 0.15 or more
- Failing to provide a specimen of breath for testing/analysis or a specimen of blood for analysis
- Being charged with a second drink driving offence while an earlier drink driving charge is still to be heard by a court
- Operating a motor vehicle dangerously when adversely affected by alcohol and over the permissible alcohol limit.

This immediate licence suspension is targeted at the Type Two high risk offenders outlined in the framework section of the discussion paper. The immediate suspension of licences of high risk offenders may help to prevent them from repeatedly drink driving, risking their own life as well as other Queenslanders.

Queensland's penalty regime

Under the *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995* penalties for drink driving offences are expressed as a fine or a term of imprisonment. A magistrate may impose a range of sentences including:

- A fine⁷⁷ (not more than the maximum fine)
- A community service order⁷⁸ (not less than 40 and not more than 240 hours to be completed within 12 months)
- A probation order⁷⁹ (not less than six months and not more than three years)
- An intensive corrections order⁸⁰ (not more than 12 months)
- A wholly or partially suspended sentence⁸¹
- A term of imprisonment⁸².

Magistrates in Queensland have the discretion to impose any fine under or equal to the maximum fine as there is no minimum fine amount legislated for drink driving offences. Queensland's maximum penalties for drink driving offences are listed in *Table 2*. The maximum fines for drink driving offences are relatively high. In comparison to other Australian jurisdictions, Queensland's maximum fines for drink driving offences are amongst the highest. For example, in Queensland the maximum fine for driving with a BAC of 0.15 or more (first offence) is \$2800. In Victoria the maximum fine for this offence is \$1401.84, in South Australia it is \$1200 and in the Northern Territory it is \$1300.

In Queensland, minimum disqualification periods are legislated for drink driving offences. Queensland's disqualification periods are considered appropriate as the period of disqualification increases depending on whether the offence is a first, second or subsequent offence and the BAC level at the time of the offence. The magistrate also has the discretion to require drink driving offenders to serve a proportion or the entire sentence as imprisonment. The punishment for offenders who commit three or more high level offences within five years must include imprisonment.

Imprisonment may be whole or part of the penalty imposed by the magistrate. Where a magistrate imposes a fine and the offender is unable to pay, the magistrate may make a fine option order to allow the offender to pay the fine through community service (see Part 4, Division 2 of the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*).

In addition to the laws under the *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995*, the *Criminal Code Act 1899* provides a penalty regime including terms of imprisonment for offenders that are charged with very serious offences such as dangerous operation of a vehicle. These laws enable police prosecutors and the courts to note the seriousness of particular offences, especially in cases where a person who operates (or in any way interferes with the operation of) a vehicle dangerously, causing the death of, or grievous bodily

harm to another person. In these circumstances, severe impairment by alcohol (as an intoxicating substance) may be the aggravating circumstance leading to the dangerous operation of a vehicle. For these circumstances, a magistrate may sentence a driver to imprisonment for a maximum period of 10 to 14 years.

Other Australian jurisdictions also have similar legislation regarding dangerous operation of a vehicle. In Western Australia and the Northern Territory imprisonment is a maximum period of 7–10 years, New South Wales is 7–14 years, Victoria is 5–10 years, the Australian Capital Territory is 4–9 years and in South Australia imprisonment is a maximum period of 7 years to a life sentence. Based on this information Queensland’s imprisonment terms for these offences are slightly higher than other Australian states and territories, with the exception of South Australia.

Table 2

Queensland’s offences and penalties for drink driving by offence and alcohol concentration limit

Limit	Offence	Alcohol result range	Penalties (fine and/or imprisonment)		Disqualification period
			Maximum fine	Imprisonment	
No alcohol limit	First offence	0.00–0.04	\$1400.00	3 months	3–9 months
	Second and subsequent offence		\$6000.00	18 months	3–18 months
General alcohol limit	First offence	0.05–0.14	\$1400.00	3 months	1–9 months
	Second and subsequent offence		\$6000.00	18 months	3–18 months
All alcohol limits	First offence	≥0.15*	\$2800.00	9 months	Minimum of 6 months
	Second and subsequent offence		\$6000.00	18 months†	Minimum 12 months

* Includes driving under the influence offences

† Offenders committing three or more of these offences within five years must have the whole or part of the punishment as imprisonment

Cumulative disqualifications

Cumulative disqualifications for multiple drink or drug driving related offences were introduced in Queensland on 18 May 2008. This means that disqualifications for drink driving offences are served cumulatively (one after the other). Prior to cumulative disqualifications, disqualification periods were served at the same time. Effectively, this meant that a person only served the longest period of any of these disqualifications, and the shortest period did not affect the offender.

Offender education programs

Under Queensland legislation, drink driving offenders may be ordered through the court to attend and complete a 'training program'. Currently the only program that is delivered through this legislative provision is the Under the Limit (UTL) program. However, in addition to the UTL program there are several other programs outside of legislation that offenders are referred to by the courts or may choose to voluntarily attend. These include the Alcohol and Drug Foundation's Driving with Care program along with a number of courses run by community groups such as the Attitudinal Driving Workshops and the Gold Coast Traffic Offenders Program.

The UTL is an 11 week drink driving prevention and rehabilitation program that uses a combination of education and therapeutic approaches to provide drink driving offenders with an understanding of their individual behaviour within their cultural and social contexts, and provide drink driving offenders with opportunities to learn strategies and skills with a view to changing their behaviour and avoiding drink driving.

Offenders are referred by some courts or may voluntarily attend Attitudinal Driving Workshops. These are free workshops designed for offenders facing disqualification or prior to application for disqualification to be lifted. It is an educational type rehabilitation program. The content is delivered by victims and practitioners affected by or involved with road trauma.

Another educational type rehabilitation program is the Gold Coast Traffic Offender Program. Offenders are referred at the court's discretion to this program and it is offered pre-sentencing to offenders intending to plead guilty. Attendance may result in a reduced fine or reduction in disqualification period to no less than the minimum applicable period. The content is delivered by practitioners from the road safety, legal, alcohol treatment and other medical fields and it costs participants \$95 which must be paid prior to commencement of program.

The Driving with Care program includes screening and assessment to direct offenders to the appropriate level of rehabilitation and is a combination type rehabilitation program (with both educational and therapeutic components) targeted to high range or repeat offenders. Offenders are referred to this program at the court's discretion or may self-refer.

Vehicle impoundment

In Queensland, vehicle impoundment and forfeiture was introduced for certain drink driving offences from 1 July 2007. Vehicle impoundment and forfeiture applies to repeat offences in the following five offence categories:

1. Driving under the influence whilst over the high alcohol limit.
2. Failing to supply a specimen of breath/blood or driving whilst under 24 hour suspension.
3. Driving whilst unlicensed or disqualified.
4. Driving a vehicle that is both unregistered and uninsured.
5. Driving a vehicle which is illegally modified

Vehicle impoundment is graduated which means it increases in severity with each offence:

- For first offences (called the zero offence), no action is taken against the vehicle but existing sanctions (for example, immediate suspension for drink driving over the high alcohol limit) and Court imposed penalties apply
- A second offence in the same offence category in the following three years (referred to as the first repeat offence), may result in the vehicle being impounded immediately by a police officer for a 48 hour period
- If detected committing three offences in the same category in a three year period (referred to as the second repeat offence), a police officer may immediately impound the vehicle for 48 hours and also apply to a magistrate to impound the vehicle for up to three months
- For further repeat offences, the vehicle may be immediately impounded for 48 hours in addition to an application to a magistrate for forfeiture of the vehicle.

The driver is responsible for costs associated with the initial impoundment of the vehicle for 48 hours and the owner (even if they are not the driver) is liable for all costs associated with the storage of the vehicle beyond the initial impoundment period. If the motor vehicle is stolen or rented, the vehicle must be released to the owner as soon as possible.

The impoundment or forfeiture of a motor vehicle is in addition to, and does not limit or otherwise affect, any penalty that may be imposed on the person for the offence.

Part Four

What changes will be made?

As a first step in addressing drink driving in Queensland, the government is introducing alcohol ignition interlocks for a range of high risk drink drivers, including those with a BAC over the high alcohol limit (≥ 0.15) and repeat drink driving offenders (within a five year period).

Alcohol ignition interlocks initiative

An alcohol ignition interlock (interlock) prevents a vehicle starting if the driver has been drinking. The interlock incorporates a breath testing device that accurately measures the alcohol present in a driver's breath. It is connected to the ignition of a vehicle and the driver is required to provide a breath sample every time an attempt is made to start the vehicle. If alcohol is detected the vehicle will not start.

Interlock technology has improved considerably since it first became available over 30 years ago and is now considered to be reliable and accurate. A range of features have also been added to reduce the possibility or likelihood of a driver 'cheating' or circumventing the device including:

- temperature and pressure sensors to ensure that the sample is provided directly by an adult human to guard against filtered, stored or artificial breath samples
- driver breath recognition systems to reduce the possibility of untrained bystanders or third parties providing a breath sample
- a retest requirement at random intervals once the vehicle's engine has started to detect rising BAC levels as a result of further drinking
- a data logger to record the results of every attempt to use the interlock; and
- sealed wiring and circuits so that attempts to tamper with the device are clearly evident⁸³.

The primary purpose of an interlock is to prevent a driver that is impaired by alcohol from operating a vehicle and, in doing so, protect the safety of the public. Interlocks provide drivers with the opportunity to legally drive when they are not affected by alcohol, allowing drivers to maintain their mobility, employment and work and family commitments.

Interlocks effectively separate drinking and driving. They have been widely evaluated particularly in the United States of America and Canada. Comprehensive reviews of these studies conclude that, while installed, interlocks are more effective in preventing further offences^{84,85,86} and alcohol related crashes⁸⁷ than traditional sanctions such as licence disqualification. While the interlock is installed, reoffence rates are 37 to 90 per cent lower than for those that do not install an interlock⁸⁸. The median reduction in reoffences associated with interlock use is 73 per cent⁸⁹. However, the effect is not sustained once the interlock is removed with offence rates returning to levels similar to those that did not participate in the interlock program^{90,91,92}. Long term change in drink driving behaviour may be achieved though if interlock participants also complete a rehabilitation program⁹³.

Who will be required to have an interlock condition on re-licensing?

An interlock licence condition will be applied on re-licensing to the following offenders:

Type 2 Offenders

- First time offenders (within a five year period) convicted of a high level offence (≥ 0.15), driving under the influence of liquor, or fail to supply specimen.
- Repeat offenders (within a five year period), that is, a person convicted of two or more drink driving offences of any kind.

In addition, the interlock condition will apply on re-licensing to those who are convicted of dangerous driving when adversely affected by alcohol.

How will the interlock program work?

The interlock condition will be a re-licensing requirement imposed on these drivers when they return to obtain their licence at the completion of their full disqualification period. The interlock condition will start on the date the licence is issued.

Participants will have the interlock condition removed from their licence after 12 months if they have an interlock device fitted to their nominated vehicle for a cumulative 12 month period (periods of licence suspension will not count towards the interlock period).

Drivers with an interlock condition will only be legally licensed to drive a vehicle equipped with an operating approved interlock. There will be severe penalties for non-compliance with the interlock condition licence.

What are the issues relating to access and equity?

Interlock services will be able to be provided in most Queensland locations (subject to procurement negotiations). Exemptions may be made, on application, to people in remote areas that are not covered by a service provider. The government is also progressing hardship provisions for the interlock program.

Also, providing a specimen of breath for an interlock device may be a difficult task for individuals with certain medical conditions (for example, severe asthma or emphysema). Therefore, exemptions may be provided, upon application, to individuals with specified medical conditions that prevent them from providing a sufficient breath sample. More details on the exemptions will be available closer to the time of implementation.

A vehicle fitted with an interlock may be used by other drivers, most likely family members. These drivers will also be required to provide a breath sample in order to start the vehicle. The interlock will not allow any driver to start the vehicle if alcohol is detected. Findings from a pilot project in the United Kingdom found that family members had a positive response to the interlock as it provided reassurance that their loved one was not driving while impaired by alcohol ⁹⁴.

What are the costs and will there be a discount for those with low incomes?

The program costs exceed \$2000 per annum in most Australian states where interlocks are in use. However, program fees are not usually paid up front, but upon provision of particular aspects of the service (for example installation, maintenance and removal) and usually on a monthly basis. This may represent a significant expense for some participants, particularly those with low incomes. Program costs may be capped for certain eligible participants. More details will be available closer to the time of implementation.

Have interlocks been considered before in Queensland?

A trial of interlocks was completed in Queensland in 2006. Participation in the program was voluntary with interlocks available as a sentencing option for drink drivers in a small number of courts. Results from a study of the trial indicated that interlocks do have the potential to reduce further drink driving offences ⁹⁵. Other positive outcomes were also observed such as reduced drinking rates amongst participants. However the very small number of participants (only 29) and relatively short follow-up period preclude drawing any definitive conclusions about the impact of the trial.

Do other Australian jurisdictions have interlock programs?

In Australia, interlock programs for drink drivers currently operate in Victoria, South Australia, New South Wales and the Northern Territory. The programs differ between jurisdictions. Victoria operates a mandatory program for certain drink drivers who must fit an interlock in order to drive legally. South Australia has also recently introduced a mandatory re-licensing program replacing a voluntary program that commenced in 2001. In New South Wales and the Northern Territory, drink drivers can volunteer to participate in the interlock program in order to receive shorter periods of disqualification. Western Australia has indicated that they intend on introducing an interlock program. Tasmania recently conducted a one year trial of interlocks to determine the appropriateness of interlocks for that state.

Part Five

What changes could be made?

The sections below contain a number of discussion points on initiatives that could be implemented in Queensland. Some of these initiatives have been adopted in other Australian jurisdictions and overseas while others are further enhancements to programs and policies currently in use in Queensland.

The enhancements and new programs outlined in this section are not government policy and are for consultation purposes only. The government is seeking the views of the community before considering the implementation and associated costs of any new anti drink driving initiatives (see Part Seven for the feedback form).

RBT and enforcement

RBT is used as a deterrent to influence a driver's choice to drink and drive through the threat of punishment^{96,97}. Well publicised media campaigns combined with RBT are integral to the overall deterrent effect of RBT enforcement targeted at both the general population and drink drivers⁹⁸. The QPS conducts RBT via booze buses and patrol cars and performs approximately three million tests per annum⁹⁹. RBT has been one of the most influential interventions and has contributed to the biggest decline in alcohol related fatalities since its introduction in 1988¹⁰⁰. However, drink driving continues to be a problem and further improvements to the delivery and operability of RBT may be possible to improve its effectiveness.

Discussion point: Extend the time limit for requiring a specimen (blood or breath) for analysis for a drink driving charge from two to three hours.

Currently the time limit for conducting breath or blood analysis for a drink driving charge is two hours. The current RBT process involves a police officer conducting an initial preliminary roadside breath test to determine the presence of alcohol. If the results from this

preliminary breath test indicate an illegal BAC the police officer can detain or arrest the driver for the purposes of a second test to verify these results. This second test will either be in the form of a breath analysis on a breath analysing instrument or via a blood test. The process of obtaining these specimens for the purposes of establishing a case against the offender must be completed within a two hour time period from the time of the offender driving.

In Queensland, the driving distances can limit the ability of police to take a detained/arrested drink driver for breath or blood analysis within the two hour window. This is particularly the case in rural areas where resources are often stretched and where breath analysing instruments (that produce a certificate for a drink driving charge) are more often kept in police stations as a shared resource for use by officers from a number of neighbouring districts. Similar limitations exist where approved persons for taking specimens of blood are not available within the distance or available within the two hour window. In situations where police do not have sufficient time to perform the breath analysis or request a specimen of blood, they may not be able to charge an individual with drink driving even if they know the person has committed an offence.

A review conducted by the Queensland Parliamentary Travelsafe Committee (*Getting Tough on Drink Drivers: Report No.46, October 2006*) identified and described a number of potential changes that could be made to RBT operations and procedures. A number of improvements to these procedures have been, or are being progressed, by the QPS. The report made further recommendations to extend the time limits for conducting breath/blood testing.

Currently, breath and blood testing must be conducted within a two hour timeframe. However, testing for the presence of a relevant drug under drug driving laws may be undertaken within a three hour timeframe. A three hour timeframe for testing drivers for both 'relevant drugs' and 'alcohol and other drugs' would remove inconsistencies in legislation. A three hour timeframe would also ensure that persons are not unfairly detained for long periods.

What are the maximum time limits for collecting specimens in other jurisdictions?

Other Australian jurisdictions also specify a timeframe in which testing must be completed (see *Table 3*). However, other than New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory (that have dense populations), Queensland remains one of the few states in Australia to have a short timeframe to obtain the specimen.

Table 3

Comparison of Australian jurisdictions for collecting specimens (adapted from Report No. 46, Getting Tough on Drink Drivers.)

State	Hours for collecting a specimen
New South Wales	2
Victoria	3
Tasmania	3
South Australia	8
Western Australia	4
Australian Capital Territory	2
Northern Territory	4
Queensland	2

Who does this target?



Potential impacts:

- Could improve the effectiveness of RBT in rural areas which may potentially result in increased detection of drink drivers
- Aligns the time required to obtain a specimen for a drink driving charge with that specified for the collection of a specimen under the current roadside drug testing program (that is, three hours)
- Drink drivers could be detained for a longer period of time (currently maximum is two hours).

Have your say

Question 1: Do you support extending the maximum time allowed to obtain a breath/blood specimen for drink driving offences from two to three hours? *Have your say on page 57.*

Discussion point: The arresting/detaining police officer could also carry out breath analysis using the breath analysing instrument.

Currently the officer requiring a driver to provide the preliminary roadside breath test may arrest or detain the person for the purposes of then conducting a breath analysis. This breath analysis will be conducted through a breath analysing instrument by a police officer that is suitably qualified to operate this device. Generally, where possible, the breath analysis is conducted shortly after the preliminary roadside breath test. Under Queensland legislation, the arresting or detaining officer is prohibited from being the operator of the breath analysing instrument, despite the fact that this officer may be suitably qualified to operate this device.

This procedure was originally incorporated into legislation to ensure that two officers (the arresting or detaining officer and the officer operating the instrument) could verify the circumstances surrounding the operation of the instrument and to corroborate evidence associated with the case. This was especially relevant with the early breath analysing instruments used in Queensland that required human intervention to operate the device by rotating a knob to determine the level of alcohol present in a sample of breath. Since the introduction of the first breath analysing instruments in 1968 there has been substantial technological advancements made to these devices. Queensland is now using one of the latest and most technologically advanced breath analysing instruments available. This device is fully automated and undertakes self-calibration and testing prior to each use, therefore requiring no human intervention to allow the instrument to sample and analyse a specimen of breath.

How does Queensland compare to other Australian jurisdictions?

The stipulation that the operator of the instrument cannot be the arresting or detaining officer is unique to Queensland. Operational difficulties arise in areas where police resources are limited. This creates problems

when the arresting or detaining officer cannot perform the breath analysis. Due to these factors, officers on single patrol may not progress an arrest as the distance and/or requirements to locate a qualified person to conduct breath analysis or take blood for the purposes of conducting other alternative analyses can be difficult and time consuming.

Who does this target?



Potential impacts:

- Improve the effectiveness of the RBT program in rural/remote areas which may potentially result in an increased detection of drink drivers
- May decrease the amount of time the drink driver is detained
- Allowing the arresting/detaining officer to perform the breath analysis will eliminate the need for a second officer, therefore freeing this officer to perform other duties
- Increased costs may be incurred through the conducting of additional breath analysis and associated training requirements for QPS officers.

Have your say

Question 2: Do you support the arresting/detaining officer also being allowed to conduct the breath analysis for drink driving offences?

Have your say on page 57.

Compulsory carriage of driver licence

Discussion point: All driver licence holders (including open licence holders) be required to produce their licence for inspection, unless the person has a reasonable excuse.

In Queensland, current laws require the holder of a learner, provisional, probationary licence or drivers of commercial, public passenger vehicles and heavy vehicles to produce their licence for inspection at the direction of a police officer unless a person has a reasonable excuse. However, the holder of an open driver licence (who is not driving or in charge of a heavy vehicle or commercial/public passenger vehicle) is allowed up to 48 hours to produce their licence at a police station if they are unable to produce their licence when directed by a police officer. A significant number of people per annum are required to present their licence to a police station for inspection within the legislated 48 hour time frame. This process takes the police officer approximately two to three hours to complete. If a person fails to produce their driver licence at the nominated police station, as requested, and the matter is further investigated, police must then locate and interview the person and issue them with a notice to appear in court, if necessary.

The current laws potentially provide a loophole for people to provide false identity or licensing information at the time of police interception. For example, a provisional licence holder who provides a specimen of breath for road side breath test (and in circumstances where their BAC is between 0.001 and 0.049) and is directed to produce their licence by the police officer could state that they are an open licence holder. In these circumstances, a driver may circumvent a requirement to conduct further testing as their claim of being an open licence holder (who has a general alcohol limit of 0.05) would mean that they are driving within the constraints of the current legal limit (for open licence

holders driving a car). Consequently this can undermine the effectiveness of police enforcement along with the other measures such as licence suspension and disqualification. As a result, this current loophole may also be exploited by unlicensed drivers.


Unlicensed drivers are a particularly problematic group of drink drivers as a result of their tendency to engage in high risk driving behaviour such as high level drink driving offences and excessive speeding^{101,102,103}. Analysis of Queensland data has shown that unlicensed driving is a significant factor for drivers involved in serious crashes. Analysis of Queensland data from 2004–2007 has shown that unlicensed controllers were 4.39 times more likely to be drink drivers when involved in serious casualty crashes¹⁰⁴.

A compulsory carriage of licence requirement for all licence holders (including open licence holders driving a car) would require safeguards for a reasonable excuse. However, there would be limited grounds as to what would constitute a reasonable excuse. For example, a person who has had their licence stolen or destroyed may have grounds for a reasonable excuse whereas simply forgetting to carry a licence when driving or leaving a licence at home may not be deemed a reasonable excuse. Consideration of a reasonable excuse would ultimately be at the discretion of a police officer.

Do other Australian jurisdictions have a compulsory carriage of driver licence requirement?

Presently New South Wales, the Northern Territory and Tasmania are the Australian jurisdictions that impose a compulsory carriage of driver licence requirement when driving a motor vehicle on a road.

Who does this target?



Potential impacts:

- Creates a potential deterrent for a person to drive a motor vehicle in violation of particular licence conditions or sanctions
- Even though a driver may not have committed a traffic offence they may be penalised for not carrying their licence
- Enables the police to enforce licence and vehicle impoundment sanctions
- Enhances RBT enforcement activity as a person would be required to produce their licence at the direction of a police officer
- Increases the detection of unlicensed drivers who are currently 4.39 times more likely to be drink drivers ¹⁰⁵.

Have your say

Question 3: Do you support **all** driver licence holders being required to carry their licence while driving and to produce their licence to a police officer for inspection, unless the person has a reasonable excuse?

Have your say on page 57.

Compulsory blood testing

Discussion point: Introduce a compulsory blood testing requirement for drivers who attend hospital for examination or treatment as a result of a motor vehicle crash.

In 1997, the Queensland Parliamentary Travelsafe Committee¹⁰⁶ recommended the introduction of compulsory BAC testing for people who attend hospital for examination or treatment as a result of a motor vehicle crash. The potential benefits were seen to be improved detection and prosecution of drink drivers (at any BAC level) involved in road crashes¹⁰⁷. It would also increase the amount and the consistent reliability of alcohol related crash data which would assist in understanding the involvement of alcohol in all crashes. This would have general benefits for monitoring and responding to the drink driving problem.

Currently, a police officer who attends a crash can require a breath sample from drivers. If the drivers have been taken to hospital, police can attend hospital and request a breath sample (and subsequently conduct breath analysis) or request a blood sample (for laboratory analysis), provided it is within two hours of the crash. However, a doctor or nurse does not have to comply with this request if they reasonably believe that taking the specimen would be prejudicial to the person's treatment or if they have another reasonable excuse. Under the current law, if no request is made by a police officer, a sample of blood may not be taken from the person for the purposes of analysis to determine the presence and/or level of alcohol present in the driver's blood.

Extending the time period in which a specimen of breath/ blood can be taken will improve this situation to some degree. However, requiring medical practitioners to take blood (for blood analysis) from all drivers involved in a road crash unless they believe that taking the

specimen would be prejudicial to the person's treatment could systematically improve the ability for police officers to effectively charge drink drivers involved in crashes, when they cannot perform the breath analysis within the stated timeframe. Without breath/blood analysis, police officers investigating crash circumstances find it difficult to determine whether alcohol was a contributing factor in a crash and may find it extremely difficult to collect evidence to sustain a drink driving charge.

There is currently very little research evidence to suggest that compulsory blood testing would have any general deterrent effect on potential drink drivers. Data collection and research into the effect that BAC level has on crash severity risk is hampered due to current BAC testing procedures. At this point in time, BAC testing for serious crash victims is not compulsory and at the discretion of the attending police officer. This leads to irregular data collection and therefore, inaccurate and biased data. For example, it was found through investigations and analyses of data for 2001–02 to 2006–07 that of the serious casualty crashes recorded, a BAC test was not performed on controllers (see definitions) in 14 per cent of fatal crashes and 37 per cent of hospitalised casualty crashes¹⁰⁸. As such, the available data only captures a proportion of the total number of drink driving events on our roads. More accurate data would provide opportunities for determining the actual prevalence of drink driving that leads to either hospitalisation or, in some cases, death. Mandatory BAC testing would also enable reliable data to be collected which could be used to inform policy decisions about the appropriateness of current legal alcohol limits and the likely benefits, if any, of lowering them.

A compulsory blood testing requirement for drivers who attend hospital for examination or treatment as a result of a motor vehicle crash would place increased work demands on health care professionals with blood specimens having to be taken along with the medical treatment of the person. Emergency departments are often very busy places with absolute priority given to patient care. It should be noted that Queensland emergency department attendances have increased by around 25 per cent in the last three years with over 400,000 attendances in the September

quarter 2009¹⁰⁹. There would also be an increased burden on health care professionals to ensure the taking and storing of the sample complies with legislated evidentiary procedures. Also, police may need to attend and maintain a chain of evidence for the blood sample. The implementation of compulsory blood testing would also increase the number of blood samples being taken at hospitals, and therefore increase the storage and testing of blood samples at laboratories.


Serious medical ethical issues are raised where blood samples are required in circumstances where a person objected to the taking of the sample or the person was unable to give informed consent.

Do other Australian jurisdictions have compulsory blood testing for drivers attending hospital?

In Victoria, the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Northern Territory and South Australia a medical practitioner is required to take a blood sample if a person is over 15 years of age (14 years of age in South Australia) and is involved in a motor vehicle crash and attends hospital for treatment (including those that are deceased). Western Australia, Queensland and Tasmania do not have compulsory blood testing requirements¹¹⁰.

New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory both have offences for medical practitioners if they fail to take a blood sample however there are exemptions/defences for their prosecution. Victoria, South Australia and the Northern Territory all have reasonable grounds listed in their legislation where medical practitioners are not required to take a blood sample. For example, a medical practitioner would not be required to take a sample if they were of the opinion that it would be detrimental to the person's proper care and treatment.

Who does this target?



Potential impacts:

- Improved detection of drink drivers involved in motor vehicle crashes that resulted in the controller being hospitalised
- Provision of prima facie evidence in the preparation of the case against an offender
- Increased work demands on health professionals conducting the blood test
- Increased costs associated with taking, storing and analysing the blood specimen
- Improved road crash data to inform future initiatives aimed at reducing drink driving.

Have your say

Question 4: Do you support the introduction of compulsory blood testing of drivers who attend hospital for examination or treatment as a result of a motor vehicle crash? *Have your say on page 57.*

Lowering the general alcohol limit (0.05)

Discussion point: Lower the general alcohol limit from 0.05.

In Queensland, the general alcohol limit requires open licence holders to have a BAC below 0.05 when driving. However, certain licence holders are not permitted to have any alcohol in their system if driving (see *Part Three* for more information on BAC limits in Queensland). Worldwide legal alcohol limits for driving range between 0.00 through to 0.15¹¹¹.

As *Figure 7* shows, the risk of a crash appears to rise for drivers with a BAC of 0.05 or greater¹¹². A driver with a BAC of 0.15 has a crash risk 22 times that of a driver with no alcohol in their system¹¹³. *Figure 7* also shows the crash risk for BAC levels below 0.05 are quite low (between 1 and 1.18) compared to those 0.05 and over (1.38–153.68).


Figure 8 (page 35) shows that the relative risk of crash involvement for speeding is comparable to illegal BAC levels¹¹⁴. It can be seen that the relative risk of an injury crash when travelling at 65km/h speed limit zone (2.00) is similar to that associated with driving with a BAC of 0.05 (1.38). *Figure 8* shows that crash risk increases significantly when the speed of the vehicle increases.

Whilst some research has established that the impairment of some driving related skills begins with any departure from zero BAC^{115,116}, further research is needed to identify the risks associated with BACs at levels below 0.05. Please see *The effects of alcohol on driving* (page 10) and *Alcohol and crash risk* (page 11) sections for more information on alcohol and crash risk.

There is also some evidence from other jurisdictions that suggests that reducing the general alcohol limit to a level below 0.05 will have some road safety benefits (such as a decrease in the average BAC levels of drink drivers^{117,118}, and a reduction in the incidence and severity of crashes¹¹⁹). However, most of these reductions to

Figure 7

Relative risk of crash involvement by BAC



Adapted: Compton, R.P., Blomberg, R.D., Moskowitz, H., Burns, M., Peck, R.C. & Fiorentino, D. (2002) *Crash rate of alcohol impaired driving. Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS, Montreal*

the alcohol limit were made in conjunction with legislative changes, media campaigns, and changes to enforcement practices so it is difficult to distinguish what impact the changes to the alcohol limit had compared to the other concurrent changes.

Because alcohol has been shown to have a wide variation of effects from person to person, special attention needs to be given to the selection of a BAC level in which the vast majority of drink drivers are likely to be affected. Lowering the general BAC limit in Queensland would require further research to identify the risks associated with BACs at levels below 0.05 and the involvement

of low levels of alcohol in crashes. To substantiate any Queensland evidence-based argument (using Queensland crash data) for a general alcohol limit below 0.05, compulsory blood testing* of any driver attending hospital as a result of a road traffic crash (regardless of police direction for breath/blood samples for analysis) would be required. Subject to this being progressed, a critical analysis of the benefits of a lower alcohol limit using non-biased Queensland data could be undertaken.

Consideration should also be given to the cost and benefits of enforcement of a reduced general alcohol limit in addition to the existing costs and benefits of existing

enforcement levels targeted at high risk drink drivers that are more likely to be involved in serious casualty crashes. That is, the cost of enforcement for lower alcohol limits may supplant the expense of enforcement of higher and riskier BAC levels ¹²⁰.

If the general alcohol limit was lowered, the ability of the drinking public to determine if they have had too much to drink to legally drive would be impacted. For example, a general alcohol limit of less than 0.05 may require people to abstain from drinking any alcohol on social occasions (for some people this may be only one standard drink) before driving. If the general alcohol limit was lowered, an education campaign would have to be developed to inform drivers how the new limit would affect them and how to correctly estimate the number of drinks it may take to reach the new limit.


Other Australian jurisdictions and further considerations

All states and territories have a general alcohol limit of 0.05. Queensland reduced its general alcohol limit from 0.08 to 0.05 in 1985. Two reviews of the effectiveness of the lower general alcohol limit in Queensland (and nationally) found that it continues to provide a reduction in fatalities by as much as 11 per cent as compared to the fatalities recorded prior to the introduction of the 0.05 general alcohol limit ^{121,122}.

If a further reduction in the general alcohol limit in Queensland were to be considered, this would not be consistent with other states. It may be more appropriate for this issue to be discussed at national road safety forums to ensure consistency across jurisdictions.

Figure 8

Relative risk of crash involvement by speed on an urban road with a speed limit of 60km/h.



Adapted: Kloeden, C., McLean, A., Moore, V., & Ponte, G. (1997). Travelling speed and the risk of crash involvement, Volume 1 findings. NHMRC Road Accident Research Unit, The University of Adelaide.

Who does this target?



Potential impacts:

- Promotes road safety and public health messages
- General public may not perceive driving with a low blood/breath alcohol concentration (0.001 to 0.049) as a serious offence
- Drivers may be unable to have one drink at social functions and then drive
- Lowering the general alcohol limit may increase drinking in the community as more people may choose to leave their cars at home and have no restraints on the amount they can drink
- Liquor industry may be affected due to changes in amount of liquor sales at venues (pubs and clubs)
- Likely to impact on those in rural communities due to the limited availability of alternative transport options/public transport in these areas
- Lowering the general alcohol limit may divert enforcement attention from the high BAC drink drivers that pose a greater crash risk
- A possible increase in the number of people caught drink driving would increase the workload of the police and court system
- May decrease the number and severity of drink driving related crashes.

Have your say

Question 5: Do you support a review of the general alcohol limit?

Question 5a: What are your comments, concerns and ideas about lowering the general alcohol limit?

Have your say on page 57.

Designated driver programs

Discussion point: The Queensland Government could promote the use of designated driver programs across Queensland for improved anti drink driving outcomes in our communities.

The general aim of designated driver programs is to reduce the level of drink driving by encouraging potential drink drivers to travel with a driver who has abstained from consuming alcohol¹²³. The primary target group for these programs are those potential drink drivers who travel to and from public drinking venues. Free soft drink is usually provided by venues to the designated driver who registers at the bar upon arrival.

Having a person with no alcohol in their system within a drinking group may have positive impacts on other alcohol related social behaviours, such as a reduction in disorderly conduct and damage of property, because the non-drinker may be able to diffuse any inappropriate behaviour in the group. However, the expectation to undertake this 'mediator' role places additional pressure on the designated driver and may deter individuals from wanting to act in this role¹²⁴.

A limited number of designated driver programs have been effectively evaluated ¹²⁵. The available evidence is insufficient to make any conclusions on the effectiveness of designated driver programs in regards to: the self reported frequency of designated driver selection before drinking began; the observation of self-identified designated drivers in drinking venues; and, self reports of driving with an alcohol impaired driver ¹²⁶. No studies have been identified that assessed the effects of designated driver programs on the incidence of alcohol related crashes ¹²⁷.

Do other Australian jurisdictions have designated driver programs?

The Northern Territory, Western Australia, Victoria, and some local governments in Tasmania and New South Wales have designated driver programs. Designated driver programs appear to be quite widespread around the world, however a limited number have been effectively evaluated to show a reduction in drink driving.

The Queensland Government developed a designated driver program named Skipper in 2006–07 (outlined in *Part Three*). The Skipper program is currently operating as a pilot in the Sunshine Coast, Gold Coast, Mackay and Gympie areas. An evaluation of the program is currently being completed ¹²⁸. However, further promotion and support of designated driver program/s in collaboration with licensees and interested community groups (and liquor accords) could have a positive impact on a person's decision to drink and drive, providing an alternative option for getting home from drinking venues.

The Queensland Government could provide assistance to community groups by developing and supporting designated driver programs. This could be undertaken by developing a guideline and key principles for interested parties.

Who does this target?

General
Population

Potential Impacts:

- Promotes road safety and public health messages
- Assists the community in developing local programs to combat drink driving and/or promote the anti drink driving message
- Provides drinkers with an alternative transport option
- Provides an incentive for a person to become a designated driver.

Have your say

Question 6: Would you support the Queensland Government developing and providing guidelines and principles to assist community groups to develop designated driver programs?

Question 7: Do you support the Queensland Government promoting the use of designated driver programs?

Have your say on page 58.

Alternative transport options

Discussion point: Research and develop a guideline for community groups to investigate and sustain alternative transport options through appropriate collaboration between industry, community groups, and government agencies.

One transportation based approach for reducing drink driving crashes is to provide both vehicles and drivers for intoxicated individuals who would otherwise drive themselves or ride with an intoxicated driver. This approach is usually referred to as ‘safe rides’. Safe ride programs encompass a wide variety of transportation alternatives, such as taxis, limousines, buses, and cars with designated drivers. Typically, when transport is needed by an intoxicated person, either that person or someone such as a server or host, obtains transport from outside the drinking environment ¹²⁹.

Alternative transport options can also be considered for major events such as music festivals, sporting events and schoolies. Providing transport to and from these events could minimise the possible harmful effects of drink driving as a risky behaviour stemming from risky drinking behaviour.

How do alternative transport options work in other Australian jurisdictions?

Governments in Australian states and territories support a wide variety of alternative transport programs and initiatives at both state and local levels.

In Australia, courtesy buses and other safe ride services are regularly provided by a number of service clubs, pubs and other licensed premises in both urban and rural areas. However, their use and potential for preventing drink driving in rural areas has not been well researched.

Researchers typically note that there are a number of barriers to the successful use of courtesy buses in rural or remote areas such as the ‘reliance on private vehicles, large geographical distances and small communities suffering cutbacks in rural services and resources’ ¹³⁰.

It is also common practice for sporting and service clubs in Queensland to provide a courtesy bus for the pick up and/or drop off of patrons. Alternative transport options could also be made available using these resources under share-use agreements between agreeable licensees (that may be owners of such vehicles) and interested community groups willing to assist and provide in-kind volunteer services.

The Queensland Government could research and develop a guideline for community groups to assist them to investigate and sustain alternative transport options. Developing standard material though may not meet the needs of individual communities.

Who does this target?

General
Population

Potential impacts:

- Creates options for people drinking to utilise alternative transport where other public transport may be unavailable
- Alternative transport options may not be feasible or sustainable for communities in rural and regional areas with large travelling distances between places of drinking and home.

Have your say

Question 8: Do you support the development of a guideline for community groups to assist them to develop, provide and sustain alternative transport options?

Question 9: Do you have any other ideas for alternative transport options that could assist your community?

Have your say on page 58.

Liquor accords and responsible service of alcohol (RSA)

Discussion point: Research and develop guidelines for assisting liquor accords and community groups to promote the anti drink driving message.

Liquor accords are community-based voluntary codes of practice that involve licensees, other businesses, local government authorities, community representatives and police. Liquor accords promote a cooperative approach to developing safe and well managed environments in and around licensed premises. These accords may address a number of issues, such as RSA policy including drink discounting bans, trained security personnel, provision of food, use of safe glassware and alcohol containers, and environmental modifications to reduce potential conflict and thereby reduce the risk of violence¹³¹. As at 30 August 2009, there were over 60 liquor accords operating in Queensland¹³². To further enhance existing and future liquor accords, research could be conducted and guidelines developed to include anti drink driving messages into liquor accords.

Liquor accords in other Australian jurisdictions

Liquor accords operate in a number of Australian states and territories to resolve local alcohol related harm issues. Like Queensland, most liquor accords include members from the local business community, local councils, police, government departments and other community organisations.

Who does this target?

General
Population

Potential impacts:

- Promotes road safety and public health messages
- Aims to ensure liquor is served, supplied and promoted responsibly
- Encourages the creation of safe, secure and social environments for patrons of licensed premises to minimise harm to individuals and the broader community.

Discussion point: Improve RSA training curriculum and standards to include appropriate educational content on drink driving.

RSA programs have evolved in many countries alongside a general increase in the availability of alcohol in society and a greater focus on the prevention of alcohol related harm. RSA programs recognise the reality that a great deal of high-risk drinking and preventable harm occurs in and around licensed premises or as drinkers make their way home¹³³.

RSA is the responsibility of licensees and bar staff and mostly aims to reduce the chance that patrons will become intoxicated. These include ‘house policies’ such as promoting food and non or low-alcohol alternatives, as well as training staff to identify early signs of intoxication and delay or stop service to intoxicated patrons.

In Queensland, the Liquor Licensing Division of the Office of Liquor, Gaming Regulation (OLGR) has a Code of Practice for the Responsible Service, Supply and Promotion of Liquor¹³⁴, which provides a proactive whole-of-industry approach to ensure liquor is served, supplied and promoted responsibly and in compliance with the *Liquor Act 1992*. Since 1 January 2009, all staff and managers responsible for the service and supply of liquor must have a current responsible service of alcohol certificate within 30 days of the commencement of such employment¹³⁵.

RSA training curriculum could include educational content on drink driving as a mandatory element. While this content may be included, research may be needed to determine whether there are any road safety benefits from such a requirement. Alternatively, this may help promote the anti drink driving message.

RSA in other Australian jurisdictions

RSA policy exists in all Australian states and territories. However, each state or territory has its own legislation and policy for managing safe liquor serving practices and training requirements for staff.

Have your say

Question 10: Would you support the Queensland Government researching and developing a guideline to assist community groups and liquor accords to promote the anti drink driving message?

Question 11: Do you support responsible service of alcohol training curriculum and standards including appropriate educational content on drink driving?

Have your say on page 58.

Restricted licences (work licences)

Restricted licences, also commonly referred to in Queensland as work licences, may be granted on application to licence holders who have been convicted and disqualified for certain drink driving offences. A work licence authorises the holder to drive only in stated circumstances directly connected with the holder’s means of earning a living.

Drink drivers eligible to apply to the court for a work licence must be first time offenders within the previous five years, had a BAC reading of ≤ 0.149 and held either a current open or provisional Queensland driver licence immediately prior to the disqualification. Additionally, provisional licence holders applying for a work licence must be aged 25 years or older at the time of the offence.

Some of the eligibility criteria include:

- the person must satisfy the court that they are a fit and proper person to hold a restricted licence having regard to the safety of other road users and the public generally
- a refusal of their application for a work licence would cause extreme hardship to the applicant or the applicant’s family by depriving the applicant of their means of earning a living.

Do other jurisdictions have work licences?

Special licences for offenders facing special hardship as a result of disqualification also currently exist in the Australian Capital Territory, Tasmania, and Western Australia. In Queensland, work licences are generally issued for twice the length of the disqualification period for the offence committed. For example, if a driver is disqualified for three months and the court grants an order directing the issue of a work licence, this licence will be issued by the Department of Transport and Main Roads for six months.

Discussion point: Abolishing restricted licences (work licences) in Queensland.

Abolishing work licences in Queensland may improve the overall general deterrent effect of disqualification as the certainty of licence loss for drink drivers would remove any opportunity for a convicted drink driver to continue driving legally.

From 1 July 2001 to 30 June 2009 there were approximately 26 000 work licences issued to convicted drink driving offenders in Queensland¹³⁶. A concern is that work licences may be regarded as a soft option. If a person is allowed to re-enter the licensing system without full punishment (licence disqualification) this could undermine the certainty and effectiveness of licence loss as a general and specific deterrent to drink driving^{137, 138}. Currently work licences are only available to Type One drink driving offenders. Therefore, if a person's licence is disqualified for speeding or dangerous driving they are not eligible to apply for a work licence.

As discussed, abolishing work licences could result in extreme hardship to a person who has been convicted of a drink driving offence or a person's family, by depriving them of a means of earning a living. With consideration to this issue, there is scope for the restricted licence scheme to be further enhanced rather than abolished completely.

Who does this target?

General
Population

Type
1
Offenders

Potential impacts:

- May further reinforce the seriousness of committing a drink driving offence as there are no further opportunities to continue driving legally
- May further enhance licence disqualification as a means of deterring licence holders from drink driving
- Convicted drink drivers and their dependents may experience severe financial hardship as they are potentially deprived of a means to earning a living
- May encourage a higher rate of unlicensed driving as convicted drink drivers who no longer have an opportunity to apply for a work licence may continue to drive despite being disqualified.

Have your say

Question 12: Do you support abolishing work licences in Queensland?

Have your say on page 59.

Retain and enhance the existing work licence scheme in Queensland with additional eligibility criteria, conditions and restrictions.

Discussion point: Exclude all provisional licence holders (regardless of age) from being eligible for a work licence.

Provisional licence holders under the age of 25 are not eligible to apply for a restricted licence but provisional licence holders over the age of 25 are eligible. All provisional licence holders regardless of age are deemed novice drivers, as they have not had the extensive driving experience that has been attained by the holder of an open licence, and represent a higher risk group as their driving skills are underdeveloped when compared to more experienced drivers.

A number of research studies have identified inexperience as a significant contributing factor of novice driver crash involvement ¹³⁹. Inexperience is not an attribute that is exclusive to newly licensed young drivers. Older drivers entering the licensing system for the first time are also regarded as novice drivers, as they too are required to develop basic vehicle operation and cognitive skills (for example, hazard perception). Research ¹⁴⁰ has demonstrated that age and experience have independent effects on crash risk.

Consumption of alcohol by novice drivers, who are still in the process of developing their driving-related skills, can inevitably result in a higher crash risk for these drivers. Investigations on novice driver crash rates in Austria ¹⁴¹, has shown a positive correlation between alcohol consumption and crash rates of novice drivers.

All novice drivers (regardless of age) that have committed a drink driving offence pose a higher risk to the community. Analysis of Queensland data shows that provisional licence holders are 1.24 times more likely to be drink drivers when involved in a serious casualty crash when compared to open licence holders ¹⁴² even after accounting for age and gender. Based on this data there are grounds to exclude all novice and inexperienced drivers, regardless of age, from entry into the restricted licence scheme.

Who does this target?



Potential impacts:

- Work licences may no longer necessarily be regarded as a soft option
- Some convicted drink drivers and their dependents may experience severe financial hardship as they are potentially deprived of a means to earning a living
- May reduce the number of convicted drink drivers eligible to apply for a work licence
- May further deter inexperienced novice drivers (including those aged 25 years and older) from drink driving.

Discussion point: Exclude all drink driving offenders who have been convicted of a drink driving offence ≥ 0.10 from being eligible to apply for a work licence.

Studies show that at 0.10 the relative risk of being involved in a crash is increased by almost five times¹⁴³. Queensland crash data shows that drivers and riders who drive with a higher BAC are significantly represented in severe crashes¹⁴⁴. Further, Queensland crash data highlights that:

- from 2001/02–2007/08 approximately a quarter (22.4 per cent) of drink driving related fatal crashes involved offenders who were significantly over the general alcohol limit with a BAC from 0.10 to 0.149
- from 2001/02–2006/07 approximately a third (28.7 per cent) of drink driving related crashes that resulted in hospitalisation involved offenders who were significantly over the general alcohol limit with a BAC from 0.10 to 0.149¹⁴⁵.

Applying tougher penalties and sanctions to those drink drivers who have higher BACs is justified based on the evidence of crash statistics. Tougher penalties that prevent convicted drink drivers from being able to apply for a work licence if detected with a BAC of 0.10 or more may have some deterrent effect and road safety benefit.

Who does this target?

General
Population

Type
1
Offenders

First time offenders (within a five year period) convicted of an offence where the BAC was ≥ 0.10 and ≤ 0.149 .

Potential impacts:

- Work licences may no longer necessarily be regarded as a soft option
- Some convicted drink drivers and their dependents may experience severe financial hardship as they are potentially deprived of a means to earning a living
- May reduce the number of convicted drink drivers eligible to apply for a work licence
- May enhance licence disqualification as a means of deterring drink drivers with a BAC ≥ 0.10 from committing further drink driving offences.

Discussion point: A requirement to fit an alcohol ignition interlock device prior to being issued with a work licence.

An alcohol ignition interlock is a device that is fitted to a motor vehicle that prevents the vehicle from starting if the driver has been drinking. Participation in an interlock program also reduces further drink driving offences and alcohol related crashes.

The interlock could also be used as a technological device to ensure that the work licence holder is compliant with the restrictions outlined in a court order. For example, a driver may be permitted to drive a vehicle between certain hours of the day, Monday to Friday to travel to work. The interlock can be programmed to these requirements, and would prevent a driver from being able to drive their vehicle outside of those restrictions.

The interlock device would be fitted to the motor vehicle for the duration that a person has the work licence and would be removed at the end of the period.

It should be noted that the general deterrent impact on the wider community of the threat of being required to install and use an interlock is not well known, however, this initiative may provide some deterrent impact on potential drink drivers.

Who does this target?

General
Population

Type
1
Offenders

Potential impacts:

- Work licences may no longer necessarily be regarded as a soft option
- Additional costs shall be incurred for a person to enter into the work licence scheme due to having to install an alcohol ignition interlock device
- A requirement to install an interlock may have implications for other persons who share the use of a motor vehicle with a person who has been issued with a work licence
- Employers may be required to install an interlock in work vehicles for employees that have sought a work licence.

Have your say

Question 13: Do you support retaining work licences in Queensland?

If work licences are retained, would you:

- 13a. support excluding all provisional licence holders (regardless of age) from being eligible for a work licence?
- 13b. support the exclusion of offenders who have been convicted of a drink driving offence of ≥ 0.10 from being eligible to apply for a work license?
- 13c. support a requirement for work licence holders to install an alcohol ignition interlock?

Have your say on page 59.

Immediate licence suspensions

Discussion point: Immediate licence suspension could be extended to drink driving offenders with a BAC of ≥ 0.10 .

Currently a person has their authority to drive on Queensland roads immediately suspended if they are charged with driving a motor vehicle with a blood alcohol content of 0.15 or more and other serious offences. Increases in fatal crash risk have been found to be associated with increases in BAC levels ^{146, 147, 148}. At a BAC of 0.10 a drink driver is almost five times ¹⁴⁹ more likely to crash. Based on crash risk, immediate licence suspension at a lower threshold would provide a swift and certain penalty that will protect the public by restraining offenders that pose a risk, with the potential to prevent a repeat drink driving offence while the immediate suspension is in effect ¹⁵⁰.

An analysis of Queensland crash data highlights that drivers with a BAC of ≥ 0.10 accounted for approximately 80.3 per cent of the total number of drink driving related fatal crashes from 2001/02–2007/08 and 77 per cent of the total number of drink driving related crashes that resulted in hospitalisation from 2001/02–2006/07.

Additional analysis of offence data shows that approximately 46.5 per cent of drink driving offenders had a BAC of at least twice the general alcohol limit; that is a BAC of ≥ 0.10 ¹⁵¹.

Under current legislation, offenders who have been immediately suspended may apply to the court for an order to allow them to continue to drive until their drink driving charge is heard if the immediate licence suspension would cause hardship. This existing arrangement would be retained for eligible offenders if there was a decrease in the BAC threshold for immediate licence suspension to 0.10.

What does the research say?


Research indicates that licence suspension is a very effective strategy for minimising crash risk for offenders in the short term and the application of the suspension as soon as is possible following the offence is the most effective aspect ¹⁵². Applying immediate suspension to a high risk group of offenders (those with a BAC of 0.10 or more) would provide the potential to improve the general and specific deterrent effect of the existing penalties and sanctions while increasing the number of offenders subject to immediate licence suspension.

An evaluation of immediate licence suspension laws for all drink drivers detected over the legal limit in California reported a nine to 13 per cent reduction of alcohol involved crash fatalities and injuries after their implementation ¹⁵³. In Nevada, implementation of immediate licence suspension laws was associated with a 41 per cent reduction in alcohol involved fatalities ¹⁵⁴. As such, there is evidence that immediate licence suspension sanctions are an effective sanction to influence a reduction in drink driving crashes.

Do other jurisdictions have immediate licence suspensions for drink driving offences?

A number of Australian jurisdictions have immediate license suspension laws for a range of traffic offences. Primarily the laws are applied to high-range drink driving offences. In some states, immediate license suspension sanctions also apply to high range speeding offences and dangerous driving charges. Victoria has immediate licence suspension for drink driving offences of 0.10 or above and for second or subsequent offences. In South Australia, an offender receives an immediate loss of licence for six months if their BAC is 0.08–0.149 and immediate loss of licence for 12 months if their BAC is 0.15 or more. New South Wales also has provisions in their legislation to permit police to immediately suspend a person's driver licence for middle or high range drink driving offences ¹⁵⁵.

Who does this target?



Offenders charged with a drink driving offence where the BAC was ≥ 0.10 .

Potential impacts:

- May have a specific deterrence effect on drivers detected with a BAC of 0.10 per cent or above
- Will subject an estimated additional 6 000 drink drivers to immediate licence suspension sanctions per annum
- May remove high risk drink driving offenders from our roads while the suspension is in effect
- May result in more licence holders (who have been immediately suspended) driving unlicensed
- May result in severe and undue hardship suffered by the dependants of convicted drink driving offenders
- May result in increased workload and administrative burden for the QPS and the courts.

Have your say

Question 14: Do you support extending immediate licence suspension to offenders with a BAC of ≥ 0.10 ?

Have your say on page 59.

Drink driving rehabilitation programs

Currently in Queensland there are several drink driving rehabilitation and offender programs available that range from simple educational style formats to programs combining educational/therapeutic treatment. These programs include the Under the Limit program, Attitudinal Driving Workshops, Driving with Care, and the Gold Coast Traffic Offender Program. A further description of these programs is provided in *Part Three*.

Participation in drink driving rehabilitation programs in Queensland can occur either through a person volunteering to enter a program, usually before attending court, or through the discretion of a magistrate who may order an offender to attend a program as part of their sentence. Often this voluntary or court ordered participation will result in reduction of the monetary fine imposed on the offender during sentencing. Several other jurisdictions have moved to introduce mandatory participation in drink driving rehabilitation programs for certain drink drivers. In these jurisdictions the courts are required to order convicted drink drivers to attend a rehabilitation program as part of their sentence.

Drink driving rehabilitation programs are an alternative or additional approach to punitive measures, which aim to prevent reoffending through reforming an individual rather than punishing them¹⁵⁶. The use of rehabilitation to treat drink drivers is an approach that has been used for several decades in a number of Australian and international jurisdictions and is often used in combination with other sanctions such as licence disqualifications and fines.

Rehabilitation programs can take a number of forms depending on the type of drink driver being targeted, the objectives of the treatment, content and style, program length and where the program is delivered¹⁵⁷. Generally rehabilitation programs for drink drivers can be classified as either the provision of education (education based

programs), the therapeutic treatment of alcohol problems (psychotherapy/counselling based programs), or a combination of both ¹⁵⁸.

Educational programs assume that offenders drink and drive because they lack appropriate knowledge to make correct decisions about the combination of their drinking and driving. Therapeutic programs such as counselling and psychotherapies focus more on the participants' drinking behaviour, the role it plays in their life and how they may be able to reduce their alcohol consumption. Combination programs incorporate both educational and therapeutic approaches, often using group work to impart drinking/driving knowledge and individual sessions for therapeutic measures.

There are a number of factors that may contribute to a person's drink driving behaviour such as attitudes or personality traits, family history, alcohol and other drug use, situational circumstances and health disorders (e.g. depression) ¹⁵⁹. As a result, it is important that rehabilitation programs for problem drink drivers are tailored to the needs of the individual to treat underlying issues that are contributing to a person offending. In order to achieve this, an initial screening and/or assessment process should be completed to guide the type, length and intensity of the treatment that a person may require ¹⁶⁰. This will allow programs to vary from simple educational style treatment for social drinkers to more intensive and/or therapeutic programs to treat problem drinkers who represent a much higher risk of reoffending ¹⁶¹.

Research into the effectiveness of mandatory attendance at drink driving rehabilitation programs has shown mixed results. For example some research has found that unmotivated participants coerced into drink driving rehabilitation are resistant to change and are likely to reoffend ¹⁶². Recent studies into court mandated treatment for convicted drink drivers have found that the use of motivational enhancement therapy could potentially be applied to increase the effectiveness of rehabilitation for involuntary participants ¹⁶³. Other academic research into the effectiveness of mandated treatment has shown

that coerced rehabilitation has had positive effects on reducing drink driving in offenders who have received the treatment ¹⁶⁴. The use of mandated treatment has also been shown to be an effective strategy to ensure higher program completion rates ¹⁶⁵.

Discussion point: Mandatory referral to a brief educational intervention for first time offenders with a BAC ≤ 0.149 .

Educational interventions have widely been used as an intervention for first time drink drivers ¹⁶⁶. These programs assume that offenders do not have adequate knowledge to make correct decisions to avoid drink driving and as such aim to provide information on why people drink and drive, the effects of alcohol, consequences of drinking and driving, and how to avoid repeat offences ¹⁶⁷. It is important to note that these brief educational interventions are not intended to be treatment programs designed to address underlying alcohol related problems.

In the health care profession brief intervention style programs play an important part of the overall approach to dealing with risky drinking in Australia ¹⁶⁸. These interventions are usually targeted towards drinkers who have not reached the stage of being classified as having alcohol abuse or dependency problems ¹⁶⁹. It is intended that through the use of these interventions individuals will be provided with advice, encouragement and skills to prevent the development of more serious alcohol related problems ¹⁷⁰.

What does the research say about brief interventions?

Research into the effectiveness of educational programs has shown positive results for this type of treatment ¹⁷¹. For example, studies have found that when education was compared to 'no remediation' on tests of short-item knowledge which relates to information on alcohol consumption and driving, results favoured the use of education ¹⁷². The use of brief interventions in the health care profession as a technique for addressing risky and high alcohol consumption has also shown positive results

in a large body of academic research^{173,174}. Research in this field has also found that brief interventions are more effective than no treatment at all, and are often as effective as more extensive treatment¹⁷⁵.

Brief educational interventions have previously been considered for Queensland. In 2006, the Queensland Parliamentary Travelsafe Committee conducted an inquiry into drink driving. This inquiry canvassed a number of issues relating to rehabilitation of offenders with the outcomes and recommendations released in their report *Getting Tough on Drink Drivers: Report No. 46, October 2006*.

In Queensland a mandatory brief educational style intervention could be used for all first time drink drivers under the high alcohol limit (0.15). This intervention would be a short course (possibly for several hours) that is designed to provide individuals with information and advice on how to break the link between drinking and driving to prevent the occurrence of future drink driving offences. Participation in this program would be in addition to current licence disqualification periods and monetary fines applied to this category of drink drivers in Queensland. Offenders may be required to show evidence of their completion of the brief educational intervention to be eligible to re-enter the licensing system, following their period of disqualification.

Similar to existing alcohol and drug treatment services offered in Queensland¹⁷⁶, these brief interventions could be offered through either government agencies or through non-government private organisations. Programs delivered by non-government or private service providers may be required by law to deliver services according to a specified set of standards. Benefits of using non-government organisations to deliver drink driving assessment and rehabilitation programs include the potential to reduce demand on existing government administered public health services and create further opportunities for community based delivery of services.

To limit the impact on people living in rural/remote areas or those that have employment or family commitments that restrict their ability to attend face-to-face sessions, interventions could utilise technology to enhance their delivery. For example brief interventions in the health setting have previously utilised computer programs and the internet to successfully deliver programs¹⁷⁷. Alternatively participants could be forwarded materials through the post containing DVDs, workbooks, CDs and so on.

Attendance at brief intervention programs will potentially be on a user-pays basis. This may be problematic especially for low-income earners and unemployed individuals who are required to complete this program. To reduce the financial impact on these offenders, magistrates would be able to continue to take into consideration a person's individual circumstances in determining the monetary fine imposed for the drink driving offence. Further investigation of options to make programs affordable for low-income participants would be required prior to the possible introduction of any program.

Do other Australian jurisdictions have brief intervention programs?

All Australian jurisdictions offer drink driving offenders some form of brief intervention and/or rehabilitation program. The types of programs offered vary significantly. For example the target groups may vary, whether or not the programs are mandatory or voluntary, program styles (education/therapeutic) and much more.

Who does this target?

Type
1
Offenders

Potential impacts:

- Potential to provide first time drink drivers with knowledge to avoid further incidents of drink driving
- Failure to comply with a court order and/or the requirements of the program may have an impact on the prevalence of unlicensed driving
- Low-income earners and the unemployed may find it difficult to pay for the brief educational intervention and may drive unlicensed
- Has the potential to reduce drink driving over the longer term, particularly for that proportion of the population that continue to drink and drive despite punishment.

Have your say

Question 15: Do you support a mandatory brief educational intervention for first time offenders with a BAC ≤ 0.149 ?

Have your say on page 59.

Discussion point: Mandatory referral to an accredited assessment and rehabilitation program could be introduced for high level and repeat drink driving offenders.

Research has consistently shown that some repeat drink drivers are unreceptive to the threat and application of legal sanctions (for example, fines and licence disqualifications), suggesting that additional interventions that treat underlying alcohol related problems are required¹⁷⁸. Although there is large variation in the content and objectives of rehabilitation for problem drink drivers, research suggests that programs should allow for the use of both educational and/or therapeutic components to treat drink drivers¹⁷⁹. That is, the provision of knowledge to separate the link between drinking and driving and/or therapy to address a person's underlying alcohol related problems.

What does the research say about rehabilitation programs?

There is a growing body of academic research showing that rehabilitation programs are effective in reducing drink driving reoffending, especially when focussed on repeat drink drivers¹⁸⁰. Research also notes that the most effective rehabilitation programs occur as part of a mix of drink driving interventions such as disqualification periods and vehicle restrictions (including alcohol ignition interlocks)¹⁸¹. Evaluations of Queensland's Under the Limit (UTL) rehabilitation program (see *Part Three* for more details on UTL) have shown positive results in reducing repeat drink driving. For example, one evaluation found reoffence rates of drink drivers who completed the program were 15 per cent lower compared to a matched sample and 55 per cent lower for repeat offenders with a BAC above 0.15¹⁸².

As a result of these positive research outcomes, the use of rehabilitation for drink drivers could be extended as a mandatory requirement for all Type Two offenders. These programs would move beyond the basic educational information provided in drink driving brief interventions as they would provide

a more in-depth approach to treating problem offenders. Offenders would be ordered to complete a drink driving assessment for the purposes of determining the type of rehabilitative treatment that they may require. This assessment would then determine the type, length and intensity of rehabilitation that an offender would mandatorily be required to complete.

Similar to existing alcohol and drug treatment services offered in Queensland¹⁸³, mandatory rehabilitation could be offered through either government agencies or through non-government private organisations. Programs delivered by non-government service providers may be required by law to deliver treatment according to a specified set of standards. Benefits of using non-government organisations to deliver drink driving assessment and rehabilitation programs include the potential to reduce demand on existing government administered public health services and create further opportunities for community based delivery of services.

Introducing mandatory rehabilitation for problem drink drivers may result in some access and equity issues for people living in rural/remote areas or those that have employment or family commitments that restrict their ability to attend sessions. This issue may be further compounded where a disqualified drink driver does not have access to alternative transport options. The current UTL program attempts to address these issues through the use of distance education provided through the Open Learning Institute of TAFE. Similar approaches could be adopted for any new mandatory assessment and rehabilitation programs developed where participants could utilise a range of resources such as DVDs, CDs, videos, computer programs and internet technology, such as virtual classrooms and internet forums, to complete the treatment.

Attendance at these programs will potentially be on a user-pays basis. The cost may vary depending on the intensity and length of rehabilitation required by the individual. Currently drink drivers participating in the UTL program may have their fine reduced, however they are still required to pay the program fees in full (currently \$750) prior to commencement of the program.

Do other Australian jurisdictions have rehabilitation programs?

All Australian jurisdictions offer drink driving offenders some form of brief intervention and/or rehabilitation program. The types of programs offered vary significantly. For example the target groups may vary, whether or not the programs are mandatory or voluntary, program styles (education/therapeutic) and much more.

Who does this target?



Potential impacts:

- Low-income earners and the unemployed may find it difficult to pay for the rehabilitation program
- Failure to comply with a court order and/or the requirements of the program may have an impact on the prevalence of unlicensed driving
- Has the potential to reduce drink driving over the longer term, particularly for that proportion of the population that continue to drink and drive despite punishment and incapacitation
- May have other positive health benefits including reduced levels and/or dependence on alcohol for certain drivers.

Have your say

Question 16: Do you support the introduction of mandatory referral to an accredited assessment and rehabilitation program for high level and repeat drink driving offenders?

Have your say on page 60.

Vehicle impoundment

Vehicle impoundment temporarily denies an offender the use of a vehicle. The vehicle is stored at a holding facility and, following a specified period, it is returned to its owner. Vehicle forfeiture entails the permanent surrender of the vehicle to the state.

The primary aim of vehicle impoundment and forfeiture is to physically separate the offender from their vehicle thereby reducing the risk that they will continue to endanger themselves or other road users. Those subject to vehicle impoundment are also deterred from further offending due to the financial cost and inconvenience associated with the loss of the vehicle including restrictions on mobility.

In Queensland, vehicle impoundment and forfeiture were introduced in 2002 for 'hoon' behaviour and extended to an array of additional repeat offences (Type Two vehicle related offences) in 2007 including some drink driving related offences such as drink driving over the high alcohol limit (BAC ≥ 0.15); failing to provide a sample of blood/breath for analysis or driving whilst under a 24 hour suspension; and, driving while disqualified or unlicensed.

Vehicle impoundment is graduated which means it increases in severity with each offence:

- For first offences (called the 'zero' offence), no action is taken against the vehicle but existing sanctions (for example, immediate licence suspension for drink driving over the high alcohol limit) and court imposed penalties apply

- A second offence of the same kind in the following three years (referred to as the first repeat offence), may result in the vehicle being impounded immediately by a police officer for a 48 hour period
- Following a third offence of the same kind in a three year period (referred to as the second repeat offence), a police officer may immediately impound the vehicle for 48 hours and also apply to a magistrate to impound the vehicle for up to three months
- For further repeat offences, the vehicle may be immediately impounded for 48 hours in addition to an application to a magistrate for forfeiture of the vehicle.

The driver is responsible for costs associated with the towing and initial impoundment of the vehicle for 48 hours and the owner (even if they are not the driver) is liable for all costs associated with the storage of the vehicle beyond the initial impoundment period. Advice from the QPS is that most tows are charged at the *Tow Truck Regulation 1999* fee of \$263.65. Storage fees are up to as much as \$44 per day for three month impoundments or if owners are unable to collect the vehicle immediately after the impounding period ends. If the motor vehicle is stolen or rented, the vehicle must be released to the owner as soon as possible.

The QPS has undertaken a review to evaluate the implementation of vehicle impoundment for Type Two vehicle related offences. This review primarily examined the legislation, policy and procedures associated with impoundment in order to inform the ongoing operation of the program. Government consideration of potential changes to the use of vehicle impoundment as a sanction would take into account the outcomes of this review.

What does the research say?

Research from North America^{184,185,186,187,188}, demonstrates that vehicle impoundment and forfeiture reduces further drink driving offences, total traffic convictions and crashes both while access to the vehicle is denied and, to a lesser extent, following the return of the vehicle to its owner. However, this research has only studied programs where the vehicle was impounded for a period of

at least 28 days. Programs where vehicles are impounded for a shorter period have not been studied.

Do other jurisdictions have vehicle impoundment?

Vehicle impoundment and/or forfeiture legislation has been introduced in all Australian states and territories, primarily as a sanction against hoon behaviour. Few Australian jurisdictions currently have vehicle impoundment and forfeiture programs that specifically target drink drivers. South Australia currently impounds the vehicles of drink drivers and Victoria announced in June 2009 that it will extend vehicle impoundment to repeat drink drivers¹⁸⁹.

Discussion point: Vehicles could be initially impounded for longer than 48 hours.

In Queensland, vehicles are initially impounded by police for a period of 48 hours. The impoundment period is generally much longer in other jurisdictions. Most places in the United States of America and Canada that impound vehicles can do so for at least 28 days for a first eligible offence¹⁹⁰. Depending on the offence, vehicles in some places can be impounded immediately for up to six months.

How does Queensland compare to other Australian jurisdictions?

Some states in Australia have longer initial impoundment periods for a range of eligible offences. For example, in Western Australia, those caught driving after they have lost their licence have the vehicle they are driving immediately impounded by police for 28 days. Western Australia has also introduced a 28 day impoundment period for a first hoon offence. South Australia will also extend the initial impoundment period in that state so that vehicles will be able to be impounded for up to 28 days for a first offence. Tasmanian police have the authority to clamp or confiscate vehicles for 28 days for a first hoon offence or an attempt to evade police. In contrast, Victoria has a 48 hour initial impoundment period.

Who does this target?

Type 2 Offenders

Repeat offenders (within a three year period), that is, a person convicted of two or more drink driving offences of any kind (refer to next discussion point).

Repeat high level offenders (within a three year period), that is, a person convicted of two or more high level offences (including an offence ≥ 0.15 , driving under the influence or fail to supply specimen).

Potential impacts:

- Longer periods of impoundment have a proven road safety benefit
- Longer impoundment periods would be likely to have a greater impact on the offender's and offender's family's mobility and access to employment, education, medical care and other essential activities
- Longer impoundment periods would increase the cost to the drink driver/owner as storage fees are generally based on a daily fee. As a result, more vehicles are likely to remain unclaimed when the impoundment period ends, especially vehicles that are of low value.

Have your say

Question 17: Do you support increasing the initial impoundment period (currently 48 hours)?

Question 17a: Do you support increasing the initial impoundment period to seven days?

Question 17b: Do you support increasing the initial impoundment period to 28 days?

Have your say on page 60.

Discussion point: Vehicle impoundment and forfeiture could be extended to any repeat drink driving offence.

Vehicle impoundment in Queensland is currently reserved for certain drink driving offences, particularly serious offences such as repeatedly drink driving when the driver is over the high alcohol limit (≥ 0.15). Drink drivers who offend at BAC levels below the high alcohol limit currently receive fines and licence disqualifications. However, these actions are not deterring a significant proportion of drink drivers from offending again. Over a quarter (26.9 per cent) of offenders in the 2007/08 financial year had one or more drink driving offences in the previous five years¹⁹¹. Extending vehicle impoundment to repeat drink driving offences at any BAC level may assist in conveying the seriousness of repeatedly drink driving, whatever the BAC level.

How does Queensland compare to other Australian jurisdictions?

South Australian police are able to impound a vehicle for any drink driving offence. Victoria announced in 2009 that it will extend its program to target repeat drink drivers¹⁹².

Who does this target?

Type 2
Offenders

Repeat offenders (within a three year period), that is, a person convicted of two or more drink driving offences of any kind.

Potential impacts:

- More drink drivers would have the vehicle they are driving impounded which would be expected to improve road safety by reducing further drink driving offences and alcohol related crashes
- Vehicle impoundment would apply to a greater number of offenders and affect the offender's family's mobility and access to employment, education, medical care and other essential activities
- More vehicles would be impounded so the administrative and operational workload of the police and the courts would be increased.

Have your say

Question 18: Do you support impounding the vehicle of drink drivers who commit two or more drink driving offences of any kind? For example, should drivers who commit one offence at 0.093 BAC and one offence at 0.072 BAC have their vehicle impounded?

Have your say on page 60.

Discussion point: The time period used to determine a second or subsequent offence, for the purposes of vehicle impoundment or forfeiture, could be extended from three years to five years.

Currently, in order for a vehicle to be impounded or forfeited, a person must have committed other offences of the same kind within the previous three years. The action taken against the vehicle (for example, whether the vehicle is impounded or forfeited) also depends on the number of offences in the previous three years.

Other drink driving penalties and sanctions in Queensland, for example, for the purposes of fines or licence disqualification consider the offences that have been committed by the person in the previous five years. Considering the offender's drink driving history over the previous five years, rather than three years, would make vehicle impoundment consistent with these other drink driving penalties and sanctions.

Have your say

Question 19: Do you support extending the time period for counting previous offences for impoundment and forfeiture from three years to five years?

Have your say on page 60.

Who does this target?



Repeat offenders (within a five year period), that is, a person convicted of two or more drink driving offences of any kind (refer to previous discussion point).

Repeat high level offenders (within a five year period), that is, a person convicted of two or more high level offences (including an offence ≥ 0.15 , driving under the influence or fail to supply specimen).

Potential impacts:

- Would make vehicle impoundment consistent with other drink driving penalties and sanctions in the time frame it employs for considering previous drink driving offences
- More drink drivers would have the vehicle they are driving impounded which would be expected to improve road safety by reducing further drink driving offences and alcohol related crashes
- More vehicles would be impounded so the administrative and operational workload of the police and the courts would be increased.

Part Six

Next Steps

The feedback received through the on-line survey, written submissions and other community consultation activities will be compiled into a report which will summarise the views expressed by the community on various options to address drink driving.

The Department of Transport and Main Roads will publish the results of the consultation on its website. Members of the community will be able to access this information by visiting www.tmr.qld.gov.au.

The views of the community gathered through the consultation process will be used to inform the Queensland Government's future direction in addressing drink driving and reduce the number of crashes, injuries and fatalities caused by drink drivers on Queensland's roads.

Part Seven

Community feedback form

We would appreciate your feedback and comments on the discussion points raised throughout this paper. For each statement below please indicate your level of support by circling the appropriate number:

1 – Strongly oppose

2 – Oppose

3 – Neutral

4 – Support

5 – Strongly support

After each statement please write any additional comments you may have. If you need more space please use the back of the comment sheet. After completing the feedback sheet detach and return to:

Drink Driving Review Team
Department of Transport and Main Roads
PO Box 673 Fortitude Valley Qld 4006
Fax: (07) 3253 4960

Alternatively you may access this form electronically on the Get Involved website www.getinvolved.qld.gov.au

		Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
1	Do you support extending the maximum time allowed to obtain a breath/blood specimen for drink driving offences from two to three hours?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
2	Do you support the arresting/detaining officer also being allowed to conduct the breath analysis for drink driving offences?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
3	Do you support all driver licence holders being required to carry their licence while driving and to produce their licence for inspection to a police officer, unless the person has a 'reasonable excuse'?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
4	Do you support the introduction of compulsory blood testing of drivers who attend hospital for examination or treatment as a result of a motor vehicle crash?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
5	Do you support a review of the general alcohol limit?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
5a	What are your comments, concerns and ideas about lowering the general alcohol limit?					

		Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
6	Would you support the Queensland Government developing and providing guidelines and principles to support community groups to develop designated driver programs?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
7	Do you support the Queensland Government promoting the use of designated driver programs?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
8	Do you support the development of a guideline for community groups to assist them to develop, provide and sustain alternative transport options?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
9	Do you have any other ideas for alternative transport options that could assist your community?					
10	Would you support the Queensland Government researching and developing a guideline to assist community groups and liquor accords to promote the anti drink driving message?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
11	Do you support responsible service of alcohol training curriculum and standards including appropriate educational content on drink driving?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						

	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
12 Do you support abolishing work licences in Queensland?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>					
13 Do you support retaining work licences in Queensland?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>					
<i>If work licences are retained, they could be strengthened with tougher eligibility criteria or conditions. Please provide your level of support to:</i>					
13a Excluding all provisional licence holders (regardless of age) from being eligible for a work licence.	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>					
13b Excluding offenders who have been convicted of a drink driving offence with a BAC of ≥ 0.10 from being eligible to apply for a work licence.	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>					
13c A requirement for work licence holders to install an alcohol ignition interlock.	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>					
14 Do you support extending immediate licence suspension to offenders with a BAC of ≥ 0.10 ?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>					
15 Do you support the introduction of a mandatory brief educational intervention for first time offenders with a BAC ≤ 0.149 ?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>					

		Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Neutral	Support	Strongly Support
16	Do you support the introduction of mandatory referral to an accredited assessment and rehabilitation program for high level and repeat drink driving offenders?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
17	Do you support extending the initial impoundment period (currently 48 hours)?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
17a	Do you support increasing the initial impoundment period to seven days?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
17b	Do you support increasing the initial impoundment period to 28 days?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
18	Do you support impounding the vehicle of drink drivers who commit two or more drink driving offences of any kind? For example, should drivers who commit one offence at 0.093 BAC and one offence at 0.072 BAC (within a three year period) have their vehicles impounded?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						
19	Do you support extending the time period for counting previous offences for impoundment and forfeiture from three years to five years?	1	2	3	4	5
<i>Comments:</i>						



References

1. In the 12 month period ending on 30 June 2008, there has been a 25.5 per cent increase in the number of drink driving offences as compared to the 12 month period ending on 30 June 2002. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
2. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in November 2009.
3. Drivers or riders aged 16 years and over with an illegal breath/blood alcohol concentration where the licence type was known. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in November 2009.
4. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in November 2009.
5. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in November 2009.
6. Watson, B, Fraine, G & Mitchell, L (1994) Enhancing the effectiveness of RBT in Queensland. *Centre for Crime Policy and Public Safety. Alcohol Related Road Crashes Conference: Social and legal approaches*. Conference Proceedings.
7. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in November 2009.
8. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in November 2009.
9. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Drink driving/riding serious crashes in Queensland: increased risk associated with unlicensed driving and those with drink driving and unlicensed driving offense histories, Unpublished.
10. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Drink driving/riding serious crashes in Queensland: increased risk associated with unlicensed driving and those with drink driving and unlicensed driving offense histories, Unpublished.
11. Ferrante, A, Rosman, D & Marom, Y (2001) Novice drink drivers, recidivism and crash involvement. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*; 33(2):221-7.
12. Ferguson, M, Schonfeld, C & Sheehan, M (1999) Drink driving offenders in a rural community. Canberra: Australian Transport Safety Bureau. Report No.: CR183.
13. Leal, N, King, M & Lewis, I (2008) Profiling drink driving offenders in Queensland. 2008. *Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety*, 19(2):47-54.
14. MacDonald, S & Dooley, S (1993) A case-control study of driving-while-impaired offenders. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*; 33(1):61-71.
15. Homel, R (1988) Policing and punishing the drinking driver: A study of specific and general deterrence. New York: Springer-Verlag.
16. Leal, N, King, M & Lewis, I (2008) Profiling drink driving offenders in Queensland. 2008. *Journal of the Australasian College of Road Safety*, 19(2):47-54.
17. Watson, B & Steinhardt, D (2006) A comparison of the crash involvement of unlicensed motorcycle riders and unlicensed drivers in Queensland, 2006, Australasian Road Safety, Research Policing & Education – Conference. Brisbane: Queensland Transport.
18. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
19. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Licensing data extracted from the EASI database in November 2009.
20. Queensland Police Service, State Traffic Support Branch, RBT data provided from the Traffic Returns and Complaints System (TRACS) in March 2009.
21. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
22. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
23. National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre (publication date unknown) *Fact Sheet – Alcohol and Driving*. University of New South Wales: Sydney. Accessed 17 February 2009. [http://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au?NDARCWeb.nsf/resources/NDARCFact_Drugs5/\\$file/ALCOHOL+AND+DRIVING.pdf](http://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au?NDARCWeb.nsf/resources/NDARCFact_Drugs5/$file/ALCOHOL+AND+DRIVING.pdf).
24. National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre (publication date unknown) *Fact Sheet – Alcohol and Driving*. University of New South Wales: Sydney. Accessed 17 February 2009. [http://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au?NDARCWeb.nsf/resources/NDARCFact_Drugs5/\\$file/ALCOHOL+AND+DRIVING.pdf](http://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au?NDARCWeb.nsf/resources/NDARCFact_Drugs5/$file/ALCOHOL+AND+DRIVING.pdf).
25. National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre (publication date unknown) *Fact Sheet – Alcohol and Driving*. University of New South Wales: Sydney. Accessed 17 February 2009. [http://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au/NDARCWeb.nsf/resources/NDARCFact_Drugs5/\\$file/ALCOHOL+AND+DRIVING.pdf](http://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au/NDARCWeb.nsf/resources/NDARCFact_Drugs5/$file/ALCOHOL+AND+DRIVING.pdf).
26. National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre (publication date unknown) *Fact Sheet – Alcohol and Driving*. University of New South Wales: Sydney. Accessed 17 February 2009. [http://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au?NDARCWeb.nsf/resources/NDARCFact_Drugs5/\\$file/ALCOHOL+AND+DRIVING.pdf](http://ndarc.med.unsw.edu.au?NDARCWeb.nsf/resources/NDARCFact_Drugs5/$file/ALCOHOL+AND+DRIVING.pdf).
27. National Health & Medical Research Council (2001) *Australian Alcohol Guidelines: Health Risks and Benefits*, Published by Commonwealth of Australia.
28. Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy (2006) *National Alcohol Strategy 2006–2009: Towards Safer Drinking Cultures*. Commonwealth of Australia: Barton ACT. Accessed 24 September 2009. [http://www.alcohol.gov.au/internet/alcohol/publishing.nsf/Content/B83AD1F91AA632ADCA25718E0081F1C3/\\$File/nas-06-09.pdf](http://www.alcohol.gov.au/internet/alcohol/publishing.nsf/Content/B83AD1F91AA632ADCA25718E0081F1C3/$File/nas-06-09.pdf).
29. Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy (2006) *National Alcohol Strategy 2006–2009: Towards Safer Drinking Cultures*. Commonwealth of Australia: Barton ACT. Accessed 24 September 2009. [http://www.alcohol.gov.au/internet/alcohol/publishing.nsf/Content/B83AD1F91AA632ADCA25718E0081F1C3/\\$File/nas-06-09.pdf](http://www.alcohol.gov.au/internet/alcohol/publishing.nsf/Content/B83AD1F91AA632ADCA25718E0081F1C3/$File/nas-06-09.pdf).
30. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2005) 2004 *National Drug Strategy Household Survey: First Results. Drugs Statistics Series 13*, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare, Canberra.
31. Queensland Health (2008) *The Health of Queenslanders 2008: Prevention of Chronic Disease. Second Report of the Chief Health Officer Queensland*. Queensland Health: Brisbane.
32. Queensland Health (2008) *The Health of Queenslanders 2008: Prevention of Chronic Disease. Second Report of the Chief Health Officer Queensland*. Queensland Health: Brisbane.
33. Moskowitz, H (1999) *Driving under the influence, in Prevention and Societal Impact of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* (Ed Ammerman, RT, Ott, PJ and Tarter, RE). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, New Jersey, 109–123.
34. Preusser, DF (2002) BAC and fatal crash risk, in *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety*, 4–9 August, Montreal, Canada.

35. Traffic Safety Centre (2003) *A history of the science and law behind DUI*, Traffic Safety Centre Online Newsletter, 1(3) <http://www.tsc.berkeley.edu/html/newsletter/Summer03/DUIHistory.pdf>.
36. Moskowitz and Robinson (1988) cited in Moskowitz, H & Fiorentino, D (2000) *A review of literature on the effects of low doses of alcohol on driving related skills*, DOT HS 809 028. United States Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Washington DC.
37. Moskowitz, H & Fiorentino, D (2000) *A review of literature on the effects of low doses of alcohol on driving related skills*, DOT HS 809 028. United States Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Washington DC.
38. Borkenstein, Crowther, Shumate, Zeil & Zylman (1964) Cited in Shinar, D (2007) *Traffic safety and human behaviour*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier. *The role of the drinking driver in traffic accidents*. Bloomington, IN: Department of Police Administration, Indiana University.
39. Compton, RP, Blomberg, RD, Moskowitz, H, Burns, M, Peck, RC & Fiorentino, D (2002) Crash risk of alcohol impaired driving. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS*, Montreal.
40. Compton, RP, Blomberg, RD, Moskowitz, H, Burns, M, Peck, RC & Fiorentino, D (2002) Crash risk of alcohol impaired driving. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS*, Montreal.
41. Compton, RP, Blomberg, RD, Moskowitz, H, Burns, M, Peck, RC & Fiorentino, D (2002) Crash risk of alcohol impaired driving. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS*, Montreal.
42. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/International Transport Forum (ITF) (2008) *Towards zero: ambitious road safety targets and the safe system approach*. Paris: OECD/ITF.
43. Shinar, D (2007) *Traffic safety and human behaviour*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
44. Parmet, W (2009) *Populations, public health and the law*. Georgetown University Press, Washington.
45. Sweedler, BM & Stewart, K (2000) Vehicle sanctions: an effective means to reduce impaired driving. *The International Council on Alcohol, Drugs, and Traffic Safety ICADTS 2000*.
46. Freeman, J & Watson, B (2009) Drink driving deterrents and self-reported offending behaviours among a sample of Queensland motorists. *Journal of Safety Research* 40:113–120.
47. Homel, RJ (1988) *Policing and punishing the drink driver: A study of specific and general deterrence*. New York; Springer-Verlag.
48. Office of Economic and Statistical Research (2009) *Information brief: Australian demographic statistics, June quarter 2009*. Retrieved on January 12, 2010 from <http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/queensland-by-theme/demography/briefs/aust-demographic-stats/aust-demographic-stats-200906.pdf>.
49. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2007) *National drug strategy household survey. State and territory supplement*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare; 2008. AIHW Cat. no PHE 102.
50. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2007) *National drug strategy household survey. State and territory supplement*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Health and Welfare; 2008. AIHW Cat. no PHE 102.
51. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2005) cited in Queensland Government (2006) *Queensland drug strategy 2006–2010*. Queensland Government: Brisbane.
52. Queensland Health (2006) cited in Queensland Government (2006) *Queensland drug strategy 2006–2010*. Queensland Government: Brisbane.
53. Queensland Health (2004) *Health determinants Queensland 2004*. Queensland Government, Brisbane.
54. Queensland Transport (2010) *Queensland current drivers' licenses as at 31 December 2009*, EASI Database, Department of Transport and Main Roads.
55. Department of Transport and Main Roads, Marketing and Communications Research (2009) *Queensland Transport RSPAT survey 2009*. Market and Communications Research: Brisbane.
56. Queensland Police Service, State Traffic Support Branch, RBT data provided from the Traffic Returns and Complaints System (TRACS) in March 2009.
57. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
58. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
59. Office of Economic and Statistical Research (2008) *Information brief: Australian demographic statistics, June quarter 2008*. Retrieved on January 20, 2010 from <http://www.oesr.qld.gov.au/queensland-by-theme/demography/briefs/aust-demographic-stats/aust-demographic-stats-200906.pdf>.
60. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
61. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
62. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
63. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
64. Compton, RP, Blomberg, RD, Moskowitz, H, Burns, M, Peck, RC & Fiorentino, D (2002) Crash risk of alcohol impaired driving. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS*, Montreal.
65. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
66. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
67. Department of Transport and Main Roads (2009) *Unpublished. Drink driving/riding serious crashes in Queensland; increased risk associated with unlicensed driving and those with drink driving and unlicensed driving offence histories, Unpublished*.

68. Shaffer, Nelson, LaPlante, LaBrie, Albanese & Caro (2007) Cited in Lenton, S, Fetherston, J & Cercarelli, R (2009) Recidivist drink drivers' self-reported reasons for driving whilst unlicensed – A qualitative analysis. *Accident Analysis and Prevention* 2009.
69. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
70. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
71. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Key drink driving offender statistics. Based on offence data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' registration and licensing database (TRAILS) on 17 March 2009.
72. Watson, B, Fraine, G and Mitchell, L (1994) *Enhancing the Effectiveness of RBT in Queensland*, paper prepared for the Prevention of Alcohol Related Road Crashes: Social and Legal Approaches Conference, Griffith University, Brisbane, 20 August.
73. Department of Transport and Main Roads (2009), *Queensland road safety tracking research report, May 2009 (WAVE 17)*, Prepared by MCR.
74. Watson, BC & Nielson, AL (2008) An evaluation of the 'Skipper' designated driver program: Preliminary results. In *Proceedings of High risk road users – Motivating behaviour change: what works and what doesn't work? National Conference of the Australasian College of Road Safety and the Travelsafe Committee of the Queensland Parliament*. Brisbane, 18–19 September 2008. Accessed 5 May 2009.
75. Watson, B, Fraine, G & Mitchell, L (1994) *Enhancing the effectiveness of RBT in Queensland*. Centre for Crime Policy and Public Safety.
76. Watson, B, Fraine, G & Mitchell, L (1994) *Enhancing the effectiveness of RBT in Queensland*. Centre for Crime Policy and Public Safety.
77. Part 4 of the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*.
78. Part 5, Division 2 of the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*.
79. Part 5, Division 1 of the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*.
80. Part 6 of the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*.
81. Part 8 of the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*.
82. Part 9 of the *Penalties and Sentences Act 1992*.
83. Robertson, RD, Holmes, E & Vanlaar, WGM (2009) *Alcohol interlocks in Canada: From Research to Practice*. The Traffic Injury Research Foundation: Ottawa, Canada.
84. Coben, JH & Larkin, GL (1999) Effectiveness of ignition interlock devices in reducing drunk driving recidivism, *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 16, pp. 81–87.
85. Bierness, DJ & Marques, PR (2004) Alcohol ignition interlock programs. *Traffic Injury Prevention*, 5, pp. 299–308.
86. Willis, C, Lybrand, S & Bellamy, N (2004) Alcohol ignition interlock programmes for reducing drink driving recidivism (Review). *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2004, Issue 3.
87. Guide to Community Preventive Services (2007) Reducing alcohol-impaired driving: ignition interlocks. Retrieved July 2 2009 from www.thecommunityguide.org/mvoi/AID/ignitioninterlocks.html.
88. Clayton, A & Beirness, D (2008) *A review of international evidence on the use of alcohol ignition interlocks in drink-drive offences*. Road Safety Research Report 89. Department for Transport: London.
89. Guide to Community Preventive Services (2007) Reducing alcohol-impaired driving: ignition interlocks. Retrieved July 2 2009 from www.thecommunityguide.org/mvoi/AID/ignitioninterlocks.html. Note: This is a summary of findings from the latest systematic review of alcohol ignition interlocks performed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in the United States (in press).
90. Coben, JH & Larkin, GL (1999) Effectiveness of ignition interlock devices in reducing drunk driving recidivism, *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 16, pp. 81–87.
91. Bierness, DJ & Marques, PR (2004) Alcohol ignition interlock programs. *Traffic Injury Prevention*, 5, pp. 299–308.
92. Willis, C, Lybrand, S & Bellamy, N (2004) Alcohol ignition interlock programmes for reducing drink driving recidivism (Review). *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2004, Issue 3.
93. Marques, P, Voas, B, Tippetts, S, Blackman, K, Timken, D & Field, C (2007) Motivational intervention keyed to interlock use reduces the rate of positive BAC tests and reduces other risk indicators. *Proceedings from the 8th Annual International Ignition Interlock Symposium*. Seattle, Washington. Retrieved July 10 2009 from http://www.interlocksymposium.com/site/ywd_acs_corporation/assets/pdf/27_1040_Marques_Motivational_Intervention_Keyed_to_Interlock-1.pdf.
94. Beirness, DJ, Clayton, A & Vanlaar, W (2008) *An investigation of the usefulness, the acceptability and impact on lifestyle of alcohol ignition interlocks in drink-driving offenders*. Department for Transport: London.
95. Sheehan, M,C, Schonfeld, C, Watson, B,C, King, M,J, Siskind, V & Freeman, JE (2006) *Implementation of a trial of alcohol ignition interlocks in Queensland. Final report*. CARRS-Q, QUT, Brisbane.
96. Delaney, Diamantopoulou & Cameron (2006) *Strategic principles of drink driving enforcement*. Monash University Accident Research Centre. Report No.249.
97. Watson, BC (1998) The effectiveness of drink driving licence actions, remedial programs, and vehicle-based sanctions. In *Proceedings 19th ARRB Research Conference*.
98. Homel, R (1994) Drink driving law enforcement and the legal blood alcohol limit in New South Wales. *Accident, Analysis and Prevention*. 26, pp.147 – 155.
99. Queensland Police Service (2009) *Queensland Police Service Annual Report, 2008–09* Queensland Government.
100. Homel, Carseldine and Kearns (1988) cited in Homel, R (1994) Drink driving law enforcement and the legal blood alcohol limit in New South Wales. *Accident, Analysis and Prevention*. 26, pp.147 – 155.
101. Watson, B (2004) The crash risk of disqualified/suspended and other unlicensed drivers. Oliver, Williams & Clayton (EDS), *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety (T2004)*, Glasgow: International Council on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety (ICADTS).
102. Watson, B (2004) *The psychological characteristics and on-road behaviour of unlicensed drivers*. Queensland University of Technology.
103. Watson, B (2002) A survey of unlicensed driving offenders. *2002 Road Safety Research, Policing and Education Conference Proceedings (pp.181–190)*. Adelaide: Transport SA.

104. Department of Transport and Main Roads (2009) Drink driving/riding serious crashes in Queensland; increased risk associated with unlicensed driving and those with drink-driving and unlicensed driving offence histories.
105. Department of Transport and Main Roads (2009) Drink driving/riding serious crashes in Queensland; increased risk associated with unlicensed driving and those with drink-driving and unlicensed driving offence histories.
106. Parliamentary Travelsafe Committee (1997) *Report No. 22 Compulsory BAC Testing – Inquiry into whether blood alcohol content (BAC) testing of people who attend a hospital for examination or treatment as a result of a motor vehicle accident should be compulsory.*
107. Parliamentary Travelsafe Committee (1997) *Report No. 22 Compulsory BAC Testing – Inquiry into whether blood alcohol content (BAC) testing of people who attend a hospital for examination or treatment as a result of a motor vehicle accident should be compulsory.*
108. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in January–March 2009.
109. Queensland Health (2009) Quarterly public hospitals performance report: September quarter 2009. Retrieved on 20 January 2010 from <http://www.health.qld.gov.au/performance/docs/QHQPHPR.pdf>.
110. Wundersitz, LN & Woolley, JE (2008) *Best practice review of drink driving enforcement in South Australia.* Centre for Automotive Safety Research. CASR Report Series. August. CASR036.
111. International Centre for Alcohol Policies (2010) – Blood Alcohol Concentration Limits Retrieved 19 January 2010 from <http://www.icap.org/PolicyTools/ICAPBlueBook/BlueBookModules/16BloodAlcoholConcentrationLimits/tabid/176/Default.aspx#2>.
112. Compton, RP, Blomberg, RD, Moskowitz, H, Burns, M, Peck, RC & Fiorentino, D (2002) Crash risk of alcohol impaired driving. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS*, Montreal.
113. Compton, RP, Blomberg, RD, Moskowitz, H, Burns, M, Peck, RC & Fiorentino, D (2002) Crash risk of alcohol impaired driving. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS*, Montreal.
114. Wundersitz, LN & Woolley, JE (2008) *Best practice review of drink driving enforcement in South Australia.* Centre for Automotive Safety Research. CASR Report Series. August. CASR036.
115. Moskowitz, H & Fiorentino, D (2000) *A review of the literature on the effects of low doses of alcohol on driving-related skills*, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Report DOT HS 809 028.
116. Moskowitz, H & Fiorentino, D (2000) *A review of the literature on the effects of low doses of alcohol on driving-related skills*, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration Report DOT HS 809 028.
117. Bernhoft, IM & Behrendorf, I (2003) Effect of lowering the alcohol limit in Denmark. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 35(4) pp.515–25.
118. Norström & Laurell (1997) cited in Fell, JC & Voss, RB (2006) The effectiveness of reducing illegal blood alcohol concentration (BAC) limits for driving: evidence for lowering the limit to 0.05 BAC, *Journal of Safety Research* 37 233–243.
119. Norström & Laurell (1997) cited in Fell, JC & Voss, RB (2006) The effectiveness of reducing illegal blood alcohol concentration (BAC) limits for driving: evidence for lowering the limit to 0.05 BAC, *Journal of Safety Research* 37 233–243.
120. European Road Safety Observatory (2006) *Alcohol*, retrieved January 25, 2007 from www.erso.eu.
121. Henstridge, J, Homel, R & Mackay, P (1997) *The long term effects of random breath testing in four Australian states: a time series analysis.* Federal Office of Road Safety (ATSB): Canberra.
122. Smith, DI (1986) Effect of low prescribed blood alcohol levels (BACs) on traffic accidents among newly-licensed drivers. *Medical Science and the Law* 26, 144–148.
123. Ditter, SM, Elder, RW, Shults, RA, Sleet, DA, Compton, R & Nichols, JL (2005) Effectiveness of designated driver programs for reducing alcohol-impaired driving: A systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 28(5), 280–287.
124. Ditter, SM, Elder, RW, Shults, RA, Sleet, DA, Compton, R & Nichols, JL (2005) Effectiveness of designated driver programs for reducing alcohol-impaired driving: A systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 28(5), 280–287.
125. Watson, BC and Nielson, AL (2008) An evaluation of the 'Skipper' designated driver program: Preliminary results. In *Proceedings of High risk road users – Motivating behaviour change: what works and what doesn't work? National Conference of the Australasian College of Road Safety and the Travelsafe Committee of the Queensland Parliament.* Brisbane, 18–19 September 2008. Accessed 5 May 2009. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/15405/> www.carrsq.qut.edu.au.
126. Ditter, SM, Elder, RW, Shults, RA, Sleet, DA, Compton, R, and Nichols, JL (2005) Effectiveness of designated driver programs for reducing alcohol-impaired driving: A systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 28(5), 280–287.
127. Ditter, SM, Elder, RW, Shults, RA, Sleet, DA, Compton, R, and Nichols, JL (2005) Effectiveness of designated driver programs for reducing alcohol-impaired driving: A systematic review. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 28(5), 280–287.
128. Watson, BC & Nielson, AL (2008) An evaluation of the 'Skipper' designated driver program: Preliminary results. In *Proceedings of High risk road users – Motivating behaviour change: what works and what doesn't work? National Conference of the Australasian College of Road Safety and the Travelsafe Committee of the Queensland Parliament.* Brisbane, 18–19 September 2008. Accessed 5 May 2009.
129. Department of Health and Human Services, Public Health Service, Office of the Surgeon General (1988) *Surgeon general's workshop on drunk driving background papers*; Washington, DC, United States of America.
130. Stewart, L & Conway, K (2000) Community action to reduce rural drink and drive crashes in New Zealand: Adapting Approaches in Dynamic Environments. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 35, 141–155.
131. Commonwealth of Australia (2008) *Technical Report No 3: Preventing alcohol-related harm in Australia: a window of opportunity*, prepared for the National Preventative Health Taskforce by the Alcohol Working Group.
132. Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation (2009) *Current Queensland Liquor Accords*. Retrieved 26 November 2009 from <http://www.olgr.qld.gov.au/industry/accords/current/index.shtml>.
133. Stockwell, T (2001) Responsible alcohol service: lessons from evaluations of server training and policing initiatives. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 3, 257–265.
134. Office of Liquor (2009) *Gaming and Racing. Code of Practice*, retrieved from <http://www.olgr.qld.gov.au/resources/liquorDocs/CodeOfPracticeRespServiceSupplyPromoLiquor.pdf>.
135. Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing (2009) <http://www.olgr.qld.gov.au/industry/training/index.shtml>.

136. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Data extracted from the Impromptu database and provided in July 2009.
137. Peck, RC (1991) The general and specific deterrent effects of DWI sanctions: a review of California's experience. *Alcohol, Drugs and Driving* 7:13–42.
138. Wagenaar, AC, Zobel TS, Williams GD & Hingson R (2000) *Effects of DWI control efforts: a systematic review of the literature from 1960–1991*. University of Minnesota, School of Public Health, Minneapolis (MN).
139. Gregersen, NP, Berg, HY, Engstrom, I, Nolen, S, Nyberg, A & Rimmo, PA (2000) Sixteen years age limit for learner drivers in Sweden – An evaluation of safety effects, *Accident Analysis and Prevention*.
140. McCartt, AT, Mayhew, D, Braitman, K, Ferguson S & Simpson. H (2008), *Effects of age and experience on young driver crashes: Review of recent literature*, Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.
141. Bartl, G & Esberger, R (2000) *Effects of lowering the legal-BAC limit in Austria*, Austrian Road Safety Board.
142. Department of Transport and Main Roads (2009) *Unpublished. Drink driving/riding serious crashes in Queensland; increased risk associated with unlicensed driving and those with drink driving and unlicensed driving offence histories, Unpublished*.
143. Compton, RP, Blomberg, RD, Moskowitz, H, Burns, M, Peck, RC & Fiorentino, D (2002) Crash rate of alcohol impaired driving. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS*, Montreal.
144. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in January–March 2009.
145. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in January–March 2009.
146. Moskowitz, H (1999) Driving under the influence, in *Prevention and Societal Impact of Drug and Alcohol Abuse* (Ed Ammerman, RT, Ott, PJ and Tarter, RE). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, New Jersey, 109–123.
147. Preusser, DF (2002) BAC and fatal crash risk, in *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety*, 4–9 August, Montreal, Canada.
148. Traffic Safety Centre (2003) *A history of the science and law behind DUI*, Traffic Safety Centre Online Newsletter, 1(3) <http://www.tsc.berkeley.edu/html/newsletter/Summer03/DUIHistory.pdf>.
149. Compton, RP, Blomberg, RD, Moskowitz, H, Burns, M, Peck, RC & Fiorentino, D (2002) Crash rate of alcohol impaired driving. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety ICADTS*, Montreal.
150. Soole, D, Haworth, N & Watson, B (2008) *Immediate licence suspension to deter high risk behaviours. 2008 Joint – ACRS-Travelsafe National Conference – Peer Reviewed Papers*.
151. Department of Transport and Main Roads. Crash data extracted from the Department of Transport and Main Roads' RoadCrash database in January–March 2009.
152. Masten, SV & Peck, R C (2004) Problem driver remediation: A Meta-analysis of the driver improvement literature. *Journal of Safety Research*, 35. 4. pp. 403 – 425.
153. Rogers, PN (1997) *The general deterrent impact of California's 0.08% blood alcohol concentration limit and administrative per se licence suspension laws. An evaluation of the effectiveness of California's 0.08% blood alcohol concentration and administrative per se licence suspension laws*, Volume 2. Sacramento, California: California Department of Motor Vehicles, Research and Development Section. CAL-DMV-RSS-97-167.
154. Henderson & Kedjidjan (1992) cited in Soole, D, Haworth, N & Watson, B (2008) *Immediate licence suspension to deter high risk behaviours. 2008 Joint – ACRS-Travelsafe National Conference – Peer Reviewed Papers*.
155. Soole, D, Haworth, N & Watson, B (2008) *Immediate licence suspension to deter high risk behaviours. 2008 Joint – ACRS-Travelsafe National Conference – Peer Reviewed Papers*.
156. Watson, B (1998) The effectiveness of drink driving licence actions, remedial programs and vehicle-based sanctions. In *Proceedings 19th ARRB Research Conference*. 1998.
157. Wells-Parker, E, Bangert-Drowns, R, McMillen R & Williams, M (1995) .Final results from a meta-analysis of remedial intervention with drink/drive offenders. *Addiction*; 90.
158. Sheehan, M, Watson, B, Schonfeld C & Wallace, A (2005) *Drink driver rehabilitation and education in Victoria*, Research Report 05/01 RACV.
159. Wells-Parker, E & Popkin, C (1994) Deterrence and rehabilitation: rehabilitation and screening – research needs into the next decade, *Journal of Traffic Medicine*; vol 23, no 2, 1994.
160. Dill, P & Wells-Parker, E (2006) Court-mandated treatment for convicted drink drivers, *Alcohol Research and Health*: vol 29, no1.
161. Wells-Parker, E and Popkin, C (1994) Deterrence and rehabilitation: rehabilitation and screening – research needs for the next decade. *Journal of Traffic Medicine* vol23, no2.
162. DiClemente, CC, Bellino, LE & Neavins, T (1999) Motivation for change and alcoholism treatment. *Alcohol Research and Health*, 23(2).
163. Dill P & Wells-Parker E (2006) Court-mandated treatment for convicted drinking drivers. *Alcohol Research and Health*. Vol.29. no. 1.
164. Wells-Parker, E (1994) Mandated treatment; lessons from research with drinking and driving offenders. *Alcohol Health & Research World*. 18 n4.
165. Dicenso, C & Paull, M (1999) Treating the alcohol dependent persons: predictors of treatment completion from a court order perspective. *Alcohol Treatment Quarterly*, 17(3).
166. Wells-Parker, E, Bangert-Drowns, R, McMillen, R & Williams, M (1995) Final results from a meta-analysis of remedial intervention with drink/drive offenders. *Addiction*, 90.
167. Popkin, CL (1994) The deterrent effect of education on DWI recidivism, *Alcohol Drugs and Driving*. 10 (3–4), cited in Ferguson, M, Sheehan, M, Davey, J & Watson, B (1999) *Drink Driving Rehabilitation: The Present Context*, Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety – Queensland.
168. Shand et. al. (2003) *Guidelines for the treatment of alcohol problems*, National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre.
169. Moyer, A & Finney, J (2005) Brief Interventions for Alcohol Problems, *Alcohol Research and Health* vol. 28, no. 1.

170. Moyer, A & Finney, J (2005) Brief Interventions for Alcohol Problems, *Alcohol Research and Health* vol. 28, no. 1.
171. Wells-Parker, E, Bangert-Drowns, R, McMillen, R & Williams, M (1995) Final results from a meta-analysis of remedial intervention with drink/drive offenders. *Addiction*, 90.
172. Wells-Parker, E, Bangert-Drowns, R, McMillen, R & Williams, M (1995) Final results from a meta-analysis of remedial intervention with drink/drive offenders. *Addiction*, 90.
173. Moyer, A, Finney, J, Swearington, C & Vergun, P (2002) Brief interventions for alcohol problems: a meta-analytical review of controlled investigations in treatment-seeking and non-treatment seeking populations. *Addiction*, 97, 279–292.
174. Bien, TH, Miller, WR & Tonigan, S (1993) Brief interventions for alcohol problems: a review, *Addiction* 88, 315–336.
175. Bien, TH, Miller, WR & Tonigan, S (1993) Brief interventions for alcohol problems: a review, *Addiction* 88, 315–336.
176. Queensland Government: Queensland Health (2008) *Inventory of Specialist Alcohol and Drug Treatment Agencies in Queensland*.
177. Moyer, A & Finney, W (2005) Brief Interventions for Alcohol Problems factors that facilitate implementation, *Alcohol Research and Health*. vol 28, no. 1.
178. Freeman J, Poppy, L, Schonfeld, C, Sheehan, M, Siskind, V & Watson, B (2006) The self-reported impact of legal and non-legal sanctions on a group of recidivist drink drivers. *Transportation Research Part F Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*. 9(1).
179. Wells-Parker, E, Bangert-Drowns, R, McMillen, R & Williams, M (1995) Final results from a meta-analysis of remedial intervention with drink/drive offenders. *Addiction*, 90.
180. Wells-Parker, E, Bangert-Drowns, R, McMillen, R & Williams, M (1995) Final results from a meta-analysis of remedial intervention with drink/drive offenders. *Addiction*, 90.
181. Freeman, J, Schonfeld, C & Sheehan, M (2007) 'Re-offending after Program Completion: a Study into the Characteristics of the Hard-Core Recidivist Drink Driver' presented at the *International Council on Alcohol, Drugs, and Traffic Safety Conference 2007*, Seattle, Washington, August 2007. Retrieved May 2009 from www.icadts2007.org/print/186.reoffending.pdf.
182. Siskind, V, Sheehan, M, Schonfeld, C & Ferguson, M Unpublished Report. *The impact of the 'Under the Limit' drink driving rehabilitation program on traffic safety: an outcome evaluation of 'Under the Limit'*. Centre for Accident Research and Road Safety – Queensland. Queensland University of Technology. Brisbane. 2000.
183. Queensland Government: Queensland Health (2008) *Inventory of Specialist Alcohol and Drug Treatment Agencies in Queensland*.
184. Crosby, I (1995) Portland's asset forfeiture program: the effectiveness of vehicle seizure in reducing rearrest among 'problem' drunk drivers. Retrieved 2 June, 2009 from <http://www.ncjrs.gov/policing/por673.htm>.
185. Voas, RB, Tippets, AS & Taylor, E (1997) Temporary vehicle immobilization: evaluation of a program in Ohio. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, Vol 29, No. 5 pp. 635–642.
186. Voas, RB, Tippets, AS & Taylor, E (1998) Temporary vehicle impoundment in Ohio: A replication and confirmation. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, Vol. 30, No. 5, pp. 651–655.
187. Deyoung, DJ (1999) An evaluation of the specific deterrent effect of vehicle impoundment on suspended, revoked and unlicensed drivers in California. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 31 pp. 45–53.
188. Simpson, Bierness & Mayhew (1997) cited in Sweedler, BM & Stewart, K (2000) *Vehicle sanctions: an effective means to reduce impaired driving*. The International Council on Alcohol, Drugs, and Traffic Safety ICADTS 2000.
189. Victorian Government, Minister for Police and Emergency Services Bob Cameron (2009) *\$22.2 million boost to help cut road toll by 30% by 2017*. Retrieved June 16, 2009 from [http://www.premier.vic.gov.au/minister-for-police-emergency-services/\\$22.2-million-boost-to-help-cut-road-toll-by-30-per-cent-by-2017.html](http://www.premier.vic.gov.au/minister-for-police-emergency-services/$22.2-million-boost-to-help-cut-road-toll-by-30-per-cent-by-2017.html).
190. Sweedler, BM, Stewart, K & Voas, RB (2004) Impaired driving: Vehicle sanctions around the world: *17th International Conference on Alcohol, Drugs and Traffic Safety 8–13 August 2004*, Glasgow, UK.
191. Queensland Transport Key offender statistics 2007/2008 extracted from TRAILS database 2009.
192. Victorian Government, Minister for Police and Emergency Services Bob Cameron (2009) *\$22.2 million boost to help cut road toll by 30% by 2017*. Retrieved June 16, 2009 from [http://www.premier.vic.gov.au/minister-for-police-emergency-services/\\$22.2-million-boost-to-help-cut-road-toll-by-30-per-cent-by-2017.html](http://www.premier.vic.gov.au/minister-for-police-emergency-services/$22.2-million-boost-to-help-cut-road-toll-by-30-per-cent-by-2017.html).

