This report presents the findings from an evaluation of a 12-month trial of ticketing for public nuisance offences by the Queensland Police Service. The trial commenced on 1 January, 2009 in Townsville and South Brisbane QPS Districts. This evaluation report addresses the effectiveness of ticketing with respect to the diversion of offenders from the criminal justice system, the cost effectiveness of ticketing over other police actions, and the unintended or negative implications of ticketing for offenders and the criminal justice system.
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Overview of the report

Griffith University was contracted by the Queensland Police Service (QPS) and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General to conduct an evaluation of the 12-month trial of ticketing for public nuisance offences. The evaluation assesses the effectiveness of ticketing for public nuisance offences including the cost effectiveness of the ticketing trial. In addition, the evaluation provides an opportunity to offer recommendations for improvements.

The chapters in this report address these aims in the following manner:

**Chapter 1** provides background information about public nuisance legislation and offending in Queensland, outlines pre-ticketing trial criminal justice responses to public nuisance offending in Queensland, describes ticketing schemes in other jurisdictions, and finally discusses the initial rationale for the QPS ticketing trial and outlines its terms.

**Chapter 2** outlines the methodology we used to evaluate the trial.

**Chapter 3** provides an overview of the trial period itself. Based on analyses of available data we describe the rate, timing and distribution of ticketing in the two participating Police Districts, the characteristics of those who were issued tickets, and the ticket payment outcomes for the trial.

**Chapter 4** examines the effectiveness of ticketing for public nuisance offending based on the results from the trial. We assess whether ticketing has resulted in an increase in enforcement action; has been effective in diverting people from the criminal justice system; has acted as a deterrent against public nuisance re-
offending; has affected police service delivery; and has improved community safety/public order.

**Chapter 5** discusses major themes drawn from consultations with key stakeholders.

**Chapter 6** presents the results of an economic analysis of the trial. Monetised costs and benefits of ticketing for public nuisance are detailed for the departments involved in the trial. In particular, we assess the effect of the trial on QPS time and workload; on court time and workload; on workload and the number of tickets processed by Queensland Transport; and on workload and the number of tickets processed by the State Penalties Enforcement Registry (SPER). Finally, we provide an overall assessment of the costs and benefits for the trial.

**Chapter 7** considers the potential negative consequences of ticketing for public nuisance offending on vulnerable groups including homeless or Indigenous populations, individuals with a history of mental illness and juveniles. We assess the differences between ticketing penalties and typical court-ordered penalties for public nuisance and *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act* (PPRA) offences. We consider potential justice issues including the impact of ticketing on an individual’s ability and likelihood of seeking justice. Finally, we address procedural and training issues that have arisen over the course of the trial.

**Chapter 8** provides an overall conclusion of the evaluation, and provides a list of recommendations for consideration in relation to the effectiveness of the operation of the ticketing program, and summarises key findings from the evaluation and provides a series of recommendations.
Summary

On 1 January 2009, a 12-month trial of the use of infringement notices (tickets) for public nuisance, public urination and associated offences commenced in the South Brisbane and Townsville Police Districts of Queensland. This trial was initiated in response to recommendations contained in the Crime and Misconduct Commission’s report, Policing Public Order: A review of the public nuisance offence (2008). Griffith University was contracted by the Queensland Police Service and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General to conduct an evaluation of the 12-month trial of ticketing for public nuisance offences. The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the effectiveness of ticketing for public nuisance offences and to offer recommendations for improvements. The key aims of the evaluation were:

- To examine the effectiveness of ticketing for incidents of public nuisance as a form of diversion of offenders from the criminal justice system.
- To examine the effectiveness of ticketing for incidents of public nuisance in terms of unintended or negative impacts on charged/ticketed individuals.
- To examine key stakeholder and community views on ticketing.
- To examine the cost-effectiveness of issuing tickets for incidents of public nuisance.

Background

A review of public nuisance offending in Queensland before the commencement of ticketing trial showed an increase in offending since the introduction of a public nuisance offence in 2004 which replaced the former offence of obscene,
abusive language and behaviour. However, this increase must also be viewed in the context of a general upward trend in public nuisance offending since the 1990s. The profile of public nuisance offenders was predominantly male and young (between the ages of 17 and 24 years). This is consistent with the profile of all offenders in Queensland. However, some evidence indicates that there has also been an overrepresentation of some vulnerable groups among those charged with public nuisance offences (CMC, 2008; Legal Aid Queensland, 2005; NSW Ombudsman, 2005; Walsh, 2006b, 2008). In particular, both quantitative and qualitative evidence suggests that homeless, mentally-ill and Indigenous people have been disproportionately represented as public nuisance offenders. Evidence also underscores the strong association between alcohol consumption and public nuisance offending in Queensland.

Prior to the introduction of the ticketing trial, public nuisance offences were dealt with by the police and the courts in the following manner: excluding cases that were diverted, public nuisance cases were handled by arrest (60%), NTA (39%), or caution or a similar action (1%). Public nuisance matters not diverted were heard in Magistrates Court. If contested, the case proceeded to summary hearing; however, in the vast majority of cases (68%), the matter was resolved by a plea of guilty. A further 35% were heard and found guilty ex parte (i.e., in absence of the defendant). In fact, fewer than 3% of cases were contested. Furthermore, 2% of all individuals charged with public nuisance offences were found not guilty. Following a finding of guilty, a fine was the most common sentence and was given in 92% of cases, with the other options used in relatively few occasions.

Following their review of public nuisance offending in Queensland, the CMC recommended that ticketing should be introduced as an additional option

1 Magistrates have the power to deal with an offence of public nuisance where the defendant fails to appear in court to answer the charge.
available to police to deal with public nuisance behaviour, but this option should be introduced in conjunction with an emphasis on ‘de-escalation’ and informal resolution of public order issues (CMC, 2008, p. 130).

The rationale for this recommendation was to more effectively manage public nuisance offending from the perspective of the criminal justice system, but particularly as they moved through the courts. In particular, the CMC argued that their evidence from their review demonstrated that a large proportion of public nuisance offences were dealt with by the courts; however, only a small proportion of these cases were actually contested. Instead, a large proportion of offenders was convicted and received a fine. Moreover, a large proportion of cases were heard ex parte. They suggested that ticketing would offer a “practical alternative for police and offenders rather than proceeding through the courts” (CMC, 2008, 128).

The CMC argued that the advantages of introducing a ticketing option would primarily relate to “costs, efficiency and consistency” (2008, 129). They argued that these benefits would outweigh possible concerns about a ticketing option—including potential reductions in procedural fairness for ticketed persons caused by their removal from the criminal justice system, reductions in the perceived “moral legitimacy” of the criminal justice system itself due to the possible public perception that ticketing was a revenue raising program, and reductions in the effectiveness of the police response to public nuisance by reducing the use of informal resolution (2008, 129).

The 12-month ticketing trial in Queensland

The 12-month trial—which commenced on 1 January 2009—was conducted in South Brisbane and Townsville police districts. These districts had relatively high concentrations of public nuisance offending and recreational/entertainment space within their regions. At the outset of the trial, procedures were explained to relevant QPS officers with the two trial districts by means of
the Commissioner’s Circular (see Appendix 1). A limited number of public nuisance offences, occurring within the boundaries of Townsville and South Brisbane QPS Districts were eligible for ticketing. Police exercised their discretion whether to issue an infringement notice or proceed down a more traditional route; however, juveniles—under the age of 17—were excluded.

**Methodology**

A series of quantitative analyses were conducted to assess evaluation questions. For these purposes, we accessed data from the QPS, Queensland Transport, Queensland Mental Health, SPER, the Department of Justice and Attorney-General and the Murri Courts.

In addition, consultations were held with a range of stakeholders, including police, Legal Aid Queensland, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services, and local government representatives. We asked stakeholders to comment on broad themes including their initial expectations of the trial, whether and how this view changed over the course of the trial, their views of potential benefits and concerns of ticketing in general and, more specifically, its potential implementation at the state-level, and suggestions for changes or modifications.

**Public urination offence**

In conjunction with the trial commencement in January 2009, the Queensland government introduced a new offence of public urination. Previously, public urination offences were recorded under the umbrella offences of public nuisance or wilful exposure. The maximum penalty for this offence is 2 penalty units ($200).

**Rates/counts reflect police records**

Readers should keep in mind that any reference to the rate or count of public nuisance offending in this report reflects only those incidents that are recorded by the police.
Key findings

The purpose of conducting a trial of public nuisance ticketing in two QPS districts was to assess (1) whether the scheme operated effectively as a diversion of public nuisance offenders from the criminal justice system, (2) whether it was a cost effective alternative to other methods of dealing with public nuisance offending, and (3) whether the scheme resulted in any unintended or negative consequences. In this section we summarise key findings related to these assessment criteria.

The distribution and payment of tickets and the characteristics of ticketed persons

1. There were regional differences in the distribution and issuing of tickets during the trial.

Tickets were issued at a rate of 310 per 100,000 people living in the two districts. The rate was nearly twice as high in Townsville—408 tickets per 100,000 people—as in South Brisbane—225 tickets per 100,000 people.

Ticketing was concentrated geographically. The majority of tickets were issued within a small number of divisions located near the Townville and Brisbane CBDs. Ticketing was also concentrated at certain times. There was monthly and daily variation in the rate of ticketing, in part this variation could be explained by peak times for recreation, nightclubs and bars in both cities.

There was variation in the volume of tickets issued for each of the nine eligible offences. However, across both districts, public urination and disorderly offences represented the majority, together accounting for two-thirds of all tickets issued in the trial.

An examination of different action types used for all public nuisance offences that occurred during the trial revealed that ticketing was the most frequently
used action type for public nuisance offending in South Brisbane, whereas, arrest was most frequently used in Townsville.

2. **Tickets were primarily issued to males aged 18 to 25 for public urination and public nuisance-disorderly offences, however, some variation existed between the two trial districts.**

In South Brisbane, public urination was the most commonly ticketed offence, accounting for well over half (58%) of tickets issued in this district. Although public urination also accounted for 25% of the tickets issued in Townsville, here tickets were most frequently issued for Public Nuisance-disorderly offences (34%). Males accounted for 89% of all tickets issued; however, the rate of ticketed females was five times higher in Townsville than in South Brisbane.

3. **Fine payments: Only one-third of tickets were paid within 28 days, the remainder were forwarded to SPER.**

The largest proportion of tickets in both districts were in default of payment and had been registered with SPER for enforcement (i.e., a Default Certificate)—56% of tickets in Townsville and 51% of tickets in South Brisbane. Ticketed persons were in default if they had not paid, elected to register for the Voluntary Instalment Plan, or elected to have the matter dealt with by a court within 28 days of the date of the ticket.

Payment was the second most common final status in both districts. Just over one-third (35%) of tickets issued in South Brisbane and 29% of those issued in Townsville had been paid by January 31, 2009. The proportion of tickets paid fluctuated slightly over the months of the trial—ranging from a low of 24% for those ticketed in February to high of 36% for those ticketed in September.

Tickets were issued and awaiting further action at Queensland Transport in about 7% of cases in Townsville and 9% in South Brisbane. If ticket amounts were over $200, and an initial instalment of $60 could be made within 28 days of
the date of the ticket, ticketed persons could elect to register for the Voluntary Instalment Plan (VIP). This occurred for about 5% of tickets in Townsville and 3% in South Brisbane.

For the remaining 3% of tickets in both districts a variety of final status types were recorded including: (1) rejected by SPER and sent back to Queensland Transport for further processing, (2) waived, suspended or voided, or (3) listed with QPS to commence prosecution against the person.

4. Mean ticket fine amounts were similar to mean court-ordered fines issued for ticketable offences during the trial period, however, most individuals receiving a ticket for a PPRA or public nuisance offence were fined a higher amount than they would otherwise receive through the Magistrate Court process.

The mean ticket issued fine for a public nuisance offence (excluding public urination) was $269, for ticketable PPRA offences, $278, and for public urination, $100. The mean court-ordered fine for a public nuisance offence was $286, for ticketable PPRA offences, $258, and for public urination, $132. However, the vast majority of tickets issued for PPRA (89%) and public nuisance (85%) offences involved a $300 fine, whereas most court-ordered fines for these offences were less than $300 (72% and 51% respectively). This finding suggests that most individuals issued a ticket for a PPRA or public nuisance offence during the trial were fined a higher amount than they would otherwise incur through the Magistrate Court process. In contrast, most court-ordered fines for public urination (55%) were higher than the set $100 ticket fine for this offence during the trial period. This suggests that individuals are likely to receive a higher fine for public urination when the matter is dealt with through the Magistrate’s Court.
The operation of the ticketing scheme as a method of diverting public nuisance offenders from the criminal justice system

5. Diversion from the criminal justice system: Ticketing decreased police use of arrest and NTA in response to public nuisance offending.

Rates of public nuisance related NTAs dropped substantially in both the South Brisbane and Townsville districts (35% and 30% respectively) relative to 2008 rates. This reduction could not be accounted for by trends in the comparison districts, statewide trends, or trends in recent years. The rate of public-nuisance related arrests also dropped in South Brisbane (27%) but not in Townsville. The apparent absence of an effect in Townsville could, however, be related to a regional increase in public nuisance arrest rates (15% increase in Cairns from 2008 to 2009) which may have negated an observable decrease resulting from the introduction of tickets.

The reduction in arrest and NTA rates in South Brisbane and NTA rates in Townsville during the trial period is consistent with findings from the police survey, with 44% to 64% of surveyed officers reporting a reduction in their use of arrest and NTAs in response to public nuisance offending since the start of the trial.

The cost effectiveness of the ticketing trial

6. Ticketing represented an overall costs-savings for the Queensland government.

Although the introduction of ticketing for public nuisance offending introduces monetary costs associated with the processing of tickets, this appears to be substantially offset by the monetary savings for QPS, and the courts as well as the increased revenue from ticket-derived fines. Specifically, Queensland Transport and SPER will see an increased workload, and thus, increased costs, however, their increased costs are much smaller than the savings to be experienced by QPS and the courts due to reduced public nuisance related arrests and NTAs. Overall,
it was estimated that a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance offending in 2009 would have resulted in monetary savings Queensland government of either $18 or 30 million based on projections derived from the two trial sites.

**Unintended or negative consequences of the ticketing trial**

7. *The introduction of ticketing led to an increased rate of public nuisance offending in the two trial districts.*

A twenty percent increase in public nuisance offending was observed in both the Townsville and South Brisbane districts during the trial relative to 2008 rates. In South Brisbane, this was accompanied by an increase in common assault both of which could not be accounted for by trends in comparison districts (Brisbane Central and North Brisbane, or by trends in recent years. This pattern of findings suggests that rates did in fact increase in response to the ticketing trial and that this may in part be attributable to a greater detection of offences resulting from an increased police presence. This is consistent with the perceptions of police and other stakeholders that ticketing for public nuisance offending increases the amount of time police can spend “on the street” as well as the number of police “on the street” at any given time.

In Townsville, the increase in public nuisance offending was accompanied by a smaller, but still sizeable (12%), increase in Cairns. In contrast, common assault decreased in both Townsville and Cairns. These findings suggest that the increase seen in Townsville may in part be driven by a regional increase in public nuisance offending. However, as the Townsville rate increase was almost twice

**Comparison sites**

Comparison sites (North Brisbane, Brisbane Central, and Cairns districts) were selected in consultation with the QPS and were chosen for their similarity to trial districts based on size, urban/rural character, and relative proximity.
that seen in Cairns, it is also likely to reflect the introduction of ticketing, and consequently a greater police presence—i.e., officers have more time on the street which may have resulted in either greater detection of public nuisance related offences. The higher rate observed in Townsville may also be a consequence of tickets being issued for minor incidents of public nuisance offending which would have previously been overlooked.

8. *A small proportion of individuals receiving tickets during the trial had a history of mental illness.*

Only 2% of ticketed persons in the South Brisbane district and 1% in Townsville were identified as having a mental illness. In both districts this was less than the proportion of individuals arrested or issued an NTA for a public nuisance offence who were identified as having a mental illness. It was also less than or similar to the proportion of public nuisance offenders identified as having a mental illness over the past nine years. However, in the current evaluation mental illness was defined as any previous contact with mental health services. This definition fails to capture a large proportion of community mental health problems, and therefore does not fully assess the impact of ticketing on this broader group of individuals.

9. *The overrepresentation of Indigenous people among Public Nuisance offenders increased in Townsville during the trial and decreased in South Brisbane.*

The rate of Indigenous public nuisance offending in Townsville during the trial was 14 times higher than the non-Indigenous rate, and in South Brisbane, 8 times higher. For Townsville, this is the highest Indigenous relative to non-Indigenous rate seen for the past five years, and in South Brisbane the lowest relative rate seen for the past five years. The increased difference between Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders in Townsville was not due to reduced non-Indigenous rates, as rates rose for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons. Instead, it was driven by a larger increase in the rate of public nuisance offending from 2008 to 2009 among Indigenous relative to non-Indigenous
individuals (40% and 13% increase respectively). The impact of ticketing on arrest and NTA rates was also vastly different between Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals in Townsville. For non-Indigenous individuals, ticketing produced a clear reduction in rates of arrest and NTAs, while for Indigenous individuals arrest rates rose during the trial and NTA rates remained relatively stable. As well, tickets accounted for a much smaller proportion of all actions for public nuisance offending among Indigenous (tickets represent 13% of all actions) relative to non-Indigenous individuals (tickets represent 44% of all actions).

There was less disparity between Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals in the impact of ticketing on arrest and NTA rates in South Brisbane. For both groups, rates of public nuisance related arrests dropped from 2008 to 2009. For Indigenous individuals this may be partly related to a clear peak in public nuisance-related arrests seen in 2008. However, for both groups the reduction in public nuisance-related arrests also appears to reflect, at least in part, the introduction of the ticketing option. As in Townsville, tickets accounted for a smaller proportion of actions for public nuisance offending among Indigenous (tickets represent 30% of all actions) relative to non-Indigenous individuals (tickets represent 43% of all actions). However, again, the difference between Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals was less marked than in Townsville.

Finally, although the relative rate of ticketing between Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals during the trial was lower than that reported above for overall public nuisance offending, individuals identifying as Indigenous were still 4 to 5 times more likely to be ticketed than non-Indigenous individuals².

² For more context regarding the overrepresentation of Indigenous people as public nuisance offenders in Queensland see CMC (2008) and Walsh (2006a; 2008).
10. Potential justice issues with respect to access to legal advice and the capacity to contest tickets.

Legal services stakeholders voiced concern that ticketing would reduce the likelihood that individuals would contest a matter that would typically be challenged in court. By and large, this view was not shared by police, with half of the officers surveyed within the two trial districts indicating that they felt ticketing did not reduce an individual’s ability to seek justice. Examination of administrative data showed that a very small proportion (1%) of those who were issued a ticket during the trial elected to contest the ticket by having the matter dealt with by the court. This appears comparable to the proportion of individuals who plead not guilty among matters heard before a court and finalised with the defendant present (<1%). However, it should be stressed that this latter proportion may represent an underestimation of the total proportion of not guilty pleas and should not be considered reliable or valid without further examination of court data.

11. Further officer training and guidance required, particularly with respect to diversion and the identification of vulnerable groups.

Findings from consultations and the police survey indicate a need for further officer training and guidance, particularly with respect to diversion, move-on directions, taking individuals to the station/watchhouse, and discretion in issuing tickets over other action types.

Evidence from the police survey and consultations revealed variance in the use of diversion sheets by officers during the trial as well as officer knowledge of pre- and post-ticket diversionary options and procedures. Interestingly, older, more experienced officers were more likely to accompany every ticket issued for a public nuisance offence with a diversion sheet.

Findings from the police survey and consultations with police indicate that it may also be difficult for officers to reliably identify individuals eligible for
diversion (i.e., homeless, Indigenous, mental health issues). Additionally, officers vary substantially in terms of their use of move-on directions as well as the proportion of ticketed individuals who are taken to the watchhouse or the station prior to ticketing. Legal service stakeholders also expressed concern regarding officer discretion in issuing public nuisance tickets versus diversion or other action types. Both police and legal service stakeholders commented that younger, less experienced officers may be less likely to exercise their discretion wisely.

Additional findings from stakeholder consultations

12. The need for greater public information and education.

In general, stakeholders felt that ticketing would only lead to an increase in community perceptions of safety/public order if statewide implementation was accompanied by extensive public information campaigns.

13. The need for coordinated efforts to reduce or prevent public nuisance offending before it occurs

Along with increased community education, stakeholders raised the need for a coordinated local government and community level effort to develop strategies which may reduce or prevent at least some of the more common types of nuisance offending. For example, in both Townsville and South Brisbane stakeholders suggested that problems with public urination in entertainment districts could be addressed by providing additional toilet facilities in these areas.

Recommendations

Overall, this evaluation has demonstrated that the ticketing scheme proved to be an effective means of diverting public nuisance offenders from the criminal justice system, as well as a cost savings for the Queensland Government;
however, we also found that ticketing may have some adverse implications for certain vulnerable groups. Consequently, if ticketing is to be extended statewide, certain safeguards should be put in place to protect these groups.

We make the following recommendations based on the findings of the evaluation.

The findings in this evaluation indicated that a statewide extension of the ticketing program would represent an overall cost savings for the Queensland government. The amount of this savings would range between $18.0 and $31.1 million based on separate projections from the two pilot sites.

Overall, the time and resource savings for QPS and the courts were also greater than any increase in workload resulting from the introduction of ticketing. Certain legal services also experienced a significant reduction in the size of their caseload as a result of the reduction in public nuisance-related arrests and NTAs.

Analysis of data from the trial period also indicated that the ticketing option was an effective means of diverting public nuisance offenders from the criminal justice system. This was particularly the case in South Brisbane where findings from analyses of QPS data and a survey of police officers indicated that the ticketing trail had the effect of reducing public nuisance related arrest and NTA rates during the trial. Reductions in use of NTAs were observed in Townsville. Comparisons to other districts and preceding years suggested that these reductions may be largely due to the choice, by officers during the trial, to issue a ticket to individuals who they previously would have arrested or issued an NTA.

1. The Queensland State government should consider the benefits and implications of a wider extension of the program of ticketing for public nuisance offences in Queensland.
During the trial, the rate of public nuisance offending was up to 14 times greater for Indigenous than non-Indigenous persons. Although this difference was lower with respect to ticketing, Indigenous persons were still five times more likely than non-Indigenous persons to receive a ticket during the trial.

For Indigenous persons in Townsville, ticketing did not diminish the overall rate of public nuisance-related arrests and NTAs. In fact, the arrest rate for Indigenous persons increased during the trial but decreased for non-Indigenous persons. Unlike effects seen for non-Indigenous persons, ticketing therefore did not function to divert Indigenous persons from the criminal justice system.

A different result was observed in South Brisbane where ticketing seems to have contributed to a reduction in arrest rates during the trial for Indigenous people. This finding points to potential regional variation in the impact of ticketing on vulnerable groups, such as Indigenous people. A lack of services in rural and remote communities could also contribute to this variation and, ultimately, to the overrepresentation of Indigenous people as public nuisance offenders.

There are a broad range of social and economic challenges facing vulnerable groups who are often overrepresented among public nuisance offenders. Although interventions such as ticketing are well-intentioned they do not address these underlying social and economic conditions. A broader social-welfare approach is needed to address the risks and needs of vulnerable groups.
2. Governmental agencies should work in partnership with local communities to address public nuisance offending in a coordinated approach which includes initiatives to reduce underlying social problems that give rise to this form of offending behaviour.

3. Consideration should be directed to understanding regional variation in the impact of ticketing particular to rural and remote communities, and communities with significant Indigenous populations.

The highest rate of public nuisance offences typically occur in known entertainment districts, for example West End in South Brisbane district (see Appendix 3) and the Brisbane Central district (see Appendix 4). A large proportion of public nuisance tickets issued during the trial were for public urination and disorderly behaviour. During consultations these types of offences were raised by police and community stakeholders as a particular problem for entertainment districts, but a problem for which clear community-level solutions could be developed—for example, providing additional public toilet facilities.

4. Governmental agencies should work in partnership with local communities to develop strategies for reducing the high rate of public nuisance offending in entertainment districts such as by providing additional public toilet facilities.

Any criminal justice program or intervention requires ongoing monitoring. Due to some of the constraints of the current evaluation,
there is a need to explore further implications of the ticketing program. For example, an identifiable challenge related to identifying vulnerable groups at various stages of the ticketing process. Queensland Transport and SPER do not record Indigenous status and therefore it is not currently possible to examine payment outcomes for this group. In addition, in the current evaluation mental illness was defined as any previous contact with mental health services. This definition is restrictive and fails to capture a substantial proportion of community mental health problems, and consequently, does not fully assess the impact of ticketing on this broader group of individuals.

Moreover, a relatively large proportion of ticketed individuals (46%) had no prior criminal history. Given the 12-month window of the trial, the current evaluation was unable to examine the possible deterrent effect (i.e., impact on rate of re-offending) of ticketing on first-time offenders. This would require a longer-term monitoring of ticketing and public nuisance re-offending rates.

The results of this evaluation revealed large variation between the two trial districts with respect to the nature and extent of ticketing, the effect on Indigenous people, and officer and stakeholder perceptions of the trial. These differences, as well as the challenges described above, stress the need to be aware of the variation in the effect of a statewide ticketing program, and the need for ongoing and improved data collection.

5. A statewide extension of ticketing for public nuisance should be accompanied by improved and on-going data collection and monitoring of the effect of the program. In addition to administrative data sources, this data collection should include consultations with community members and stakeholders.
Vulnerable groups regardless of their Indigenous status require access to diversionary options. Post-ticket diversionary options vary across Queensland. For example, in South Brisbane district, post-ticket diversion options include Murri Court and Special Circumstances Court; however, in Townsville, post-ticket diversion includes Murri Court only—there are currently no options for non-Indigenous vulnerable groups.

The directive regarding diversion sheets specified in the Commissioner’s Circular (no. 32/2008) provides an excellent safeguard for ensuring that vulnerable groups are appropriately diverted. However, information from the police survey and consultations revealed divergent practices in relation to the distribution of diversion sheets to ticketed persons. There was also evidence of variation in officers’ awareness of diversion sheets during the trial; the potential consequence being that some eligible ticketed persons were not receiving diversion sheets. One way of addressing this problem could be to issue diversion sheets to all ticketed persons. Indeed, evidence from the police survey and the consultations indicated that this practice is already occurring in some police stations.

6. **In support of a statewide extension of the ticketing program, an assessment should be undertaken to ascertain the post-ticket diversionary options (e.g., Murri Court and Special Circumstances Court) available across jurisdictions that are suitable for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous vulnerable groups.**

7. **Diversion sheets should be provided to all ticketed persons.**

Traffic infringement notices were used to ticket public nuisance offences for the purposes of the 12-month trial only. This eliminated the time and
costs involved in producing a customised ticket book for public nuisance offences and the intent was to develop a specific infringement notice for public nuisance offences if the pilot was successful. By including relevant information, a dedicated public nuisance infringement notice could address issues related to the ticketing of vulnerable groups—specifically, by facilitating ongoing monitoring of the impact of ticketing on Indigenous people—and the ease with which ticketed persons can contest or obtain additional information regarding the ticketing process.

8. That dedicated public nuisance infringement notices should be designed to include clear instructions for the ticketed person, including instructions on how and when to pay, formally contest tickets and for accessing further information from a government website. Tickets should also record key demographic information including the gender, age and Indigenous status of the ticketed person.

Police officers raised concerns about access to prior ticketing history. Currently, tickets are recorded in an individual’s traffic history, and are not easily accessible to officers undertaking routine criminal history checks.

9. Police information systems should be modified to ensure improved officer access to a person’s public nuisance ticketing history.
Chapter 1—Introduction: background and terms of the trial

On 1 January 2009, a 12-month trial of the use of infringement notices (tickets) for public nuisance, public urination and associated offences commenced in the South Brisbane and Townsville Police Districts in Queensland. This trial was initiated in response to recommendations contained in the Crime and Misconduct Commission’s (CMC) report, Policing Public Order: A review of the public nuisance offence (2008). Griffith University was contracted by the Queensland Police Service and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General to conduct an evaluation of the 12-month trial of ticketing for public nuisance offences. The evaluation assesses the effectiveness of ticketing for public nuisance offences and offers recommendations for improvements.

In this first chapter we outline the recent history of related public nuisance legislation, offending and criminal justice system responses to public nuisance in Queensland prior to the commencement of the trial. We describe ticketing schemes that have been introduced in other jurisdictions in Australia and Britain and briefly discuss previous critiques of police ticketing for public nuisance. Next, we summarise the rationale presented by the Crime and Misconduct Commission (CMC) which led to the recommendation to implement the ticketing trial. Finally, we outline the terms of the trial itself.
1.1. Public nuisance offending in Queensland

Changes in public nuisance offending legislation

The public nuisance offence was introduced in 2004 as section 7AA of the Vagrants, Gaming and Other Offences Act 1931 (Qld) (the Vagrants Act) and the changes took effect in April 2004. It was later transferred to section 6 of the Summary Offences Act in March 2005 after the former act was repealed. The public nuisance offence replaced the former offence of obscene, abusive language and behaviour, and was introduced amidst community concern over the safety of public spaces, particularly arising from events occurring in Far North Queensland and Mt Isa (e.g., Beattie, 2003; Rose, 2002). While there were some changes in relation to penalty rates and the meaning of ‘public’, there were few practical differences between the public nuisance offence and the former offence of obscene, abusive language and behaviour.

According to the current legislation, a person is considered to have committed a public nuisance offence if their behaviour is both “disorderly, offensive, threatening or violent” and “interferes with, or is likely to interfere with a person’s peaceful passage through, or enjoyment of, a public space” (s. 6(2), Summary Offences Act, 2005). Importantly, offensive or threatening behaviour is considered to include offensive, abusive or threatening language. Currently, public nuisance offences attract a penalty of up to $1,000 or 6 months imprisonment.

The broad nature of the public nuisance legislation in Queensland, as in other jurisdictions, leaves the police and courts with a large degree of discretion in deciding what should be defined as a chargeable public nuisance offence. Thus, for example, whether or not a particular behaviour (e.g., offensive language) will attract a public nuisance offence charge is highly dependent on the time, the place, and other important factors.
The nature and extent of public nuisance offending in Queensland

In 2008, the Crime and Misconduct Commission (CMC) conducted a review of the use of the public nuisance offence in Queensland following the introduction of the offence in 2004. Their report documented trends in public nuisance offending in Queensland between 2003 and 2005 (CMC, p. 2008). On the basis of data provided by QPS, they reported 29,415 incidents (which often included more than one offence charge) between 1 April 2003 and 31 March 2005. The rate per 100,000 was 364 for the period between April 2003 and March to 2004 and 389—following the introduction of the legislation—for the period between April 2004 and March 2005 (2008, p. 54).

Thus, over the two-year period considered in their review, the CMC reported a 7% increase in recorded public nuisance offending since the introduction of the new offence in April 2004. In addition, they reported significant increases in the rate of recorded public nuisance incidents in three areas: Metro North, Metro South and Southern QPS regions (CMC 2008, p. 66). Despite these increases, the CMC also reported that the increases they observed since the implementation of the public nuisance legislation should be viewed in the context of a generally upward trend in public nuisance offending from July 1997 to June 2007 as well as substantial monthly fluctuations (2008, pp. 54-5).

The CMC analysis also indicated that the age and gender profile of public nuisance offenders was consistent with that of Queensland offenders overall (CMC, 2008, p. 76). Public nuisance offenders were predominantly male (approximately 84%) and had a median age of 23 years, with 48% aged between 17 and 24 years (CMC, 2008). A relatively small proportion (7%) of public nuisance offenders were under 17 years of age and so were legally classified as juveniles.
Based on police narrative reports, the CMC also reported that most public nuisance charges related to violent or threatening behaviour and threatening language. Where charges were for offensive and threatening language alone, approximately half of these were reportedly associated with offensive/threatening language directed towards police. According to QPS statistical data, the vast majority of public nuisance incidents also occurred in conjunction with the consumption of alcohol or drugs.

**The overrepresentation of public nuisance offending among marginalised groups**

One important concern expressed in submissions to the CMC was that public nuisance laws disproportionately affect disadvantaged and vulnerable groups including Indigenous people, mentally ill and/or homeless people (see also, NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, 1999; Taylor & Bareja, 2002). Police statistical data regarding the Indigenous status of public nuisance offenders between 1 April 2003 and 31 March 2005 confirmed this for Indigenous populations. During this period, individuals who were identified as Indigenous people were nearly 13 times more likely than non-Indigenous people to be identified by the police as public nuisance offenders (CMC, 2008, p. 77). There were also regional differences in the extent of over-representation, with the proportion of Indigenous public nuisance offenders found to be particularly high (60%) in Far North Queensland (2008, p. 78). Based on police and court data the CMC concluded that the over-representation of Indigenous people had not increased as a result of the legislative change in 2004.

Based on police narratives, the CMC also reported that Indigenous offenders were particularly susceptible to being charged with certain public nuisance offences. For example, one in three police narratives dealing with offensive language involved Indigenous people, which demonstrated “... a sense of tension between police and Indigenous people.... [where] police often respond to offensive language used by Indigenous people where it could not be suggested
that there was any real ‘interference’ with police carrying out their duties” (2008, p. 43).

Direct evidence of the overrepresentation of mentally ill and/or homeless people was less clear cut. Because police and court data do not contain records on the homelessness and/or mental health status of public nuisance offenders, the CMC was unable to report empirical findings regarding rates of public nuisance offending among these vulnerable populations. The CMC argued that although there was some evidence to suggest that these groups had been overrepresented, there was no direct evidence to suggest that the overrepresentation of these groups had increased since the introduction of the new public nuisance offence (2008, 113). However, a number of observational and case studies have demonstrated that marginalised groups including homeless, mentally ill and Indigenous people are overrepresented among those coming before the Magistrates Court for public nuisance offences in Queensland cities (see for example, Legal Aid Queensland, 2005; Walsh, 2006b; 2008).

**The link between alcohol consumption and public nuisance offending**

In their review, the CMC described a strong correlation between alcohol consumption and public nuisance offending in Queensland. Evidence from consultations and submissions suggested that the vast majority of public nuisance charges in Queensland were issued in the management of the behaviours of intoxicated individuals—or, “party people” (2008, p. 113). Further, the CMC suggested that there was evidence of an increase in the strength of this correlation over time due to (a) an increase in the proportion of incidents involving alcohol; (b) an increase in the number of incidents on licensed premises and business; and (c) the concentration of public nuisance offences in the primary entertainment areas of the Brisbane CBD, Cairns, Surfers Paradise and the Gold Coast (2008, p. 113).
1.2. CJS responses to public nuisance in Queensland

Prior to the introduction of the ticketing pilot, public nuisance offences were dealt with by the police and the courts in a variety of ways. Police for example used a number of permissible actions to respond to persons considered to be involved in nuisance offences, including:

- Diversion—there were five levels of diversion that could be used by police: observe but no action; informal caution: formal caution; issue a move-on direction; and for youth, a community conference could be called.
- Arrest and charge (where the suspect is taken to the watchhouse)
- Issue a notice to appear

Based on QPS data, which excluded incidents that were diverted, the following actions were taken. About, 60% of cases were handled by arrest, 39% by notice to appear and less than 1% by caution or similar action. Of these cases, Indigenous persons were arrested 68% of the time while 32% were issued with a notice to appear. For non-Indigenous persons, proportionately fewer were arrested (57%), and a greater proportion (43%) was issued a notice to appear (CMC, 2008, p. 96-97).

Prior to the ticketing pilot, cases that were not diverted were taken to court. For adults the matter was dealt with in the Magistrates Court. If contested, the case proceeded to summary hearing. However, in the vast majority of cases (62%), the matter was resolved by a plea of guilty. A further 35% were heard and found guilty ex parte, or in absence of the defendant. In fact, fewer than 3% of cases were contested. Furthermore, 2% of all individuals charged with public nuisance offences were found not guilty. Of those found guilty, only 55% had the verdict

---

3 Magistrates have the power to deal with an offence of public nuisance where the defendant fails to appear in court to answer the charge.
recorded, although this figure was substantially higher for Indigenous persons (74%) as compared to 46% for non-Indigenous persons (CMC, 2008, p. 96-97).

Following a finding of guilty, a number of possible sentence options were considered by the court, including:

- a conviction with no further punishment
- a fine
- a term of imprisonment
- an intensive correction order
- a probation order
- a ‘good behaviour bond’ or recognisance order
- a community service order

A fine was the most common sentence and was given in 92% of cases, with the other options used in relatively few occasions. The good behaviour bond option was given in only 3% of cases, no further punishment in 2%, and other monetary orders in about 1.3%. Custodial orders were used in 1.4% of cases and all other penalties in only 0.3% of cases (CMC, 2008, p. 101).

1.3. Ticketing public nuisance offending in other jurisdictions

Other jurisdictions have expanded the use of ticketing to target what are commonly referred to as nuisance offences. Typically, tickets have been used to deal with regulatory types of offences including speeding fines, parking fines and fare-evasion; however, there have been some more recent initiatives both in Australia and the UK to expand the use of tickets for activities that are considered to be more criminal in nature (Coates, Kautt, & Mueller-Johnson, 2009; Criminal Justice and Police Act, 2001 (UK); Criminal Procedure Act, 1986 (NSW); Mitchell and Babb 2007).
Infringement notice schemes in Australian jurisdictions

New South Wales commenced a 12-month trial of Criminal Infringement Notices (CINs) in September 2002 (NSW Ombudsman, 2005). CINs were permitted to be issued by police in 12 local command areas during the trial for prescribed penalty notice offences—common assault, larceny and shoplifting (less than $300), obtaining money, etc., by false representation, goods in custody, offensive conduct, offensive language, obstructing traffic, and unauthorised entry of vehicle or boat. Exclusions from the CIN option included juveniles under the age of 18 years, individuals who were the subject of an outstanding first instance warrant, and offences connected to industrial disputes or demonstrations and protests. Based on the conclusions of the NSW Ombudsman that the CIN trial represented an improved method of dealing with minor offences, and a cost savings, the Criminal Infringement Notice Scheme commenced statewide in October 2007 (Parliament of NSW, 2007).

In Victoria, a system of penalty enforcement—the PERIN (Penalty Enforcement by Registration of Infringement Notice) Court, now the Infringements Court—began in 1987. Although initially the number of offences for which infringement notices could be issued was relatively small (11); by 2002 this number had increased dramatically, though eligible offence types were non-criminal. On 1 July 2008, the Victoria Police commenced a three-year trial of on-the-spot fines for minor offences. The trial included seven offence types: shop theft (of goods for sale for less than $600); wilful damage of property (where the damage is worth up to $500); indecent or obscene language; offensive behaviour; consuming or supplying liquor on unlicensed premises; failure to leave licensed premises when requested; and careless driving by a full licence holder.

Infringement notice scheme in the UK

On the spot Penalty Notices for Disorder (PND) began in the UK with the introduction of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001. In 2004-05 all police
forces across Britain had introduced PNDs for eligible public order offences (Mitchell & Babb, 2007). A relatively wide range of offences are eligible for PNDs including statutory infringements related to fireworks and hoax calls and public order offences such as disorderly ‘behaviour while drunk in a public place’ and ‘behaviour likely to cause harassment’. There has been a large increase in the issuing of PNDs in the UK—from 2005-06 to 2006-07 there was a 32% rise (Mitchell & Babb, 2007). In order to issue tickets, police must ensure that offenders meet certain criteria—aged 16 years and older, able to understand English, not mentally disordered or impaired through alcohol or drugs, no previous offending history for disorder, and a fixed place of residence in the UK.

1.4. Critiques of ticketing for public nuisance

Concerns about the potentially negative consequences of ticketing for public nuisance have been raised by a number of commentators (Bagaric 1998; CMC 2008, p. 129; Fox 1995, 2003; NSW Ombudsman, 2005; Spicer & Kilsby, 2004; Walsh, 2008). These concerns generally fall into five categories, although the categories are not mutually exclusive.

- reductions in procedural fairness and other justice issues

Based on results from the evaluation of a 12-month trial conducted in NSW before the introduction of its infringement notice scheme, a very small proportion of those issued infringement notices elected to have the matter heard before a Magistrate. During the trial only 2.6% of the total number of infringement notices issued were challenged in the courts, and 0.9% were withdrawn after being issued (NSW Ombudsman, 2005, p. ii). In general, such a low court challenge rate raises concern that legitimate justice issues are being marginalised by the practicality provided by the ticketing scheme. However, these percentages are not dissimilar to the small percentages of public nuisance matters currently challenged under the current Queensland system whereby all matters proceed through the Magistrates or Childrens Courts.
• reductions in the perceived legitimacy of the criminal justice system,

Results from the NSW ticketing trial revealed some evidence of the diminution of the seriousness of the criminal act. For example, infringement notices were used to deal with assault matters that may have required a more significant sanction than a fine (NSW Ombudsman, 2005). Moreover, a related concern for any ticketing program is countering the issue that the public may perceive ticketing as a revenue raising scheme (Fox, 2003).

• increases in the number and type of offenders in the system—i.e., “net-widening”

Based on results from the NSW evaluation, some evidence suggests that infringement notices were being issued in circumstances unlikely to be considered criminal if before the courts or where police would have otherwise determined to caution a suspected offender (NSW Ombudsman, 2005). This was particularly the case with offensive language offences, where the Ombudsman argued that in many of these cases “...the words spoken would not be considered offensive if the matter was to be determined by a court” (NSW Ombudsman, 2005, 74). In short, they argued that ticketing as an option for some offences may contribute to widening the net of social control toward behaviours that would not have otherwise been targeted by the criminal justice system.

• overrepresentation of members of vulnerable groups among ticketed persons, and the possible reduction in the effectiveness of public nuisance responses

Evidence suggests that three groups in particular are at higher risk of receiving public nuisance offences: homeless, mentally-ill and Indigenous people. Walsh argues that ticketing removes the possibility of using other methods of dealing with public nuisance among vulnerable groups which may address underlying disadvantages. In short, concerns over the application of interventions aimed at controlling public nuisance offending may target the most vulnerable groups
across the community who, in general, may struggle to respond to financial penalties. Additionally, financial sanctions for nuisance behaviour may do little or nothing to address the underlying causes of public nuisance among these groups.

1.5. The rationale and terms of the ticketing trial

The rationale and terms of the ticketing trial

The CMC recommendation to introduce ticketing for public nuisance offending

Following the review of public nuisance offending in Queensland, the CMC recommended:

That ticketing should be introduced as a further option available to police to deal with public nuisance behaviour. Ticketing should be introduced only in conjunction with a focus on ‘de-escalation’ and informal resolution of public order issues. The introduction of ticketing as an option should be evaluated to ensure it is not having an adverse effect in Queensland (CMC 2008, p.130).

The rationale for this recommendation was to more effectively manage public nuisance offending from the perspective of the criminal justice system, but particularly as they moved through the courts. Principally, the CMC argued that their evidence from the review demonstrated that a large proportion of public nuisance offences were dealt with by the courts; however, a small proportion of these cases were actually contested. Instead, a large proportion of offenders was convicted and received a fine. Moreover, a large proportion of cases were heard ex parte, or in absence of the defendant. They suggested that ticketing would offer a “practical alternative for police and offenders rather than proceeding through the courts” (CMC 2008, 128).

The CMC argued that the advantages of introducing a ticketing option would primarily relate to “costs, efficiency and consistency” (2008, p.129). They argued
that these benefits would outweigh possible concerns about a ticketing option—including potential reductions in procedural fairness for ticketed persons caused by their removal from the criminal justice system, reductions in the perceived “moral legitimacy” of the criminal justice system itself due to the possible public perception that ticketing was a revenue raising program, and reductions in the effectiveness of the police response to public nuisance by reducing the use of informal resolution (2008, p.129).

**The terms of the 12-month ticketing trial in Queensland**

The 12-month trial—which commenced on 1 January 2009—was conducted in South Brisbane and Townsville police districts. These districts had relatively high concentrations of recreational or entertainment space and public nuisance offending within their regions (Metropolitan South and Northern regions, respectively). Some key dimensions of the trial included:

- At the outset of the trial, procedures were explained to relevant QPS officers within the two trial districts by means of the *Commissioner’s Circular No.32 – Trial issuing of Infringement Notices for public nuisance, public urination and associated offences* (see Appendix 1).
- Police were to exercise their discretion whether to issue an infringement notice or proceed down a more traditional route.
- Juveniles—under the age of 17 were to be excluded from the ticketing option.
- Officers were to provide diversion sheets (stating diversionary options), to Indigenous offenders in Townsville and to homeless and Indigenous offenders in South Brisbane.
- Offences for which the ticketing option could apply and associated fixed penalties are outlined in Table 1.1.
- Eligible offences had to occur within the boundaries of the selected police districts and within the 12 months of the trial.
Ticketing for specific PPRA offences could only occur in the context of a ticket simultaneously being issued for a public nuisance offence only.

The ticketed person could elect to have the matter dealt with before a Magistrates Court for summary determination.

A record was kept that tracked offenders’ infringement notice histories.

Payment of the fine within the 28 days of the issuing of the ticket effectively ended the matter — there was no need for court involvement. No conviction was recorded.

The ticketed person could elect to enter a Voluntary Instalment Plan.

Table 1.1 Offences for which tickets could be issued under the ticketing trial and associated fine amounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Fine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public nuisance – disorderly behaviour</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public nuisance – offensive behaviour</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public nuisance – threatening behaviour</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public nuisance - violent behaviour</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public nuisance – language only</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(1)</td>
<td>Public urination</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790(1)</td>
<td>Resist Arrest, Incite, Hinder or Obstruct Police Act</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+40(1)</td>
<td>State False Name or Address</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6. Chapter summary

This chapter introduced the evaluation of the public nuisance trial in Queensland. Stemming from concerns about public nuisance behaviours as well
as positive experiences in other jurisdictions and the potential efficiency gains to be realised, the 12-month trial was implemented on January 1, 2009. In the next chapter we describe the methodological procedures used to evaluate the trial.
Chapter 2—Methodology

This evaluation makes use of information from a variety of quantitative and qualitative sources. We consulted a range of key stakeholders including the police, legal services, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services, other criminal justice services and local government representatives. In addition, we accessed data from QPS, Queensland Transport, Queensland Mental Health, SPER, the Department of Justice and Attorney-General and the Murri Courts.

2.1 Data sources

Consultations

Consultations were held with a range of state and local government stakeholders within Townsville and South Brisbane districts, as well as with senior officials representing Queensland criminal justice agencies.

We asked stakeholders to comment on broad themes including their initial expectations of the trial, whether and how their views changed over the course of the trial, their views of potential benefits and concerns of ticketing in general and, in the event of its statewide extension, their suggestions for changes or modifications.

Consultations were held separately for each agency and location, and were conducted at various points during the trial and after its completion.

Consultations in Brisbane were conducted earlier in the trial and included:

- QPS, Operational Performance Review (OPR) Unit (June 2009)
- QPS frontline officers (July 2009)
- ATSILS, Brisbane (August 2009)
Legal Aid Queensland, Brisbane (August 2009)
Homeless and Special Circumstances Court, Brisbane (July 2009)
Brisbane City Watchhouse (January 2010)

Townsville consultations were conducted after the completion of the trial (February 2010) and included the following groups:

- QPS officers involved in the trial in Townsville police division
- ATSILS, Townsville
- Legal Aid Queensland, Townsville
- Local government representatives, Townsville City Council.

**Queensland Police Service (QPS)**

The QPS provided two separate de-identified police-reported occurrence data files covering (1) the trial period and (2) the trial period and eight years preceding the trial.

**Trial Period Data File**—included occurrence, offender and officer information related to 1,618 tickets issued for eligible public nuisance and PPRA offences (see Table 1.1) from 1 January 2009 to 30 November 2009. These data included the demographic characteristics of ticketed persons—i.e., sex, age, Indigenous status and previous offending history; details of the occurrence—i.e., date, time and location of the offence, offence and action type (i.e., arrest or NTA); as well as a unique identifier for the issuing officer.

**Longitudinal Data File (2001 to 2009)**—included occurrence and offender information for (1) public nuisance and PPRA offences eligible for ticketing under the trial, (2) earlier offences which had been subsequently replaced by
Comparison sites

Comparison sites (North Brisbane, Brisbane Central, and Cairns districts) were selected in consultation with the QPS and were chosen for their similarity to trial districts based on size, urban/rural character, and relative proximity.

Queensland Transport

**Trial Period Data File**—Queensland Transport provided a de-identified data file including occurrence, offender and ticket information related to 2,200 tickets issued from 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2009. In addition, information on the payment status of tickets was available up to 31 January 2010.

---

4 The discrepancy between the number of tickets recorded by QPS and QT was due largely to differences in time periods covered—QT provided data for 12 months of the trial while QPS was able to provide an 11-month data file. For further discussion of this issue see the Limitations section in this chapter.
Table 2.1 Offences included in the longitudinal dataset are listed according to their QPS offence category with the relevant statute and section reference indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Offence/Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary Offences Act 2005</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public Nuisance Other - Summary Offences Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public Nuisance - Disorderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public Nuisance - Offensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public Nuisance - Threatening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public Urination²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public Nuisance - Language Offences Directed Toward Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6(1)</td>
<td>Public Nuisance - Violent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790(1)</td>
<td>Resist Arrest, Incite, Hinder or Obstruct Police Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>790(2) +40(1)</td>
<td>State False Name or Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vagrants Gaming and other Offences Act 1931</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7(E) &amp; 7(1)(E)</td>
<td>Disorderly Behaviour (replaced by Public Nuisance Offences in April 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A(2)(A) &amp; 7(1)(C) &amp; 7AA(3)(A)</td>
<td>Obscene, insulting, offence etc., language (replaced by Public Nuisance Offences in April 2004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7AA(1)</td>
<td>Public Nuisance Offences (introduced in April 2004)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criminal Code Act 1899</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Common Assault</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nb. Offences listed in the greyed out section are those which were eligible for ticketing under the 2009 Ticketing Trial.

1. Offence was transferred over to the Summary Offences Act in 2005.
2. In conjunction with the trial commencement in January 2009, the Queensland government introduced a new offence of public urination. Previously, public urination offences were recorded under the umbrella offences of public nuisance or wilful exposure. The maximum penalty for this offence is 2 penalty units ($200).
Data included available characteristics of ticketed persons—i.e., sex, age and suburb (Indigenous status was not recorded by Queensland Transport); characteristics of the occurrence—i.e., date, time and location of the offence, and offence type; characteristics of the ticket—i.e., payment status and final outcome (see Appendix 2 for details); and finally, the issuing officer’s station.

**Department of Justice and Attorney-General (JAG)**

*Longitudinal Data File* (2001 to 2009)—JAG provided a de-identified data file including occurrence, offender and court-related information for public nuisance and PPRA offences eligible for ticketing under the trial as well as earlier offences which were later replaced by those listed under the *Summary Offences Act 2005* (see Table 2.1). Offence occurrences were included in the longitudinal data set if the offence was one of those outlined in Table 2.1 and the matter was brought before a Queensland Magistrates Court between 1 January 2001 and 30 November 2009. The data set included offender characteristics—sex, age, Indigenous status, suburb of residence, and country of birth. In addition, the data provided occurrence characteristics including date, time and location of the offence, as well as the offence type (along with statute and section references). Information was also provided on the result of all related court appearances and type of court-ordered penalty (if found guilty and the matter was finalised).

*Murri Court Longitudinal Data File* (2007-2009)—JAG provided a de-identified data file containing information about adults appearing before the Murri Court whose charges included offences eligible for ticketing under the trial. The data represented all such matters over the three years of Murri Court operation (from January 2007) as recorded at the Evaluation Court sites (Brisbane, Caboolture, Rockhampton, Townsville and Mt Isa). Data included occurrence information pertaining to court jurisdiction and offence type (statute and section reference, only).
**Special Circumstances Court**—Consultation with JAG revealed that there were no instances of the eligible offences listed in Table 2.1 having been heard in the Special Circumstances Court. Therefore, Special Circumstances Court data are not reported here.

**Queensland Health**

**Trial Period Data File**—Data were obtained from Queensland Health pertaining to the mental health status of individuals who had a history of contact with Queensland Health Mental Health Services. QPS then matched these data to the QPS data spanning the period of 1 January 2001 to 30 November 2009, so that individuals with a history of mental health problems who were also charged with a public nuisance offence during this period could be flagged.

A final de-identified data file containing mental health status variables for ticketed individuals was then forwarded by QPS to the evaluators. The file contained a flag for history of contact with mental health services, the most recent contact with mental health services, and the history of a forensic order or involuntary committal in Queensland.

**State Penalties Enforcement Registry (SPER)**

**Trial Period Data File**—SPER provided a de-identified file including occurrence, offender, and fine/payment information related to tickets registered with SPER for eligible public nuisance and PPRA offences from 28 February 2009 to 17 November 2009. Given the lag between the date that tickets are issued and the date they are registered with SPER, the SPER trial data only included tickets pertaining to offences which occurred from 1 January to 29 June 2009. Offence data included the date, time and suburb of the offence and the offence type. Ticket recipient details included gender, date of birth, and residing suburb. Information was also provided regarding the fine amount, date registered with SPER, payment history and any enforcement action taken by SPER.
**Longitudinal Data File** (2005 to 2009)—included occurrence, offender, and fine/payment information related to all court-ordered fines registered with SPER for eligible public nuisance and PPRA offences from 15 May 2005 to 17 November 2009. Offence data included the date, time, and suburb of the offence and the offence type. Offender details included gender, date of birth, and suburb of residence. Information was also provided regarding the fine amount, date registered with SPER, payment history and any enforcement action taken by SPER (see Appendix 2 for more detailed information regarding SPER status and enforcement actions).

**Police Survey**

A 96-item survey was developed by the evaluation team to measure the opinions and experiences of officers involved in the administration of the ticketing trial in the South Brisbane and Townsville districts. During survey development the evaluation team consulted with officers from the South Brisbane District. Decisions regarding the content and structure of the survey were also based on consultations with QPS and the Department of Justice and Attorney General.

The survey (see Appendix 2) was administered online via the secure QPS intranet system. Officers were notified of the survey via email and completed an online consent process prior to commencing the survey itself. Although the survey was administered through QPS, the identity and information provided by respondents remained confidential. Officers were provided with a discrete timeframe (1 December to 22 December 2009) within which to complete the survey.

The survey was completed (at least partially) by 229 officers. Of these 229 officers, 170 were included in the final sample. Officers were excluded based on the following criteria:

1. Failed to indicate whether they served in the Townsville or South Brisbane district (Question 37 of survey).
2. Indicated that policing public nuisance was *not* a core part of their duties (Question 41);

AND indicated that they issued “0” Infringement notices for public nuisance offending in a typical week (Question 13);

AND had primary duties listed which would have limited their capacity to issue infringement Notices for public nuisance offending during the trial period (e.g., watchhouse duties; Inquiries).

Table 2.2 provides details of the officers within the two trial districts who formed part of the final sample.

**Table 2.2 Characteristics of QPS officers surveyed in the two trial districts.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane (N=42)</th>
<th>Townsville (N=128)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female (%)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of age (mean)</td>
<td>35.9 (23.0 – 50.0)</td>
<td>36.8 (22.0 – 58.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-secondary education (%)¹</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service</td>
<td>8.5 (1.0 – 33.0)</td>
<td>9.8 (1.0 – 41.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public nuisance offending forms part of their core duties (%) (yes)</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>91.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*nb.* Values in brackets next to the mean Years of age/ service are the range of values present within the two samples.

¹Post-secondary education includes Bachelors or Masters degrees; graduate certificates or diplomas; Tafe or Trade certificates; Tertiary certificates or diplomas.

**Economic Analysis of the ticketing trial**

We conducted an economic analysis of the ticketing trial by assessing the effect of the trial on QPS time and workload; on court workload; on workload and the
number of tickets processed by Queensland Transport; and on workload and the number of lodgements processed by the State Penalties Enforcement Registry (SPER) within the two trial districts. This information was then used to derive projected time and workload, and monetary costs and benefits of the trial if it had been implemented statewide in 2009. A detailed description of the economic analysis methodology is provided in Chapter 6 and further details are given in Appendices 6.b and 6.c.

2.2 Limitations

The data described above and presented throughout this report are subject to limitations which are summarised below but also raised at various points throughout remaining chapters.

Most of the quantitative analyses in this evaluation are based on information from the operational databases of criminal justice and other government agencies. It is the administration of programs, rather than research, that is the primary goal of these databases and as result they presented some limitations with respect to the analysis presented in this report.

Other limitations arose as a result of the limited scope of time following the completion of the trial (31 December 2009) for agencies to compile the necessary data and for the evaluators analyse and report on these data. In addition, the evaluation commenced mid-trial, and as a result it was not possible collect baseline information (i.e., prior to the trial) from police survey respondents and stakeholders involved in the consultations.

Specific limitations include:

- QPS began recording public nuisance offences types (i.e., public urination, public nuisance - disorder, public nuisance – violent, etc.) at the commencement of the trial on 1 January 2009; however, this information was not available for periods prior to the trial. Consequently, it was not
possible to examine changes in rates of different public nuisance offence types over time.

- Due to differences in QPS and court (JAG) coding of offence data and changes in the relevant legislation over the 9-year period examined, some discrepancy in rates of public nuisance and PPRA offending between court and QPS data may exist.

- There was a discrepancy between the number of tickets recorded by QPS and Queensland Transport which was primarily due to differences in time periods covered by the two agencies—Queensland Transport data covered the full 12 months of the trial whereas QPS data only extended to 30 November 2009. However, there were some differences in the counts produced by the two agencies over and above differences resulting from their respective periods of coverage. An examination of the same time period for each dataset showed that Queensland Transport data included 260 tickets not appearing in the QPS data—a discrepancy of about 7% which is likely due to differences in coding between the two agencies.

- Based on the current court data obtained from JAG, we are unable to determine whether an individual has pleaded guilty, not guilty or has failed to submit a plea in approximately 32% of public nuisance offence cases which were heard before a Magistrate. This limitation is elaborated further in section 7.4 Potential Justice Issues.

**Chapter Summary**

This chapter presented information on the data sources accessed, the methodological procedures employed, and the limitations encountered for the Queensland public nuisance ticketing trial evaluation. The next chapter provides an overview of the trial period.
Chapter 3—Overview of the trial period: The nature and extent of ticketing for public nuisance

A primary goal of this evaluation was to describe the trial period itself. We use QPS, Queensland Transport, and Police Survey data to describe the frequency, distribution and timing of ticketing during the trial, the types of offences for which tickets were issued, the characteristics of those who were issued tickets, and the final payment outcomes for tickets. In this and subsequent chapters we also consider differences between the two districts in the trial.

3.1 How many tickets were issued and where?

Ticketing rates in the two districts

Overall during the period, from 1 January to 30 November, 2009 a total of 1,618 tickets were issued to 1,490 individuals.

Results showed variation in the frequency and distribution of tickets across districts and time periods. Of the 1,618 tickets issued, the majority, 61%, (n = 991) were issued in the Townsville district, and the remaining 39% (n = 627) were issued in the South Brisbane district.

---

5 The results presented in this section are based on QPS data from the first 11 months of the ticketing trial—1 January, 2009 to 30 November 2009.
The tickets were issued at a rate of 310 per 100,000 people living in the two districts. The rate was nearly twice as high in Townsville—408 tickets per 100,000 people—as in South Brisbane—225 tickets per 100,000 people.

Townsville district is composed of 24 police divisions. During the pilot, 7 of these divisions issued no tickets at all; and the remaining 17 divisions (71%), issued tickets ranging from 1 to 607. The majority of all Townsville district tickets were issued in the Townsville division—607 tickets, or 61% of the district total, followed by the Kirwan division (n = 73, 7%) and Mundingburra division (n = 50, 5%, see Appendix 3). Among the eight divisions in the South Brisbane district, the largest proportion of tickets were issued in the West End and Dutton Park divisions, which accounted for 55% (n = 347) and 32% (n = 200) of tickets, respectively (see Appendix 3).

3.2 When were tickets issued?

Peaks in the monthly rate of ticketing

Figure 3.1 shows the monthly variation in the rate of tickets issued in the two districts.

With the exception of a peak in April, a month in which there were three public holidays and four rounds of NRL league games, South Brisbane showed a gradually increasing monthly rate over the course of the trial. The average monthly rate in this district was 57 tickets per 100,000 residents, and ranged from a low of 33 tickets in February to a high of 105 tickets in November, when, for the first time, the South Brisbane rate surpassed the monthly Townsville rate.

In this study, rates per 100,000 residential population are calculated using the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) Census population estimates for the specified areas. Annual census counts are based on the residential population in June 2001 and 2006. Where specified, estimates for other years were provided by the QPS.
In Townsville the average monthly rates were approximately 90 tickets per 100,000 people; however, there was a relatively large fluctuation in this rate with peaks in January, May and July (113, 110 and 133 tickets issued per 100,000 people, respectively), and a low in June (57 tickets per 100,000 people). The peaks in May and July coincide with a number of recreation and entertainment events held in Townsville—e.g., in May 2009 the Groovin’ the Moo Music Festival, two Cowboys home games, and a Full Moon party on Magnetic Island—and in July 2009, the 400 V8 Race, an A Series four-day cricket test match, a Full Moon party, and two Cowboys home games.

*Figure 3.1 Tickets issue per 100,000 population per month during the trial period by district*

![Figure 3.1](source: QPS data)

**High volume days of the week**

Higher volume days were correlated with peak times for recreation, and patronage of bars and nightclubs. The majority of offences for which tickets were
issued occurred on weekends. This was particularly the case in Townsville where three-quarters (76%) of offences occurred on a Friday, Saturday or Sunday. In South Brisbane about two-thirds (67%) occurred on the same days. In both districts, the lowest volume days of the week were Monday (4.7%) and Tuesday (3.5%).

Although there is also a possible association between peak rates of ticketing and the number of officers available to issue tickets, we were limited in our ability to determine the total number of rostered officers at any given time. However, information from consultations suggested that this may be the case. In the Townsville district, for example, stakeholders indicated that within the City of Townsville, public nuisance offences could be high on Tuesday nights as a result of discounted alcohol nights at bars and nightclubs near the Flinders Street Mall. However, Tuesday nights also have typically fewer rostered officers dedicated to the area, which may explain the lower proportion of tickets issued on this day. One challenge is that the day of the week analysis includes the entire Townsville district, which is large and extends beyond of the city of Townsville.

**Peak times of the day**

There was also variation in the hour of the day at which ticketed offences tended to occur. On average, the greatest proportion of offences occurred in the late evening and early morning hours—this was consistent across districts. In Townsville, two-thirds of ticketed offences (67%) occurred between 11:00 PM and 5:00 AM, and in South Brisbane, a similar proportion (66%) occurred between 10:00 PM and 4:00 AM. Peak hourly offence rates were typically at 1:00 AM in Townsville (60 ticketed offences per 100,000 people) and at 10:00 PM in South Brisbane (34 ticketed offences per 100,000 people) (Figure 3.2).
Figure 3.2 Tickets issued per 100,000 population per hour of the day during the trial period by district

![Graph showing tickets issued per 100,000 population per hour of the day during the trial period by district.](image-url)

Source: QPS data

3.3 How often were eligible offences ticketed?

Across both districts, the two highest volume offences were public urination (38%) and public nuisance—disorderly (29%)—together accounting for two-thirds of the 1,618 ticketed offences during the trial (see Appendix 3).

Figure 3.3 shows that public urination offences represented the majority—well over one-half (58%)—of tickets issued in South Brisbane, and about one-quarter of those issued in Townsville. Public nuisance – disorderly behaviour offences accounted for the highest proportion of Townsville tickets (34%) and about one-fifth (20%) of those issued in South Brisbane.
Together, public nuisance – violent behaviour, offensive behaviour, language, and threatening offences made up a higher proportion of tickets issued in Townsville (34%) than in South Brisbane (17%).

Tickets for two PPRA offences—(1) resist arrest, incite, hinder, obstruct and (2) state false name or address—accounted for similar proportions of tickets issued in Townsville and South Brisbane (6% and 5%, respectively).

**Figure 3.3 Proportion of tickets per offence type by district**

3.4 **How many tickets were issued as a proportion of all action types for public nuisance offences in 2009?**

During the trial, there were a total of 4,945 actions for all public nuisance offences within the ticketing trial offence criteria. The rate at which tickets were issued for these offences—as opposed to actions including arrests, notices to appear, or ‘other action types’ such as warrants and cautions—varied across districts (see Figure 3.4). Tickets were issued for the greatest proportion (41%)
of public nuisance offences in South Brisbane, whereas, arrests were made in the greatest proportion (47%) of these offences in Townsville.

**Figure 3.4 Proportion of action types for public nuisance offences in Townsville and South Brisbane districts, 2009**

Figure 3.5 and 3.6 shows the distribution of ticketing, arrest and notice to appear actions for eligible offence types within South Brisbane and Townsville. Ticketing accounted for higher proportions of all offences in South Brisbane. In both districts, ticketing was the most frequent action for public urination. In fact, in South Brisbane, ticketing was used for 96% of public urination offences, NTAs were issued for 4% of offences and arrest was used in only one instance over the course of the trial period.

Arrest was the most common action take for a greater number of offence types in Townsville than South Brisbane. The proportion of arrests surpassed tickets and NTAs in Townsville for public nuisance – offensive behaviour, language offences, disorderly behaviour and threatening behaviour offences. In South Brisbane, arrests surpassed other action types for public nuisance – violent and threatening behaviour offences only.
**Figure 3.5** Proportion of action types for selected public nuisance offences, South Brisbane district, 2009
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Source: QPS

**Figure 3.6** Proportion of action types for selected public nuisance offences, Townsville district, 2009

![Proportion of action types for selected public nuisance offences, Townsville district, 2009](image)

Source: QPS
### 3.5 *How did the number of tickets issued vary among officers?*

A total of 360 officers issued 1,618 tickets during the trial—Townsville had a larger share of these officers (68%, n = 246) than South Brisbane (32%, n = 114).

Officers typically issued tickets on more than one occasion—71% issued two or more tickets, while the remaining 29% (n = 105) of officers issued only one ticket.

The average number of tickets issued per officer was higher in South Brisbane—5.5 tickets per officer with a range of 1 to 56 tickets—than Townsville—4.0 tickets per officer with a range of 1 to 28 tickets.

### 3.6 *Repeat ticketing: How many people were issued more than one ticket during the trial?*

To assess whether individuals received multiple tickets in one or more occurrences during the trial we counted unique ticketed persons using the QPS data.

Figure 3.7 illustrates the rate of repeat ticketing during the trial. Across both districts, a total of 1,490 people were issued one or more tickets during the first 11 months of the trial. The largest proportion of these people (92%, n = 1,372) were issued only one ticket, and the remainder were issued either two (7%, n = 21) or three (< 1%, n = 10) tickets (see Appendix 3).

The rate of unique individuals who were issued tickets was higher in Townsville—370 people per 100,000 population—than in South Brisbane—212 people per 100,000 population. In addition, the proportion of ticketed people who were issued multiple tickets over the course of the trial was about two times higher in Townsville (10%) than in South Brisbane (5%).
Those who were issued more than one ticket during the trial received them either (a) within the same incident, (b) during different incidents, or (c), in relatively few cases, in both of these situations (See Appendix 3).

Overall, roughly 4% of ticketed persons were issued tickets over the course of different occurrences. This proportion was higher in Townsville (6%) than in South Brisbane (2%).

![Figure 3.7 Rate of repeat ticketing during the trial](image)

Figure 3.7 Rate of repeat ticketing during the trial

1. Percentage of ticketed people who received tickets during more than one incident during the trial. Source: QPS

3.7 Who was issued a ticket during the trial?

Although there was some variation between the districts, people issued tickets during the trial tended to be relatively young—a majority between 18 and 25 years—and male. Indigenous people were overrepresented, based on population, as ticketed persons.

The following analyses are based on unique ticketed persons—or the 1,490 individuals who received one or more tickets during the trial.
Gender

Overall, males accounted for a much larger proportion (89%) of ticketed persons than did females (11%). However, the proportion of females who were issued tickets was larger in Townsville than in South Brisbane. Specifically, the rate of ticketed females was about five times higher in Townsville—124 per 100,000 females—than South Brisbane—24 per 100,000 females. Males in Townsville were ticketed at a rate—718 per 100,000 males—that was about one and one-half times higher than the male rate in South Brisbane—447 per 100,000 males.

Age

The mean age of those who were issued tickets in the two districts was just under 26 years, and ranged from 14 to 79 years (SD = 8.9 years). Ticketed persons were slightly younger, on average, in Townsville (26 years) than in South Brisbane (27 years).

Although juvenile offenders are excluded from the QPS ticketing option (and SPER cannot enforce tickets to juveniles), 22 juveniles—under 17 years—were issued tickets which accounted for less than 2% of the total number of ticketed persons. Ticketed juveniles were distributed equally across the two districts. It was not possible to determine whether the juveniles who appeared in the QPS data represented an error in data entry or the actual age of ticketed persons.

In both districts the rate of ticketed persons reached a peak in the late teenage years (see Figure 3.8). One-half of those issued tickets within each district were between the ages of 18 and 25 years.
**Indigenous status**

Indigenous status was reported for the majority (97%) of ticketed persons during the trial. Overall, Indigenous people were ticketed at a rate that was about five times higher than non-Indigenous people (Figure 3.9). Across both districts, Indigenous people were ticketed at a rate of 1,290 per 100,000 Indigenous population. In contrast, the rate for non-Indigenous people was 251 tickets per 100,000 non-Indigenous population (see Appendix 3). For further context regarding the rate of ticketing for Indigenous people, see Chapter 7.1 in this report.

In absolute terms, the Indigenous rate was higher in Townsville—1,387 per 100,000 Indigenous population—than in South Brisbane—933 per 100,000 Indigenous population. However, this difference was due in part to the higher rate of ticketing overall in Townsville. In Townsville, the Indigenous rate was four times higher than the non-Indigenous rate, while in South Brisbane the Indigenous rate was just over five times higher.
Indigenous ticketed persons were older on average than their non-Indigenous counterparts—particularly in South Brisbane, where the mean age for Indigenous people who were issued tickets was 32 years in contrast to 26 years for non-Indigenous people.

Greater proportions of ticketed females in each district were Indigenous than was the case for ticketed males. In Townsville, 42% of ticketed females were Indigenous compared to about 18% of ticketed males. In South Brisbane Indigenous people accounted for 23% of ticketed females and 5% of ticketed males.

Indigenous offenders were more likely to have been issued multiple tickets. This was particularly the case in South Brisbane where one in five (20%) Indigenous offenders were issued two or three tickets over the course of the trial, compared to about one in 20 (5%) non-Indigenous offenders.
Criminal history

Over one-half (54%) of those who were issued tickets during the trial had at least one previous offence. Using the available QPS data it was possible to examine the categories of previous offences for ticketed people, but not the count of these offences. Categories included offences against the person, property offences, drug offences, and public nuisances offences.

Figure 3.10 illustrates the proportion of ticketed offenders with a history of prior offending. Among those who had recorded previous offences, 41% had offences in only one category, and remaining 59% had more diverse criminal histories with recorded offences in more than one offence category. Slightly higher proportions of Townsville ticketed persons had recorded offences. Overall, public nuisance offences were most commonly recorded in both districts, followed by property offences, offences against the person, and drug offences.
Offender characteristics for each offence type

There was some variation in offender characteristics across the different offence types. Non-Indigenous males were issued a greater share of public urination tickets than their total representation across all tickets (Figure 3.11). Indigenous people exceeded their total share of tickets for all offence types with the exception of public urination. Females exceeded their total share of tickets for all offence types with the exception of ‘public nuisance – violent’ and public urination offences.

Figure 3.11 Proportion of ticketed public nuisance offence types for Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders, 2009

Source: QPS

% within racial category
Overall, Indigenous people were issued 16% of tickets during the trial. They exceed this share for all ticket offence types with the exception of Public Urination for which their share was 6%.

3.8 What were the ticket payment outcomes?

Queensland Transport provided information about the final payment status—as of January 31, 2010—for 2,200 tickets issued during the trial. The largest proportion of tickets in both districts were in default of payment and had been registered with SPER for enforcement (i.e., a Default Certificate)—56% of tickets in Townsville and 51% of tickets in South Brisbane (Figure 3.12). Ticketed persons were in default if they had not paid, elected to register for the Voluntary Instalment Plan, or elected to have the matter dealt with by a court within 28 days of the date of the ticket.

Payment was the second most common final status in both districts. Just over one-third (35%) of tickets issued in South Brisbane and 29% of those issued in Townsville had been paid by January 31, 2009. The proportion of tickets paid fluctuated slightly over the months of the trial—ranging from a low of 24% for those ticketed in February to high of 36% for those ticketed in September.

Tickets were issued and awaiting further action at Queensland Transport in about 7% of cases in Townsville and 9% in South Brisbane. If ticket amounts were over $200, and an initial instalment of $60 could be made within 28 days of the date of the ticket, ticketed persons could elect to register for the Voluntary Instalment Plan (VIP). This occurred for about 5% of tickets in Townsville and 3% in South Brisbane.

7 It should be noted that tickets have a rolling status and ‘awaiting further action’ may be indicative of their status in the cycle when the data was obtained.
For the remaining 3% of tickets in both districts a variety of final status types were recorded including: (1) rejected by SPER and sent back to Queensland Transport for further processing, (2) waived, suspended or voided, or (3) listed with QPS to commence prosecution against the person. Over the course of the trial there were a total of 24 tickets, or 1% of the total, for which the ticketed person elected to have the matter dealt with by court.

Figure 3.12 Distribution of payment outcomes for tickets issued during the trial as of January 31, Queensland Transport data, 2010

1. Default Certificate (DC) has been accepted and registered with SPER.
2. Ticket has been issued and is awaiting further action.
3. Voluntary Instalment Plan (VIP) application accepted and registered with SPER.
4. Includes all other final status types, VIP or DC rejected by SPER, ticket was waived, suspended or voided, and ticket listed with QPS to commence prosecutions against ticketed person.

Source: Queensland Transport

To assess payment status and outcomes at the level of SPER, we examined tickets registered with SPER, for a one-month period, between the 1st and 31st of March 2009. This provided a minimum of seven months between the SPER registration
date and the data extraction date—for the purposes of this evaluation, SPER was able to provide complete data up to the 15 November 2009.

A total of 182 public nuisance tickets had been registered with SPER in March 2009. By 15 November 2009, payment had been finalised for 15% of these tickets, and for a further 26% of tickets, individuals had entered into an instalment payment plan with SPER (Figure 3.13).

Figure 3.13 SPER payment/status outcomes, 2009

SPER had taken enforcement action against individuals for a total of 15% of tickets. In most cases (12%) this involved suspension of an individual's driver's licence. Other enforcement types had been issued in 3% of cases. These included enforcement warrants, fine collection notices and warrants of apprehension which (for definitions of SPER status types see Appendix 2).

The largest proportion (43%) of individuals had a reported SPER status of “no current action.” This status indicates that SPER contact with the ticketed person
had been attempted or had commenced; however, payment had not been finalised, nor had some other enforcement action been initiated.

3.9 *Are ticketed individuals directed to the watchhouse or moved-on from the scene?*

Results from the Police Survey indicated that the reported proportion of individuals transported to the watchhouse prior to being issued a ticket varied between the Townsville and South Brisbane districts. On average, Townsville officers indicated that 22% of individuals to whom they had issued tickets during the last 30 days had been transported to the watchhouse prior to being issued a ticket. However, reported proportions varied substantially between officers (from 0% to 100%), with 57% of Townsville officers indicating there had not been any such occasions during the last 30 days.

The proportion of transported individuals was much smaller in South Brisbane where, on average, officers indicated that only about 5% of individuals were moved to the watchhouse prior to issuing a ticket. Again, this varied substantially (from 0% to 100%) between officers; with most officers (83%) indicating that during the last 30 days there had been no occasions where they had transported an individual to the watchhouse prior to issuing a ticket. When asked to provide typical reasons why they would transport an individual to the watchhouse prior to issuing a ticket, Townsville and South Brisbane officers indicated the following:

- offender was violent (33% and 41%, respectively),
- to stop the continuation of the offence (41% and 50%, respectively),
- offender was highly intoxicated (30% and 20%, respectively), and
- offender was uncooperative (6% and 19%, respectively).
What proportion of public nuisance related Infringement Notices are accompanied by a move-on direction?

Officers surveyed in the Townsville and South Brisbane district were asked to provide an estimated percentage in relation to the following question: “Over the last 30 days, out of the Infringement Notices you have issued for public nuisance offences, what proportion have been accompanied by a move-on direction?”

In both the South Brisbane and Townsville districts, the average estimated proportion of tickets accompanied by a move-on direction was 38% (ranging from 0% to 100% across officers in both districts).

3.10 Summary of findings

This chapter provided an overview of the trial period based on information from a variety of data sources. The key findings were:

- Tickets were issued at a rate of 310 per 100,000 people living in the two districts. The rate was nearly twice as high in Townsville—408 tickets per 100,000 people—as in South Brisbane—225 tickets per 100,000 people.
- Ticketing was concentrated geographically. The majority of tickets were issued within a small number of divisions located near the Townville and Brisbane CBDs. Ticketing was also concentrated at certain times. There was monthly and daily variation in the rate of ticketing, which can be partially explained by peak times for recreation and use of nightclubs and bars in both cities.
- There was variation in the volume of tickets issued for each of the nine eligible offences. Across both districts, public urination and disorderly offences represented the majority, together accounting for two-thirds of all tickets issued in the trial.
An examination of different action types used for all public nuisance offences that occurred during the trial revealed that ticketing was the most frequently used action type for public nuisance offending in South Brisbane, whereas arrest was most frequently used in Townsville.

Although there was some variation between the districts, people issued tickets during the trial tended to be relatively young—a majority were between 18 and 25 years—and male.

Indigenous people were overrepresented as ticketed individuals. Overall, they were ticketed at a rate that was about five times higher than non-Indigenous people (see Chapter 7.1 for context).

Ticketed persons tended to have prior criminal histories. Over one-half of those issued tickets had at least one previous offence.

The majority of tickets issued during the trial were in default of payment one month following the trial—56% of tickets in Townsville and 51% of tickets in South Brisbane. Tickets were paid in roughly one-third of cases overall, though this was slightly lower in Townsville (29%) than in South Brisbane (35%). For a further 4% of tickets overall, individuals elected to pay through the Voluntary Instalment Plan.

A very small proportion (1%) of those who were issued a ticket during the trial elected to contest the ticket by having the matter dealt with by the court.

In some cases officers transported people to the watchhouse before issuing a ticket. This occurred more frequently in Townsville (22%) than in South Brisbane (5%). The rationales provided by police for moving individuals to the watchhouse included: calming violent offenders, stopping the continuation of an offence, and highly intoxicated and/or uncooperative offenders.

Police indicated that tickets were accompanied with move-on directions in over one-third of cases (38%).
Chapter 4 – Exploring the effectiveness of ticketing for public nuisance offending

The current chapter addresses the following key questions pertaining to the effectiveness of ticketing for public nuisance offending:

- Has ticketing resulted in an increase in enforcement action?
- Has ticketing been effective in diverting people from the criminal justice system, reflected in a reduction in public nuisance-related arrest and NTA rates?
- Are Infringement Notices effective as a deterrent against public nuisance re-offending?
- Has ticketing for public nuisance offending impacted on police service delivery?
- Has ticketing for public nuisance offending improved community safety/public order?

For each of these questions we considered evidence derived from data obtained from a survey of officers within the two trial districts, and administrative data obtained from QPS. We considered trends over time and also compared trends in the two trial districts with those observed in similar comparison sites (i.e., Cairns as a comparison site for Townsville and North Brisbane and Brisbane Central as comparison sites for South Brisbane), as well as statewide trends.
4.1 Has ticketing resulted in an increase in enforcement action?

Police Survey

The majority of South Brisbane officers and half of Townsville officers surveyed indicated that the availability of Infringement Notices had enabled them to respond to more incidents of public nuisance offending than previously.

Seventy percent (70%) of South Brisbane officers and 50% of Townville officers expressed some level of agreement with the following statement: “Now that Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences are available I am able to respond to more incidents of public nuisance offending than previously”. Fifteen percent of South Brisbane officers and 17% of Townville officers disagreed with this statement. A large proportion (33%) of Townville officers remained undecided on this issue.

However, when the same issue was framed in the following way: “Now that Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences are an option, I am taking more formal action for more public nuisance offences than before”, smaller proportions of South Brisbane (43%) and Townville (27%) officers expressed agreement. A large proportion of officers in both districts indicated that they were undecided regarding their agreement or disagreement with this statement (40% in South Brisbane and 43% in Townsville).

Footnote: Formal action refers to either arresting an individual, issuing an NTA or issuing an Infringement Notice.
Administrative Data

Findings reported in this section are based on administrative data supplied by QPS pertaining to the rate of public nuisance, PPRA and common assault offences from 1 January 2001 through to 31 December 2009.

Findings show the effect of the ticketing scheme on overall public nuisance offending rates. Results are reported separately for the two trial districts.

South Brisbane

Figure 4.1 displays the rate of public nuisance offending within South Brisbane, North Brisbane and Queensland from 2001 to 2009. Over the period, there was a generally increasing trend in the rate of public nuisance offending in South

**Figure 4.1 Rate of public nuisance offending, South Brisbane, North Brisbane districts and Queensland, 2001-2009**

Public nuisance offence, arrest, and NTA rates reported in this section include offences for which tickets could be issued under terms of the ticketing trial, this includes certain PPRA offences. See Table 1.1 for specific details of the offences included.

Juveniles (under 17 years of age) were not included in these offending rates as ticketing for public nuisance offending only applies to those individuals aged 17 years and older.
Brisbane that was paralleled in North Brisbane and Queensland as a whole. The percent change in rates from 2001 to 2009 (with 2001 as a baseline) is presented for South Brisbane, North Brisbane and Brisbane Central in Figure 4.2. The figure shows a 21% increase in the rate of public nuisance offending in South Brisbane from 2008 to 2009. Rates also rose slightly in North Brisbane, but only by 3%. In contrast, from 2008 to 2009 there was a slight decrease (7%) in rates of public nuisance offending in Brisbane Central. Statewide, public nuisance offending rates rose slightly, with a 3% increase from 2008 to 2009. Although Figure 4.2 displays a general upward trend in public nuisance offending within the South Brisbane district from 2001 to 2009, the 21% increase observed in 2008 to 2009 is substantially larger than increases observed in the two preceding years (12% for both 2006 to 2007 and 2007 to 2008).

**Figure 4.2 Percent change in the rate of public nuisance offending, South Brisbane, North Brisbane and Brisbane Central districts, 2001-2009**
To determine whether the increase in public nuisance offending in South Brisbane was mirrored in other related offences not part of the ticketing trial, the change in rates for common assault over this nine-year period were also examined. Figure 4.3 displays the percent change in common assault rates in South Brisbane, North Brisbane and Brisbane Central from 2001 to 2009, with 2001 as a baseline. As illustrated, there was an increase (17%) in common assault rates in the South Brisbane district from 2008 to 2009. In contrast, rates of common assault in both Brisbane Central and North Brisbane districts evidenced a small decline during this period (2% and 5%, respectively).

Overall, there was a marked increase in the rate of public nuisance offending in South Brisbane from 2008 to 2009. The size of this increase was not seen in statewide trends, or in the two comparison districts. It was also larger than the increases observed in the South Brisbane district in recent years.

This increase may be due to a heightened police response to incidents of public nuisance within South Brisbane resulting from the introduction of ticketing as an additional option for dealing with these offences. The fact that both public nuisance and common assault rates increased in the South Brisbane district is consistent with the view derived from the police survey and consultations with police that the availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending...
increases the number of police “on the street” at any given time, thus providing officers with more opportunities to detect public nuisance and related offences such as common assault. 9

**Figure 4.3** Percent change in the rate of common assault, South Brisbane, North Brisbane and Brisbane Central districts, 2001-2009

![Graph showing percent change in the rate of common assault](image)

Source: QPS

**Townsville**

Figure 4.4 displays the rate of public nuisance offending within the Townsville and Cairns districts in relation to Queensland-wide trends from 2001 to 2009. As illustrated, there has been a general upward trend in public nuisance offending rates over this period in the Townsville district, similar to statewide trends.

9 See comment on page 12 with respect to increases in police actions regarding public nuisance offending and the issue of net-widening.
Cairns saw a drop in public nuisance offending rates from 2001 to 2003 but rates, but a generally increasing rate since then. From 2008 to 2009, Townsville experienced a 22% increase in public nuisance offending. Rates also rose in Cairns by 12% during this period. Both rates were higher than the statewide trend which, as noted previously, increased by a relatively modest 3% from 2008 to 2009.

The rise in public nuisance offending seen in the Townsville district from 2008 to 2009 was also larger than the two preceding years for which there were modest increases of 2% from 2006 to 2007 and 8% from 2007 to 2008. A large increase in public nuisance offending (35%) was observed in the Townsville district from 2005 to 2006. However, a similar rise in public nuisance offending during this period was also seen in the Cairns (27%) district, suggesting a common, regional cause. In contrast, the increase in public nuisance offending seen in the Townsville district during the trial period was markedly larger than that observed in the Cairns district, suggesting that the Townsville increase is at least partly driven by the introduction of ticketing scheme.

**Figure 4.4 Rate of public nuisance offending, Townsville, Cairns districts, and Queensland, 2001-2009**
To determine whether the increase in public nuisance offending in Townsville was mirrored in other related offences not part of the ticketing trial, the change in rates for common assault over this nine year period was also examined. Figure 4.5 displays the percent change in common assault rates in the Townsville and Cairns districts from 2001 to 2009 with 2001 as a baseline. As illustrated in Figure 4.5, there has been a steady decline in rates of common assault since 2006 in Townsville. This has been accompanied by a similar decline in common assault rates in Cairns. Thus, unlike the pattern observed in South Brisbane, the increase in public nuisance offending in Townsville was not accompanied by an increase in related offences, suggesting that the increase may be associated with greater

**Figure 4.5 Percent change in the rate of common assault, Townsville and Cairns districts, 2001-2009**

Source: QPS
detection of public nuisance related offences and/or the issuance of a ticket for incidents of public nuisance offending which would have previously been overlooked. However, note that a smaller, yet sizeable increase in public nuisance offending was also observed in Cairns during the trial period, suggesting that the rise in Townsville rates may be partly driven by regional increases in public nuisance offending.

4.2 Effectiveness as a means of diverting people from the criminal justice system.

Police Survey
Approximately half of the South Brisbane and Townsville district officers surveyed indicated that the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending led to a reduction in their use of NTAs and arrest rates in response to incidents of public nuisance.

Surveyed officers were asked to indicate whether the introduction of Infringement Notices had affected their use of other responses to public nuisance offending, such as issuing a caution, issuing an NTA, or making an arrest. As illustrated in Figures 4.6 and 4.7, over one-half of the officers surveyed in the South Brisbane district felt that the introduction of the ticketing scheme led to a reduction in their rate of arrests and use of NTAs in response to incidents of public nuisance (64% reported a reduction for NTAs and 59% for arrest). A somewhat smaller proportion of officers in Townsville reported a reduction in their use of NTAs and arrest in dealing with public nuisance offending since the start of the ticketing trial (53% and 44%, respectively).

10 Offence type (e.g., public urination, public nuisance disorderly offences, etc) was only recorded by QPS at this level of detail during the trial period; as a result comparisons with previous years were not possible.
**Figure 4.6** Proportion of surveyed officers who felt that ticketing had decreased, increased, or had no impact on their use of NTAs as a response to public nuisance offending
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*Source: Police Survey*

**Figure 4.7** Proportion of surveyed officers who felt that ticketing had decreased, increased, or had no impact on their use of arrest as a response to public nuisance offending

![Bar chart showing the proportion of surveyed officers who felt that ticketing had decreased, increased, or had no impact on their use of arrest as a response to public nuisance offending.]

*Source: Police Survey*
Very few officers in either district reported an increase in their use of NTAs or arrest rates for public nuisance offending since the start of the trial (3% to 4%, respectively). It is also worth noting that across both districts, the reported use of NTAs appears to have been most affected by the introduction of the ticketing scheme.

**Administrative Data**

Findings reported in this section are based on administrative data supplied by QPS pertaining to the rate of public nuisance and PPRA offences from 1 January 2001 through to 31 December 2009.

The analysis examines the effect of the ticketing trial on police use of various responses to public nuisance. In particular, results show whether the introduction of ticketing was associated with changes in police use of arrest, NTAs or other responses to public nuisance offending. Results are reported separately for the two trial districts.

**South Brisbane**

Figure 4.8 presents the proportion of public nuisance offences in the South Brisbane District that were responded to by issuing a ticket, issuing an NTA, making an arrest, or some other course of action (e.g., drug or drunk diversion) in 2008 and 2009. As indicated, during 2009, South Brisbane officers responded to 42% of public nuisance offences by issuing a ticket. This was associated with a marked reduction in the proportion of both arrests and NTAs but had no effect on the proportion of other action types.
It was also of interest to examine whether this reduction in the overall proportion of public nuisance arrests and NTAs was also seen when changes in the rate of arrests, NTAs, tickets and other action types were examined. As illustrated in Figures 4.9 and 4.10 the rate of arrests and NTAs for public nuisance offences in South Brisbane have shown a generally increasing trend over the past nine years. Both arrest and NTA rates exhibited a marked decline from 2008 to 2009. Arrests dropped by 27% and NTAs by 35%. In contrast, the rate of arrests and NTAs for public nuisance offences in North Brisbane showed a small increase during this period (2% and 3%, respectively).

Statewide, the change in rates of arrests and NTAs for public nuisance offending during this period was also relatively minor, with arrest rates decreasing 6% and NTA rates increasing 5%. As illustrated in Figures 4.9 and 4.10, the marked reduction in arrests and NTAs in South Brisbane could not be accounted for by trends in recent years, particularly for NTAs, for which the two preceding years...
saw a marked rate increase (19% for 2006 to 2007 and 34% for 2007 to 2008). In the Brisbane Central district (see Appendix 4 for additional data), arrest and NTA rates also declined somewhat (9% and 7%, respectively) from 2008 to 2009, but again this reduction was minor relative to that seen in South Brisbane.

In sum, there was a marked reduction in public nuisance related arrest and NTA rates in South Brisbane during the ticketing trial. Comparison to other districts and preceding years suggests that this reduction may be largely due to the choice, by South Brisbane officers during the trial, to issue a ticket to individuals who they previously would have arrested or issued an NTA. This is particularly apparent in relation to NTAs which evidenced the most marked reduction in rate.

Figure 4.9 Rate of arrests for public nuisance offending, South Brisbane, North Brisbane districts, and Queensland, 2001-2009
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Townsville

Figure 4.11 illustrates the proportion of public nuisance offences in the Townsville district that were responded to by issuing a ticket, issuing an NTA, making an arrest, or using some other course of action (e.g., drug or drunk diversion) in 2008 and 2009. During 2009, Townsville district officers responded to 28% of recorded public nuisance offences by issuing a ticket. This resulted in a reduction in the relative proportion of both public nuisance-related arrests and NTAs from 2008 to 2009 without affecting the relative proportion of other action types.

Although there was a drop in the proportion of public nuisance-related arrests in the Townsville district, there was no change in the rate of arrests during this period (see Figure 4.12). In contrast, the rate of public nuisance related arrests in the Cairns district rose by 15%.

Source: QPS
Figure 4.11 Proportion of public nuisance offences as a function of action type: Arrest, NTA, Ticket or Other action type, Townsville district, 2008-2009

Figure 4.13 displays the rate of public nuisance related NTAs during the trial period in the Townsville and Cairns districts relative to the statewide average. As illustrated, there was a marked reduction (30%) in public nuisance related NTAs in the Townsville District during the trial period. In contrast, both the Cairns district and the statewide average trends exhibited an increase (9% and 5%, respectively) in the rate of public-nuisance related NTAs during the same period.

In sum, the introduction of Infringement Notices as an option for policing public nuisance offences in the Townsville district led to a reduction in the use of NTAs, suggesting that during the trial officers began ticketing individuals to whom they would have previously issued an NTA. In contrast, whilst the relative proportion of public nuisance-related arrests declined during the trial period, the overall rate of arrests remained the same from 2008 to 2009. The absence of an effect in Townsville could, however, be related to a regional increase in public nuisance.
Figure 4.12 Rate of arrests for public nuisance offending, Townsville district, Cairns district and Queensland, 2001-2009

Source: QPS

Figure 4.13 Rate of NTAs for public nuisance offending in Townsville district, Cairns district and Queensland, 2001-2009

Source: QPS
arrest rates (15% increase in Cairns from 2008 to 2009) which may have negated an observable decrease resulting from the introduction of tickets.

4.3 Effectiveness as a deterrent against public nuisance re-offending

Police Survey

The vast majority of officers surveyed felt that ticketing was effective as an immediate penalty for illegal behaviour. However, when asked to consider public nuisance recidivism, less than one-half of the officers surveyed felt that ticketing was an effective deterrent against public nuisance re-offending.

Eighty-one percent (81%) of South Brisbane officers and 77% of Townsville officers expressed agreement with the view that Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending were effective in providing an immediate penalty for illegal behaviour.

When asked to consider their views prior to the commencement of the trial, 29% of South Brisbane officers and 30% of Townsville officers agreed with the view that Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences would be an effective deterrent against public nuisance re-offending in general. In contrast, 36% of South Brisbane officers and 41% of Townsville officers indicated that they disagreed with this view.

When asked to consider their current views, the number of officers supporting the view that Infringement Notices are an effective deterrent against public nuisance re-offending was still less than half (36% of South Brisbane officers and 42% of Townville officers). Furthermore, significantly more officers in South Brisbane (43%) expressed disagreement with this view than in Townsville (27%).
Finally, when current views were considered relative to views held prior to the commencement of the trial, there was a significant increase in support of the view that Infringement Notices were an effective deterrent against re-offending among Townsville officers but not among South Brisbane officers surveyed.

**Less than one-third of officers surveyed felt that Infringement Notifications were an effective deterrent against re-offending for individuals who have been affected by alcohol.**

Thirty percent (30%) of Townsville officers and 24% of South Brisbane officers surveyed expressed some level of agreement with the following statement: “Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences have been an effective deterrent against re-offending for offenders affected by alcohol”. The remainder of South Brisbane and Townsville officers either indicated that they disagreed with this statement (48% and 31%, respectively) or were undecided (29% and 39%, respectively).

**Just over a half of officers disagreed with the view that Infringement Notices provide a greater deterrent against re-offending than an arrest.**

In both South Brisbane and Townsville, 55% of officers surveyed expressed disagreement with the view that Infringement Notices provided a greater deterrent against re-offending than an arrest. Only 12% of South Brisbane officers and 13% of Townsville officers agreed with this view. Approximately one-third of officers in both districts were undecided (33% in both districts).

**Approximately one-half of South Brisbane officers and one-third of Townsville officers agreed that a Notice to Appear provided a greater deterrent against re-offending than an Infringement Notice.**
Officers were asked to consider the following view: “A Notice to Appear provides a greater deterrent against re-offending than an Infringement Notice”. Forty-eight percent (48%) of Brisbane officers and 36% of Townsville officers expressed some level of agreement with this statement. A smaller proportion of officers (22% and 24%, respectively) disagreed with this view, whilst 31% of South Brisbane and 40% of Townsville officers indicated that they were undecided.

Finally, when officers were asked to list any perceived limitations with the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending, approximately 10% of officers stated that Infringement Notices did not provide a large enough penalty or deterrent against public nuisance re-offending.

4.4 Implications for Police Service Delivery

Police Survey

- General Impressions

The vast majority of officers surveyed felt that introduction of Infringement Notices had made it easier to police public nuisance offences and that Infringement Notices were useful in their day-to-day duties.

Ninety percent (90%) of South Brisbane officers and 86% of Townsville officers felt the introduction of Infringement Notices as an option for responding to public nuisance offences had made it easier to deal with public nuisance offending. Only two officers in Townsville (1.7%) indicated that they felt the introduction of Infringement Notices had made it more difficult to respond to public nuisance offending.

When asked to consider their current views of ticketing for public nuisance offending, 76% of Brisbane officers and 79% of Townsville officers expressed agreement or strong agreement with the following statement: “At this point in the
Infringement Notice trial period, I find them to be useful in my duties”. Ten percent (10%) of Brisbane officers and 11% of Townsville officers surveyed expressed either disagreement or strong disagreement with this statement.

The majority of officers perceive Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending to be useful in their day-to-day duties and to have generally improved their ability to deal with public nuisance offending. Finally, 91% of South Brisbane officers and 93% of Townsville officers indicated that they would support a statewide extension of the ticketing scheme as an option for policing public nuisance offending.

- Timeliness of police responding and police workload

The majority of police officers in both the Townsville and South Brisbane districts felt that Infringement Notices were a more time efficient method of responding to public nuisance offending and that their introduction had increased the amount of time they could spend “on the street” and enabled them to respond to antisocial behaviour in a timely manner.

Over three-quarters of officers in both the South Brisbane and Townsville Districts (83% of South Brisbane officers and 77% of Townsville officers) felt that the availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending had increased the amount of time they could spend “on the street”. Twelve percent of officers in South Brisbane and 9% of Townsville officers disagreed with this view and the remainder were undecided.

When asked to consider the relative time efficiency of issuing an Infringement Notice versus taking someone to the watchhouse, most South Brisbane and Townsville officers in South Brisbane (88% and 79%, respectively) disagreed with the view that there is no difference in time efficiency between taking someone to the watchhouse and issuing an Infringement Notice. Remaining
officers either agreed with this view or were undecided. The vast majority of police officers in both districts (83% and 75%, respectively) also agreed that Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences were more time-efficient than issuing an NTA.

One manner in which Infringement Notices improve efficiency is through reduced paperwork. In South Brisbane, 71% of officers indicated agreement with the view that the availability of Infringement Notices had reduced the amount of paperwork they had to do. The proportion of Townsville officers advocating this view was very similar (73%).

Most officers surveyed (64% of South Brisbane officers and 69% of Townsville officers) indicated that the availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending improved the timeliness of police responding. A similar proportion of officers (67% and 63%, respectively) felt that the availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences let them serve the public better.

Finally, officers were asked to describe the advantages of having Infringement Notices as an option for responding to public nuisance offending. The major advantages reported by officers in relation to police service delivery were:

- Provide a quicker, easier way of dealing with public nuisance offending
- Provide an additional option for responding to public nuisance offending
- Reduce workload
- Allow officers to spend more time on the street

Has it improved public safety?

Approximately one-third of officers surveyed in both the Townsville and South Brisbane districts felt that the introduction of Infringement Notices
for public nuisance offending had increased community perceptions of safety and public order.

As illustrated in Figure 4.14, less than one-third of officers in the Townsville (27%) and South Brisbane (29%) districts felt that the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending had increased community perceptions of safety. In fact, a similar proportion (23% in Townsville and 29% in South Brisbane) disagreed with this view. When asked to consider the impact on community perceptions of public order, a slightly higher proportion of Townsville (35%) and South Brisbane (31%) district officers surveyed felt that the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending had enhanced community perceptions of public order.

**Figure 4.14** Proportion of surveyed officers in agreement, disagreement or remaining undecided regarding the view that Infringement Notices had increased community perceptions of safety

Source: Police Survey
However, as illustrated Figure 4.15, the same proportion of officers in South Brisbane (31%) expressed disagreement with this view.

Figure 4.15 Proportion of surveyed officers in agreement, disagreement or remaining undecided regarding the view that Infringement Notices had enhanced community perceptions of public order
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Source: Police Survey

Whilst approximately half of the officers surveyed expressed disagreement with the view that the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending had no impact on public disorder, less than one-third felt that it had led to an increase in community safety and reduced public disorder.

When asked to consider their own perceptions of the impact of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending, 55% of South Brisbane district officers and
45% of Townsville district officers indicated that they disagreed with the view that there had been no impact on public disorder. However, when asked to consider the view that the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending had resulted in a decrease in public disorder and increase in community safety, less than one third of officers in both the Townsville (28%) and South Brisbane (31%) districts expressed agreement. These findings are summarised in Figure 4.16.

**Figure 4.16** Proportion of surveyed officers in agreement, disagreement or remaining undecided regarding the view that Infringement Notices had increased community safety and reduced public disorder

4.5 Summary of Findings

- There was a twenty percent increase in recorded public nuisance offending rates in South Brisbane and Townsville during the trial period relative to 2008 rates. This increase could not be accounted for by trends
in comparison districts or was markedly larger than increases seen in recent years in both districts.

- In South Brisbane the increase in recorded public nuisance offending was accompanied by an increase in arrest rates for common assault, suggesting that the increase in recorded public nuisance offending may in part be attributable to greater detection of offences due to police having more time to spend “on the street”. This is consistent with views expressed by police during consultations and in the survey.

- In Townsville, the increase in recorded public nuisance offending was not accompanied by an increase in related offences not part of the ticketing trial, suggesting that the increase observed in Townsville may be associated with greater detection of public nuisance related offences and/or the issuance of tickets for incidents of public nuisance offending which would have previously been overlooked.

- In the South Brisbane district, the rate of public nuisance related NTAs and arrests dropped by 35% and 27%, respectively during the trial period, relative to 2008 rates. This reduction could not be accounted for by trends in the comparison districts, statewide trends, or trends in recent years with in South Brisbane.

- In the Townsville district, the rate of public nuisance related NTAs decreased by 30% during the trial period relative to 2008 rates. In contrast, there was no change in public nuisance arrest rates in the Townsville district from 2008 to 2009.

- The reduction in arrest and NTA rates in South Brisbane and NTA rates in Townsville during the trial period is consistent with findings from the police survey, with 44% to 64% of surveyed officers reporting a reduction in their use of arrest and NTAs in response to public nuisance offending since the start of the trial.
• Most surveyed officers reported that ticketing was effective as an immediate penalty for illegal behaviour. However, less than half reported that they were effective as a deterrent against public nuisance re-offending.

• The vast majority of officers surveyed felt that the ticketing option made it easier to police public nuisance and that ticketing for public nuisance offending was useful in their day-to-day duties. More specifically, surveyed officers felt that:
  o tickets were more time-efficient primarily because they involved less paper work;
  o tickets allowed police to spend more time “on the street”; and
  o tickets allowed police to respond to antisocial behaviour in a timely manner.

• Approximately one-third of officers surveyed in both the Townsville and South Brisbane districts reported that the introduction of ticketing for public nuisance offending had increased community perceptions of safety and public order.
Chapter 5—Results from stakeholder consultations

Consultations were held with a range of stakeholders, including police, Legal Aid Queensland, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Services, and local government representatives (see detailed description in Chapter 2). We asked stakeholders to comment on broad themes including their initial expectations of the trial, whether and how this view changed over the course of the trial, their views of potential benefits and concerns of ticketing in general and, more specifically, its potential implementation at the state-level, and suggestions for changes or modifications.

5.1 What were the initial stakeholder expectations of the trial?

Overall, initial expectations were high. Police stakeholders commented that issuing tickets would free a significant proportion of resources and time traditionally spent dealing with public nuisance offences through arrest or NTA. Many also felt the ticketing option would not lead to an increase in the total number of public nuisance offences processed.

Some police stakeholders voiced their initial concerns about the extent to which ticketing might reduce their ability to remove public nuisance offenders from the scene of an incident, for example to defuse a situation; however, they stated that this concern was addressed early in the trial when they realised that they could continue to use methods including move-on powers or transporting offenders to the watchhouse in conjunction with ticketing.
The views of stakeholders from legal services were mixed. While some were concerned about potential justice issues that may arise from the ticketing option (e.g., decreased likelihood of contesting tickets for public nuisance offences), others felt that the use of tickets would reduce the number of their clients having to appear in court—resulting in a reduction in the numbers of clients seeking legal advice for charges resulting from public nuisances offences. This latter group of legal service stakeholders suggested that this was particularly important with respect to the effective use of legal service resources and court time, but also with respect to their clients, many of whom could not afford to take time off work for court.

Legal services views were also mixed with respect to the likelihood that their clients would seek legal advice after being issued a ticket—some representatives indicated that clients had sought legal services advice while others commented that clients had not and would be very unlikely to do so.

Local government stakeholders had similarly high expectations for the trial at the outset. As with police stakeholders, they stated that ticketing would permit police resources to be refocussed to matters of greater concern within the city. They also commented that ticketing might serve as a deterrent to reduce alcohol-related public nuisance in bar and nightclub areas. In addition, these stakeholders said that to be effective in combating public nuisance offending, ticketing would need to be augmented with other simple local government interventions—for example, building public toilets in entertainment districts to reduce public urination, or hiring private security to patrol these areas.

5.2 Perceived positive implications

Police stakeholders were unanimous in commenting that ticketing freed a significant proportion of resources and time traditionally spent dealing with public nuisance offences through arrest or NTA. In Townsville, in particular, stakeholders stated that an increased police presence resulting from ticketing for
public nuisance would address community concerns regarding the availability of police to address other potentially more serious issues.

Some legal service stakeholders stated that the introduction of ticketing for public nuisance had reduced their caseload freeing their time and court resources for more serious cases. Both legal services and police stakeholders commented that certain public nuisance offenders viewed public nuisance tickets as a better option than being arrested or issued an NTA\textsuperscript{11}.

5.3 Justice issues resulting from the trial

Legal service stakeholders in particular voiced concerned that there might be a reduction in perceived justice because their clients were not likely to elect to contest tickets even when they had legitimate grounds. This, they felt, was particularly relevant for Indigenous clients who were most likely to challenge arrests and NTAs for PPRA offences—for example, resist, incite, hinder obstruct police—but would not be likely to contest tickets for the same offences.

5.4 Effect of the trial on vulnerable groups

There were divergent opinions with respect to the impact of the trial on vulnerable groups. For example, with respect to Indigenous people, legal service representatives in one district commented that the ticketing trial had produced no effect on their caseload. Other legal services indicated a significant drop in their caseload, particularly for the most minor public nuisance offences, e.g., urination or language offences. However, these legal service stakeholders also commented that this was not the case in outlying or rural police divisions, where minor offences continued to appear before the court—and frequently involved Indigenous clients.

\textsuperscript{11}It should be noted that this evidence is indirect and anecdotal so should be treated with caution. No consultations with ticket recipients were conducted during the current evaluation.
Some police respondents stated that they felt that their role was to emphasise diversion where appropriate (i.e., for vulnerable groups including Indigenous persons). They also indicated that diversion can arise at two levels: prior to formal action being taken (e.g., issue ticket, arrest), by diverting individuals to an appropriate service; or after a ticket has been issued, by issuing diversion sheets which outline options, for eligible individuals (e.g., Murri or Special Circumstances Courts).

### Post-ticket diversion options

**Diversi**

**onary options vary across the state.** In the two trial districts officers had access to different options for diverting public nuisance offenders. For example, there are currently no post-ticket diversion options for non-Indigenous vulnerable groups (e.g. non-Indigenous homeless people) in Townsville. Post ticket diversion options in South Brisbane include Murri Court and Special Circumstances Court.

Officers stated that they did not intend to issue tickets to homeless individuals as they viewed ticketing as an ineffective means of dealing with individuals who have no means of paying the fine. However, they also commented that it was not always possible to identify whether or not someone was homeless since some individuals would provide a shelter address and as a result may be issued a ticket. Similarly, several police respondents commented that although their intention was to avoid issuing tickets to those who were mentally ill, they sometimes found it difficult to assess a person’s mental health status.

Although police stakeholders stated that their aim is to divert vulnerable groups prior to taking formal action, some legal service representatives held the view that police were not always opting to divert (at the pre-ticket level) in situations where diversion would be an appropriate option.
5.5 Police discretion in dealing with public nuisance offending

Although the ticketing scheme gives police officers a number of options and allows them to use their discretion in the manner that individuals are processed, some stakeholders expressed concerns regarding the degree of discretion available to police. This concern was universally expressed by staff from all legal services. Some respondents in particular commented that certain low-level offences should be solely ticketable, removing discretion from police about the type of action to take. As well, they suggested that officers should not have the option to arrest in cases involving offences such as public urination, disorder, or language offences.

5.6 Fine payment and fine amounts

There were differing opinions regarding the use of fixed fines amounts. Some legal service representatives commented that the fine rate was too high, unrealistic, and not payable by their clients. They suggested lower fines might be more effective. However, other legal service representatives viewed fine amounts as reasonable and stated that there are always other options available for settling fine amounts, for example, community service.\(^{12}\) This latter group of legal service stakeholders also thought that the fines were not a deterrent for some of their clients—in particular, chronic recidivists.

Some respondents from the police service commented that fines could be even higher to be more effective—double or triple the amount for repeat offenders. However, they agreed with all other stakeholders that there was a major

\(^{12}\) Where an unpaid infringement notice is issued with SPER, the person may apply to SPER for a fine option order, which allows the offender to pay the fine by performing community service (see sections 43-50 of State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999).
problem regarding the accumulation of fines, particularly among vulnerable groups.

5.7  When do officers use tickets for violent situations

One major issue of concern was the use of tickets in situations where violence has taken place. According to the police, tickets are only issued in situations where the parties have calmed down and there are no complainants. If there is the possibility of escalation, tickets are not considered appropriate and other interventions are used.

5.8  Potential increased numbers of public nuisance offenders

Some police respondents commented that individuals who had committed minor offences, which would have normally been ignored, were more likely to be dealt with by issuing a ticket. This would be due in part to the speed with which tickets could be issued, and to a freeing-up of police time and resources resulting from a reduction in arrests and NTAs.

Local government representatives stated that an increase in police presence on the street could lead to an increase in the detection of offending. As an example of the connection between police presence and detection: in Townsville, Tuesday night is a peak entertainment night in the CBD, but a night for which only two officers are rostered to patrol the area. As a result, even though officers and local government representatives described this as a peak night in terms of public nuisance offending, this is not reflected in the QPS data which instead show Tuesdays as having the lowest average rate of recorded public nuisance offending in both Townsville and South Brisbane.

5.9  Other community solutions to public order

Stakeholders stated that the introduction of ticketing would not on its own solve the problem of nuisance offending. Local government stakeholders in particular
commented that there was a need for increased community education, as well as coordinated local government and community level efforts to develop strategies intended to reduce or prevent the more common types of nuisance offending. One particular suggestion raised by local government stakeholders was to increase the number of public toilets in bar and entertainment areas to alleviate the problem of public urination, one of the more common nuisance offences ticketed during the trial period.

5.10 Expanding ticketing to other minor offence types

When asked, some stakeholders from police, legal services and local government indicated that ticketing could be expanded to other minor offence types. Examples of offences suggested by these stakeholders included shoplifting, minor drug offences (such as possession of small amounts of cannabis), disorderly on a licensed premises, disobey move-on direction, trespassing, some forms of graffiti, and other PPRA offences involving contravening a direction. At the same time, some legal service representatives expressed concern with the current public nuisance legislation and its broad interpretation (i.e., Summary Offences Act, 2005). In the opinion of these stakeholders too many minor offences were being caught up in the definition.

5.11 Recommendations and concerns if extended statewide

Stakeholders raised a number of issues related to the possible extension of the ticketing scheme throughout Queensland. These concerns ranged from public awareness, to police training, liability, expansion of included offences, and use in situations involving violence.

Local government representatives were concerned that there was a need to increase community awareness and understanding of the ticketing scheme in the event of a statewide extension.
Since the majority of ticketing incidents involve some level of intoxication, local government representatives commented that police training should focus on the appropriateness of passive interventions, such as issuance of a ticket or move-on order only, versus active removal of the individual either accompanying them to the station or watchhouse, or by simply placing the individual in a taxi and directing them to a safe place.

Police stakeholders also voiced concern regarding the ability of officers to access an individual’s prior ticketing history when issuing a ticket for a public nuisance offence. They stated that previous tickets for public nuisance offences are currently recorded in an individual’s traffic history and are difficult to access during routine criminal history checks. They recommended that in the event of a statewide extension of the ticketing program, police information systems should be updated to improve officer access to ticketing history, and specifically suggested that where individuals have previously received multiple tickets this should be flagged in their record.

5.12 Chapter summary

This chapter provided a summary of the various views which emerged from the consultations conducted within the scope of this evaluation. The consultations were informed by a diversity of views from stakeholder agencies and local government representatives. In the main, the views that emerged from the consultations were that the ticketing trial itself was successful. At the same time, a number of concerns were voiced and possible safeguards were suggested in the event of a future statewide extension of ticketing for public nuisance.
Chapter 6—Economic analysis of the ticketing trial

The current chapter presents the results of an economic analysis of the trial. Monetary costs and prospective monetary benefits of ticketing for public nuisance are detailed for the Queensland government departments and services involved in the trial. We assess time, workload and/or ticket volume changes that occurred as a result of the trial for the Queensland Police Service, Department of Justice and Attorney General, Queensland Transport, and the State Penalties Enforcement Registry (SPER).

More specifically, the economic analysis addresses the following questions:

- What would be the effect of a statewide extension of the ticketing trial on police time and workload?
- What would be the effect of a statewide extension of the ticketing trial on court time and workload?
- What would be the effect of a statewide extension of the ticketing trial on Queensland Transport workload and number of tickets to be processed?
- What would be the effect of a statewide extension of the ticketing trial on SPER workload and number of tickets to be processed?

6.1 How do we assess costs and benefits?

To answer the above questions, we employed an economic analysis model (e.g., Levin et al., 2001; Manning, Homel and Smith, 2006) to measure the costs and potential benefits (net present value) of social interventions. Steps included: deciding which benefits and costs to count; cataloguing the effects and selected measurement indicators; predicting effects quantitatively over time; quantifying
costs and benefits in terms of dollar amounts among stakeholder agencies; distributing costs among stakeholders (where required); depreciating tangible capital assets (where required); categorising all costs and benefits; discounting costs and benefits to obtain present values (PV); calculating net present value (NPV) for future comparisons among program alternatives with the goal of satisfying the net present value criterion; and conducting sensitivity analysis to measure the responsiveness of the results to changes in salient variables that could affect the overall result.

The net present value (NPV) equals the difference between the present value of benefits and the present value of costs: that is, the total savings, or additional cost, resulting from the implementation of the proposed program or intervention. In short, if the calculated NPV is positive, there is a net economic benefit resulting from program or intervention—in this instance, the ticketing option.

It is important to note that the NPV does not necessarily identify the most efficient allocation of resources out of all possible alternatives, but rather, a more efficient allocation of economic resources out of the specific alternatives being compared. The NPV method is the most appropriate method for the current evaluation as it will provide a reasonable estimate of the monetary costs and benefits that are evaluated (Boardman, Greenberg, Vining, Weimer, 2008).

6.2 How did we estimate costs and benefits for the trial?

Costs and benefits included in the evaluation

The observed costs and benefits associated with the QPS ticketing trial were used to derive estimates for costs and benefits of a hypothetical 2009 Queensland-wide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance offences. For the purposes of this analysis, “no ticketing” is the reference condition to which “ticketing” is compared.
The potential costs and benefits associated with the QPS ticketing trial are listed in Table 6.1. Note that the economic analysis in this study was limited to measurable costs and benefits with direct monetary values: indirect benefits such as the ability of officers to spend more time on patrol, rather than preparing paperwork at the station were not included. Further, changes in Murri Court and special circumstances courts have also been excluded, as the guidelines for the ticketing trial indicate that these should not experience a change in caseload. Finally, since the study focussed on questions of cost-effectiveness for the four agencies directly affected by the ticketing trial, broader societal costs or benefits have not been considered at this time.
### Table 6.1 Potential Costs and Benefits of the QPS Ticketing Trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COSTS</th>
<th>BENEFITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Time issuing public nuisance tickets by QPS</td>
<td>- Less time spent by police issuing NTAs to public nuisance offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time for QPS taking public nuisance ticket recipients to watchhouse</td>
<td>- Less time spent by police making public nuisance arrests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time for QPS taking public nuisance ticket recipients to station</td>
<td>- Less time spent by police on arrest-related paperwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time for QPS to provide a brief of evidence for public nuisance tickets that go to trial</td>
<td>- Less time spent by police transporting public nuisance arrestees to watchhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time for QPS to testify in court for public nuisance ticket</td>
<td>- Less time spent by police at watchhouses with public nuisance arrestees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Time for police prosecutor to prosecute contested public nuisance tickets in court</td>
<td>- Less time spent by watchhouse staff on processing arrestees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased tickets to be administered by Queensland Transport</td>
<td>- Less time spent by police preparing court documents for public nuisance offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increased tickets and payment plans to be administered by SPER</td>
<td>- Less time spent by police attending court for public nuisance cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decreased revenues from court-ordered fines</td>
<td>- Less time by police prosecutors processing public nuisance cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Less workload by court staff for public nuisance cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Revenues from public nuisance tickets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How did we calculate benefits and costs?**

The projected decrease in arrests and NTAs resulting from the ticketing trial was calculated by comparing the proportionate changes in rates of arrests and NTAs.
for each trial site (Townsville and South Brisbane) to their corresponding reference sites (Cairns for Townsville and North Brisbane for South Brisbane) between 2008 and 2009.

Any change in the proportion of arrests and NTAs for the reference sites was presumed to be comparable to what the trial sites would have experienced had there not been a ticketing trial. For example, if there was a 20% increase in arrest rates for eligible offences in Cairns from 2008 to 2009, we assumed that, in the absence of the ticketing trial, there would have also been a 20% increase in arrests for eligible offences in Townsville for the same period. These projected changes from 2008 to 2009 for the two trial sites were compared to the actual arrest and NTA rates for 2009: the differences in the projected and actual rates were presumed to be the result of the ticketing trial.

Ticketing rates for the two trial sites were calculated by dividing the number of tickets issued by that police district’s estimated population. These decreases in the rates of arrests and NTAs, and the rates of ticketing, were then multiplied by Queensland’s population to determine the projected number of arrests and NTAs “saved,” and the number of tickets issued, for a statewide implementation of a ticketing program.

Once the decrease in arrests and NTAs, and the number of tickets, were calculated, monetary costs and benefits for a statewide implementation of the ticketing trial in 2009 were calculated. This was achieved by multiplying these figures by unit costs and weights which were derived from administrative data supplied by QPS, JAG, Queensland Transport, and SPER, in addition to qualitative or contextual information provided by organisational representatives and our survey of patrol officers. The details of these analyses can be found in Appendix 6A.
6.3 What did we find?

The following section summarises the projected impact of a hypothetical statewide implementation of the ticketing trial in 2009 on QPS, JAG, Queensland Transport, and SPER workloads and (where available) time. We also estimate the projected statewide monetary savings for 2009 given this hypothetical implementation. These results are derived from costs, workload, and time estimations provided by departmental/organisational representatives, as well as analyses performed on extracts of administrative data supplied by these agencies. Details regarding the derivation of the figures presented below including specific costs, weights, and sources of data, are provided in Appendix 6A. Within each of the following sections, separate sets of projected statewide costs and benefits are presented based on the Townsville and South Brisbane results. It should be noted that the two trial sites were intentionally selected to reflect two different types of Queensland police districts: one urban, one primarily rural. Given the pattern of results from the two trial sites, it is reasonable to assume that the total statewide impact of a ticketing scheme is likely to lie somewhere between the two sets of projected results.

What is the effect on police time and workload?

Table 6.2 illustrates the projected effect on QPS patrol officers and watchhouse staff time, workload, and monetary costs and benefits for a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance offending.

Similarly, Table 6.3 details the projected statewide effect of ticketing for public nuisance offending on the workload, and monetary costs and benefits, for police prosecutors. Projected monetary costs and benefits for police prosecutors were based on the average monetary costs associated with cases for which a guilty plea was submitted and for cases requiring a full trial. Costs and benefits for police prosecutors were calculated in terms of court cases processed rather than time or salaries, which reflects the form of costing information provided by QPS.
Table 6.2 Projected effect of a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance on QPS patrol officers and watchhouse staff workload, time, and associated monetary savings for QPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload: Net Benefits (NB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in arrests</td>
<td>3,177.41</td>
<td>4,703.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in NTAs</td>
<td>3,568.61</td>
<td>9,152.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload: Net Costs (NC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in tickets</td>
<td>12,521.15</td>
<td>23,806.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time: Net Benefits (NB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol officers: Time savings due to fewer arrests and NTAs (hours)</td>
<td>55,663.03</td>
<td>103,465.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchhouse staff: Time savings due to fewer arrests (hours)</td>
<td>174,400.13</td>
<td>258,164.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time: Net Costs (NC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol officers: Time increases, due to public nuisance tickets (hours)</td>
<td>12,012.52</td>
<td>26,244.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net time savings (hours)</strong></td>
<td>218,050.64</td>
<td>335,385.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monetary: Net benefits (NB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol officers: Monetary benefits due to fewer arrests and NTAs</td>
<td>$2,121,874.78</td>
<td>$3,944,104.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchhouse staff: Monetary benefits due to fewer arrests</td>
<td>$11,091,197.55</td>
<td>$16,418,312.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monetary: Net costs (NC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol officers: Monetary costs due to public nuisance ticket</td>
<td>$457,917.26</td>
<td>$1,000,453.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Present Value (NPV)</strong></td>
<td>$12,755,155.07</td>
<td>$19,361,963.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6.3 Projected effect of a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance on QPS police prosecutors workload and associated monetary savings for QPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload: Net benefits (NB)</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in court cases pleading guilty (or otherwise terminated early in the process)(^1)</td>
<td>5,469.00</td>
<td>11,233.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in court cases going to full trial(^1)</td>
<td>1,277.02</td>
<td>2,622.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workload: Net costs (NC)</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in court cases going to full trial (due to contested public nuisance tickets)</td>
<td>216.62</td>
<td>266.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monetary: Net benefits (NB)</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost savings, due to fewer court cases from arrests and NTAs</td>
<td>$1,950,975.90</td>
<td>$4,007,203.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monetary: Net costs (NC)</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost increases, due to court cases from contested public nuisance tickets</td>
<td>$182,228.18</td>
<td>$224,307.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Present Value (NPV)</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,768,747.72</td>
<td>$3,782,896.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Based on 9.85% (n=4,840) of the court cases examined for which the stage of the court process was unclear or ambiguous. For the purposes of this analysis, these ambiguous cases were categorised as being completed early in the process, as this was the more conservative allocation (i.e. leading to a reduced cost savings).
Detailed information regarding the calculation of specific costs and benefits can be found in Appendix 6A.

As illustrated by Tables 6.2 and 6.3, if ticketing for public nuisance offending had been implemented statewide in 2009, QPS patrol officers, watchhouse staff and police prosecutors would have experienced a reduction in workload and an overall net time savings. These savings would have occurred regardless of which trial district formed the basis of the statewide projection.

Overall, based on the South Brisbane and Townsville statewide projections, the estimated time savings would have translated into a statewide net present value of $14.5 million and $23.1 million, respectively.

**What is the impact on court time and workload?**

Table 6.4 presents the projected statewide increases and decreases in workload for the courts and the associated monetary savings for JAG. Costs and benefits were calculated in terms of court cases processed rather than time or salaries, which reflects the form of costing information as it was initially provided to us from JAG. Detailed information regarding the calculation of monetary and time costs and benefits can be found in Appendix 6A.

Table 6.4 demonstrates that if ticketing for public nuisance offending had been implemented statewide in 2009, courts would have experienced a reduction in their annual workload. Given South Brisbane and Townsville statewide projections this would have resulted in an estimated statewide net present value (i.e., savings) of $3.2 million and $6.9 million, respectively.
Table 6.4 Projected effect of a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance on Magistrates Courts’ workload and associated monetary savings for JAG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload: Net benefits (NB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in court cases pleading guilty (or otherwise terminated early in the process) (^1)</td>
<td>5,469.00</td>
<td>11,233.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in court cases going to full trial(^1)</td>
<td>1,277.02</td>
<td>2,622.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload: Net costs (NC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in court cases associated with contested tickets</td>
<td>216.62</td>
<td>266.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monetary: Net benefits (NB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost savings, due to fewer court cases from arrests and NTAs</td>
<td>$3,556,233.80</td>
<td>$7,304,320.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monetary: Net costs (NC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost increases, due to court cases from contested public nuisance tickets</td>
<td>$324,923.96</td>
<td>$399,953.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Present Value (NPV)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,231,309.84</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,904,366.97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Based on 9.85% \((n=4,840)\) of the court cases examined for which the stage of the court process was unclear or ambiguous. For the purposes of this analysis, these ambiguous cases were categorised as being completed early in the process, as this was the more conservative allocation (i.e. leading to a reduced cost savings).
What is the impact on Queensland Transport?

Table 6.5 presents the projected statewide increases in workload for Queensland Transport and the associated monetary costs. Costs and benefits were calculated in terms of tickets processed rather than time or salaries, which reflects the form of costing information as it was initially provided to us. Detailed information regarding the calculation of specific costs and benefits can be found in Appendix 6A.

Table 6.5 Projected impact of a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance on Queensland Transport workload and associated monetary costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload: Net costs (NC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in number of tickets</td>
<td>12,521.15</td>
<td>23,806.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monetary: Net costs (NC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost increases, due to processing public nuisance tickets</td>
<td>$136,104.95</td>
<td>$258,779.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of adding infrastructure for new ticket categories</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Present Value (NPV)</strong></td>
<td>- $137,604.95</td>
<td>- $260,279.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results indicate that if a statewide extension of the ticketing scheme had occurred in 2009, Queensland Transport would have experienced an increase in net workload. Based on South Brisbane and Townsville statewide projections this would have resulted in a statewide increase in associated costs to Queensland Transport of $138 thousand and $260 thousand, respectively.
What is the impact on SPER?

Table 6.6 presents estimates of the effect of a statewide extension of the ticketing scheme on workload and associated costs to SPER. The table shows the number of finalised and non-finalised lodgements to SPER, as well as the type of

Table 6.6 Projected effect of a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance on SPER workload and associated monetary costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload: Net Benefits (NB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in lodgements for court-ordered fines: finalised</td>
<td>1,415.24</td>
<td>2,906.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in lodgements for court-ordered fines: non-finalised</td>
<td>2,967.66</td>
<td>6,095.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workload: Net Costs (NC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in lodgements for public nuisance tickets: finalised</td>
<td>1,459.34</td>
<td>3,124.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in lodgements for public nuisance tickets: non-finalised</td>
<td>6,217.38</td>
<td>13,313.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monetary: Net benefits (NB)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost savings, due to fewer lodgements for court-ordered fines</td>
<td>$78,421.42</td>
<td>$161,073.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monetary: Net costs (NC)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost increases, due to increased lodgements for public nuisance tickets</td>
<td>$132,075.80</td>
<td>$282,820.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Present Value (NPV)</strong></td>
<td>-$53,654.38</td>
<td>-$121,747.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
lodgement (i.e., lodgements for court-ordered fines versus lodgements for public nuisance tickets). Costs and benefits were calculated in terms of lodgements processed rather than time or salaries, which reflects the form of costing information as it was initially provided to us. Detailed information regarding the calculation of specific costs and benefits can be found in Appendix 6A.

As was the case for Queensland Transport, a statewide extension of the ticketing scheme would lead to a net increase in SPER workload. Based on South Brisbane and Townsville projections, a statewide extension of ticketing would lead to an increase in net operating costs of either $54 thousand or $122 thousand, respectively. Although a possible statewide implementation would result in a projected reduction in lodgements from Magistrates Courts, this reduction would be surpassed by the increased number of lodgements resulting from public nuisance tickets.

**Impact on public revenue from public nuisance fines**

As detailed in Table 6.7, the statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance offending would impact on public revenue generated from court-ordered public nuisance fines as well as revenue derived from public nuisance-related tickets. The decrease in public revenue from fewer court-ordered fines (due to fewer public nuisance court cases) is more than negated by the increase in revenue collected from ticket-based fines. Based on South Brisbane and Townsville projections, a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance offending would lead to a projected statewide net revenue increase of either $480 thousand or $1.4 million, respectively.
Table 6.7 Projected effect of a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance on public revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monetary: Net benefits (NB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase public nuisance ticket-based revenues</td>
<td>$1,385,864.81</td>
<td>$3,338,338.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monetary: Net costs (NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in court-ordered public nuisance fines paid(^1)</td>
<td>$905,991.11</td>
<td>$1,860,858.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value (NPV)</td>
<td>$479,873.70</td>
<td>$1,477,479.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Reflects the fines paid as opposed to the fines billed (of which only a proportion would be paid).

6.4 Chapter summary

Overall monetary costs and benefits to QPS, courts, Queensland Transport and SPER

Table 6.8 summarises the projected overall costs and benefits associated with the possible statewide extension of the ticketing scheme. Estimates presented in this chapter have indicated that the added costs of processing tickets, and the decrease in revenue from public nuisance court cases, will be substantially less than the savings in staffing costs for QPS and the courts, and the revenue from ticket-derived fines. Although Queensland Transport and SPER will see an increased workload—and thus, increased costs—from a statewide extension of
Table 6.8 Overall monetary costs/benefits to QPS, courts, Queensland Transport and SPER.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monetary: Net benefits (NB)</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QPS net monetary benefits</td>
<td>$15,164,048.23</td>
<td>$24,369,620.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAG/courts net monetary benefits</td>
<td>$3,556,233.80</td>
<td>$7,304,320.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPER net monetary benefits</td>
<td>$78,421.42</td>
<td>$161,073.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public nuisance related public revenue net monetary benefits</td>
<td>$1,385,864.81</td>
<td>$3,338,338.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monetary: Net costs (NC)</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QPS net monetary costs</td>
<td>$640,145.44</td>
<td>$1,224,760.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport net monetary costs</td>
<td>$137,604.95</td>
<td>$260,279.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAG/courts net monetary costs</td>
<td>$324,923.96</td>
<td>$399,953.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPER net monetary costs</td>
<td>$132,075.80</td>
<td>$282,820.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public nuisance related public revenue net monetary costs</td>
<td>$905,991.11</td>
<td>$1,860,858.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net Present Value (NPV) | $18,043,827.00 | $31,144,679.74 |
the ticketing scheme, the increased costs for these agencies are much smaller than the savings to be experienced by QPS and the courts. Thus, although some agencies will experience increased costs from a statewide program of ticketing for public nuisance offences, it is anticipated that the Queensland government, as a whole, will experience net benefits (NPV, or savings) of either $18.0 or $31.1 million based on projections from each of the two pilot sites.

**Limitations of the economic analysis**

The analyses presented in this chapter were limited in several respects. In part, the estimates reflect the availability of data given the evaluation timelines; however, there were also some limitations that were unique to each dataset. These are detailed in Appendix 6B.

**Sensitivity analysis**

The results presented in this chapter represent estimates based on the available information. As is the case with all statistical estimates, there is an expected degree of uncertainty so that the ‘true’ value typically lies within a certain range of values. To better understand the validity of the estimates presented in this chapter, we conducted a sensitivity analysis. This method tests the robustness of the result with respect to potential variations in the underlying assumptions, such as the rates of arrests, notices to appear, ticketing for public nuisance offences, and the statewide impact of the contested tickets being found guilty, rather than found not guilty in the South Brisbane and Townsville sites. The procedure and results of the sensitivity analysis are detailed in Appendix 6C.
Chapter 7—Unintended consequences and possible refinements

In this chapter we consider the potential negative consequences of ticketing for public nuisance offending on vulnerable groups such as homeless or Indigenous populations, and individuals with a history of mental health illness. We also examine the difference, if any, between ticketing penalties and typical court-ordered penalties for public nuisance and PPRA offences. Justice issues are also addressed—in particular, the impact of ticketing on an individual’s ability, and propensity, to seek justice. Finally, we address procedural and training issues that have arisen over the course of the trial.

Various sources of data were examined in addressing the aforementioned points of interest: qualitative data derived from consultations with key stakeholders, qualitative and quantitative data from a survey of police officers involved in the trial, and quantitative administrative data from QPS, Queensland Transport, JAG, SPER, and Queensland Health.

7.1 Has ticketing for public nuisance offending affected vulnerable groups?

The following section addresses the impact of ticketing for public nuisance offences on vulnerable populations including homeless people, those with a history of mental illness and Indigenous people. To address this issue we surveyed police regarding their process of identifying and dealing with homeless, Indigenous and or mentally ill public nuisance offenders. We also addressed this issue during our consultations with police, Legal Aid and ATSILS, details of which are presented in Chapter 5. Administrative data from QPS and Queensland Health pertaining to the proportion of ticketed individuals who had a history of
mental illness or who were identified as Indigenous people were also examined. We were limited in our ability to address the impact of ticketing for public nuisance offending on homeless individuals and/or individuals with otherwise little or no ability to pay fines as QPS do not keep records on the homeless and/or socioeconomic status of ticketed persons.

**Police Survey**

Officers were surveyed regarding the current process of determining the homeless and/or Indigenous status of public nuisance offenders to whom they are issuing a ticket. They were also asked to consider the efficacy of ticketing as a deterrent for public nuisance offenders with a history of mental illness.

*Less than half of the officers surveyed indicated that they attempt to determine the homeless and/or Indigenous status of individuals to whom they are issuing a ticket.*

As illustrated in Figure 7.1, 29% of South Brisbane officers and 17% of Townsville officers indicated that there was currently no reliable way to determine whether someone was homeless prior to issuing a ticket for public nuisance offending. In contrast, a larger proportion of officers disagreed with this view (37% of South Brisbane officers and 42% of Townsville officers), suggesting that there were reliable procedures in place for determining homeless status.
Figure 7.1 Agreement/disagreement among surveyed officers who agreed, regarding the view that there is currently no reliable way to identify whether someone is homeless prior to issuing a ticket for public nuisance offending

When asked to consider the steps they take to identify whether an individual is homeless, 46% of South Brisbane officers and 43% of Townsville officers indicated that they typically ask an individual whether he/she has an address. If the individual indicates that they have no address, the officer assumes they are homeless.

Additionally, as illustrated in Figure 7.2, 56% of South Brisbane officers and 43% of Townsville officers indicated that they try to determine if someone is homeless whilst issuing an Infringement Notice for public nuisance offending. A smaller proportion of surveyed officers (33% in South Brisbane and 28% in Townsville, see Figure 7.2) indicated that they also try to determine the Indigenous status of public nuisance offenders to whom they are issuing a ticket.
Finally, we considered whether the steps taken, or not taken, by officers to determine homeless and/or Indigenous status varied as a function of gender, age, rank and years of service with QPS. Firstly, higher ranked officers were found to be more likely to agree with the view that there is currently no reliable way to determine whether someone is homeless prior to issuing a public nuisance offence ticket. Officers who disagreed with the following statement: “I try to determine if someone is homeless, while issuing an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence”, tended to be younger than those officers who either disagreed or remained undecided regarding this statement. No other relationships emerged (see Appendix 7 for details).

These findings, alongside those derived from police consultations reported in Chapter 5, suggest that in some cases it may be difficult to reliably determine whether someone is homeless prior to issuing a ticket. However, the perceived
need to identify homeless status prior to issuing a ticket appears to be related to some extent to experience, with older, higher ranked (so presumably more experienced officers) more likely to attempt to identify homeless status of offenders prior to issuing a ticket. Additionally, that less than half of the officers surveyed indicated that they attempt to determine the homeless and/or Indigenous status of ticketed individuals suggests some officers may be inadvertently ticketing vulnerable groups for whom diversionary options are available.

**Most officers surveyed indicated that they either disagreed, or were undecided regarding the view that Infringement Notices were an effective deterrent against re-offending for individuals with a mental illness.**

When surveyed, very few officers (7% in South Brisbane and 2% in Townsville) expressed agreement with the following statement: “Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences have been an effective deterrent/penalty against re-offending for mentally ill offenders”. In South Brisbane 55% of officers expressed disagreement with this statement whilst the remaining 38% indicated that they were undecided. In Townsville, 38% of officers surveyed expressed disagreement with the view of Infringement Notices as an effective deterrent against re-offending in individuals suffering from a mental illness, whilst a large proportion of officers (60%) indicated that they were undecided. Responses to this item were unrelated to age, gender, years of service or rank within QPS (see Appendix 7).

---

13 During consultations officers indicated that they always attempt to divert individuals with mental illness. It is therefore difficult to interpret the large proportion of surveyed officers who neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement that tickets have been an effective deterrent for this group. Officers who are aware of their obligation to divert individuals with mental illness may have been unsure how to respond.
Administrative Data

- Are individuals with a history of mental illness receiving tickets?

For the purposes of this analysis, history of mental illness was defined as any previous recorded contact with Queensland Mental Health Services. It is important to note that this is an underestimation of the number of ticketed persons who may have a mental illness, since evidence suggests that large proportions of mentally ill persons do not access mental health services. For example, estimates from the National Health Survey (ABS, 2003) indicate that, among Australians with mental and behavioural disorders, only 2.9% had seen a psychologist and another 4.3% had seen some other mental health professional.

Of the 1,490 unique individuals who received a ticket for a public nuisance or PPRA offence during the trial, 21 were identified as having a history of mental illness. Eleven of these individuals were ticketed in the South Brisbane district (2% of all individuals receiving a ticket in South Brisbane) and 10 were ticketed in the Townsville District (1% of all individuals receiving a ticket in Townsville). Two of these individuals (both in Townsville) received more than one ticket on the same occasion. For both individuals this involved a ticket for a public nuisance offence along with a ticket for a PPRA offence. The offences included Public Urination, Public Nuisance – Disorderly, Public Nuisance - Language offences directed towards police, and Resist arrest, incite, hinder, obstruct police. Two of the 21 individuals had previously been under a Forensic Mental Health Order. One of the 21 individuals ticketed was a juvenile. Two were female and six were Indigenous.

14 This was based on a matching of first name, surname and date of birth, between QPS and Queensland Health administrative data: thus the accuracy of this figure is contingent on the accuracy of these records. Any data entry errors (e.g., incorrectly entered surname or date of birth) would result in a valid match going undetected, resulting in an underestimation of the total number of ticketed individuals with a history of mental illness.
Nineteen of the 21 individuals had some history of previous offending. Fourteen had at least one previous incident of violent offending (offences against the person). Twelve had at least one previous drug offence. Sixteen had a history of offences against property. Finally, 16 of these 21 individuals had a previous good order offence.

In South Brisbane, during the trial period, 6% of individuals arrested and 2% of individuals issued an NTA for a public nuisance offence had a history of mental illness. In Townsville, the proportion of individuals arrested or issued an NTA for a public nuisance offence who had a history of mental illness was 3% and 2% respectively. Thus during the trial period, the proportion of ticketed individuals with mental illness was less than the proportion arrested and similar to the proportion issued an NTA in South Brisbane and Townsville. Finally, as illustrated in Figure 7.3, the proportion of public nuisance offenders with a

\[ \text{Figure 7.3 Proportion (\%) public nuisance offenders with a history of mental illness for each calendar year from 2001 to 2009} \]

Source: QPS and Queensland Health
history of mental illness in the Townsville and South Brisbane districts has fluctuated slightly over the past nine years. The proportion dropped slightly from 2008 to 2009 in South Brisbane and rose in Townsville. However, for both districts, this change was similar to trends seen from 2007 to 2008, suggesting that the introduction of ticketing had little or no effect on the number of individuals with mental illness being charged/issued tickets for public nuisance offending.

- **Did ticketing disproportionately affect Indigenous people?**

The impact of the ticketing trial on rates of public nuisance offending among Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons was examined for the two trial districts. Figure 7.4 displays the rate of public nuisance offending for Indigenous persons from 2005 to 2009\textsuperscript{15} in the Townsville and South Brisbane districts. As illustrated, there was a general upward trend in public nuisance offending among Indigenous persons for both trial districts over this five year period. The rate of public nuisance offending among Indigenous persons in the Townsville district increased by 40% from 2008 to 2009. This increase was similar to that observed from 2005 to 2006 (37% increase) but markedly larger than changes observed from 2006 to 2007 (9% decrease) and 2007 to 2008 (7% increase).

\textsuperscript{15} QPS introduced mandatory recording of Indigenous status in July 2004, thus rates of Indigenous/non-Indigenous public nuisance offending for years prior to this date could not be reported.
Figure 7.4 Rate of public nuisance (PN) offending among Indigenous persons in the Townsville and South Brisbane districts from 2005 to 2009

The rate of public nuisance offending among Indigenous persons in the South Brisbane district declined by 20% in 2009 relative to 2008 rates, but remained higher than rates observed in 2005, 2006 and 2007. As illustrated in Figure 7.4, rates displayed a marked peak in 2008. Thus it is unclear whether the reduction in rates from 2008 to 2009 reflects the effects of the ticketing trial or factors specific to 2008 which contributed to the peak in public nuisance offending among Indigenous persons in the South Brisbane district.

Among non-Indigenous persons, the rate of public nuisance offending rose by 13% in the Townsville district and 26% in the South Brisbane District from 2008 to 2009. As illustrated in Figure 7.5, rates of public nuisance offending among non-Indigenous people have consistently risen across the past five years, with the increase observed during the trial period, similar in magnitude to that seen in the previous four years.
In considering the extent to which ticketing functioned to divert Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons from the criminal justice system, we examined arrest and NTA rates for the two trial districts. As illustrated in Figure 7.6, the Townsville district experienced a 28% increase in public nuisance related arrest rates and a 3% decrease in public nuisance related NTA rates for Indigenous persons. In contrast, the South Brisbane district saw a 55% decrease in public nuisance related arrests among Indigenous persons, and a 15% decrease in public nuisance related NTAs. As seen at the level of offending, there was a marked peak in Indigenous public nuisance related arrests in 2008 in South Brisbane, suggesting that the drop in arrest rates seen during the trial period could reflect the absence of factors contributing to the 2008 peak. At the
same time, the 2009 arrest rate was also lower than that observed in any of five previous years documented in Figure 7.6, suggesting that the reduction does in part reflect the introduction of tickets. This is further illustrated in Figures 7.7 and 7.8. As illustrated, tickets accounted for only 15% of all actions taken against Indigenous public nuisance offenders in Townsville and 30% in South Brisbane. Similarly, a marked reduction was observed in the proportion of public nuisance related arrests for Indigenous persons in the South Brisbane District (75% in 2008 to 42% in 2009), but very little change in the proportion of public nuisance related arrests in the Townsville district (59% in 2008 to 57% in 2009).
Figure 7.7 Townsville district arrests, NTAs, and other actions for public nuisance offending among Indigenous persons

Source: QPS

Figure 7.8 South Brisbane district arrests, NTAs, and other actions for public nuisance offending among Indigenous persons

Source: QPS
A different picture emerged for non-Indigenous public nuisance related arrest and NTA rates which, as illustrated in Figure 7.9, decreased across both districts. The largest reductions for both districts were observed for NTA rates, which dropped by 50% in the Townsville district and 37% in the South Brisbane district. Smaller reductions in public nuisance related arrests for non-Indigenous persons were observed in both the Townsville district (27%) and South Brisbane district (24%).

*Figure 7.9 Rate of public nuisance related arrests and NTAs for non-Indigenous persons in the Townsville and South Brisbane districts from 2005 to 2009*

Source: QPS

The impact of ticketing on arrest and NTA rates among non-Indigenous persons is further illustrated in Figures 7.10 and 7.11. Tickets accounted for a similar proportion of actions taken for public nuisance offending in the Townsville and South Brisbane districts (44% and 43% respectively). A similar reduction in the
**Figure 7.10** Townsville district arrests, NTAs, and other actions for public nuisance offending among non-Indigenous persons

Source: QPS

**Figure 7.11** South Brisbane district arrests, NTAs, and other actions for public nuisance offending among non-Indigenous persons

Source: QPS
proportion of public nuisance related arrests and NTAs was observed for non-Indigenous persons in both districts.

Finally, we examined relative rates of public nuisance offending between Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons. As illustrated in Figure 7.12, in 2009, the rate of public nuisance offending among Indigenous people in the Townsville district was 13.7 times higher than that seen among their non-Indigenous counterparts. This was an increase from 2008, when the Indigenous public nuisance offending rate was 11.1 times higher than the non-Indigenous rate. It was also higher than relative rates observed in 2005, 2006 and 2007. In contrast, the rate of public nuisance offending among Indigenous persons in South

**Figure 7.12** Rate of public nuisance related offending among Indigenous relative to non-Indigenous persons in the Townsville and South Brisbane districts from 2005 to 2009

Source: QPS
Brisbane was 7.7 times higher than non-Indigenous persons in 2009, down from 12.2 in 2008. Importantly, the rate of public nuisance offending among Indigenous relative to non-Indigenous persons in the South Brisbane district during the trial period was also lower than relative rates seen in all previous years documented in Figure 7.12.

To summarise, the impact of ticketing on public nuisance offending, arrest and NTA rates appears to differ between Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons, particularly in the Townsville district. Firstly, for non-Indigenous persons across both trial districts, there was an overall increase in public nuisance offending from 2008 to 2009. A larger increase in public nuisance offending during this period was observed for Indigenous persons in the Townsville district. In contrast, Indigenous public nuisance offending rates in the South Brisbane district dropped from 2008 to 2009.

Reductions in arrest and NTA rates were observed for non-Indigenous persons across both districts, indicating that ticketing has diverted a substantial proportion of non-Indigenous persons from the criminal justice system, but has also led to an overall increase in the detection of/action against public nuisance offending in this group. In contrast, the rate of public nuisance related arrests among Indigenous persons increased in the Townsville district during the trial period, whilst NTA rates remained relatively stable. Thus in Townsville the introduction of ticketing did not function to divert Indigenous people from the criminal justice system as it did for their non-Indigenous counterparts. Instead, the introduction of ticketing appears to have contributed to an increased rate of public nuisance offending perhaps due to greater police presence resulting in enhanced detection of public nuisance offending in this group. This effect was, however, only observed in the Townsville district, with public nuisance related arrest rates dropping for Indigenous persons in South Brisbane. Given the clear peak seen in 2008 arrest rates in South Brisbane, it is difficult to determine the extent to which reductions in 2009 reflect the impact of ticketing and/or the absence of factors contributing the 2008 peak.
Differences between the Townsville and South Brisbane districts also emerged when relative rates of public nuisance offending between Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons were examined. In Townsville the rate of Indigenous offending during the trial was 13.7 times higher than the non-Indigenous rate, and in South Brisbane, 7.7 times higher. This was the highest relative rate Townsville has seen for the past five years, and for South Brisbane, the lowest relative rate for the past five years.

7.2 Has ticketing impacted on the use of diversionary options for public nuisance offending?

Police Survey

The vast majority of officers in both the South Brisbane and Townsville districts indicated that the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending had not impacted on their use of cautioning and diversion in response to incidents of public nuisance.

Figures 7.13 and 7.14 illustrate officers’ perceptions of how the introduction of Infringement Notices has impacted on their use of cautioning or diversion (take to a local service or have someone come and collect the person) in response to incidents of public nuisance. As indicated, the vast majority of officers surveyed in both the Townsville and South Brisbane districts (78% and 79% of officers respectively) indicated that the availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending had no impact on their use of cautioning in response to incidents of public nuisance. A similarly large proportion of officers in both districts indicated the same null impact on their use of diversion (85% of South Brisbane officers and 87% of Townsville officers).

Whilst a minority of officers in both districts reported a reduction in the use of cautioning for public nuisance offending since the start of the ticketing trial, this proportion was larger in Townsville (19%) than in South Brisbane (10%).
Very few officers (5% in South Brisbane and 6% in Townsville) reported a reduction in their use of diversion since the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending.

The perceived effect of ticketing on the use of diversion was unrelated to officer age, rank or years of service with QPS, but was related to gender. Female officers were more likely to indicate that the introduction of ticketing had reduced their use of diversion as a response to public nuisance offending. Age, gender, rank or years of service with QPS were unrelated to the perceived effect of ticketing on the use of caution as a response to public nuisance offending.

**Figure 7.13** Proportion of surveyed officers who reported that the introduction of Infringement Notices had decreased, increased, or had no impact on their use of cautioning as a response to public nuisance offending

Source: Police Survey
Figure 7.14 Proportion of surveyed officers who felt that the introduction of Infringement Notices had decreased, increased, or had no impact on their use of Diversion as a response to public nuisance offending.

- What proportion of offenders who receive a ticket for a public nuisance offence are given a diversion sheet?

Just over a third of South Brisbane officers (36%) and only 15% of Townsville officers indicated that they give diversion sheets to those public nuisance offenders who they assess as eligible for diversion. Interestingly, this was more common among female officers. A smaller proportion of officers surveyed (10% of South Brisbane officers and 4% of Townsville officers) indicated that they accompany every issued public nuisance offence ticket with a diversion sheet. However, this behaviour was more likely among older, higher ranking officers, with more years of service with QPS.
When asked to indicate what diversionary services are available in their area, 76% of officers surveyed listed at least one of the services outlined below. The remainder (24%) indicated that there were no diversionary services available. In some cases, particularly in more remote, regional areas, no services are available. In other cases, officers appear to be unaware of diversionary options that are available in their area, or explicitly indicated that they were unaware that diversionary options and/or diversion sheets existed.

- **What types of diversionary programs are PN offenders being referred to?**

Officers who were able to list available diversionary options (76% of surveyed officers) typically listed one of the following services:

**South Brisbane**
- Murri Watch Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islanders Corporation, Woolloongabba
- Hospitals
- Ozcare, Kangaroo Point
- St Vincent de Paul, South Brisbane
- Micah projects Inc., West End
- Indigenous Youth Health Service, Woolloongabba
- West End Community House
- Homeless Persons Court Diversion Program

**Townsville**
- Youth Drop in Centre (e.g., Townsville/Thuringowa Integrated Youth Program)
- Women's Centre, Aitkenville
- Powerhouse Support Centre, Townsville
- Gurindal, Townsville
- Hospitals
- Friend or family’s home
- Reverend Charles Harris Diversionary Centre, Aitkenville
- Murri Court
- Queensland Indigenous Alcohol Diversion Program, QIADP
- St Vincent de Paul, Townsville

**7.3 Are ticketing penalties higher than court-ordered penalties for public nuisance offending?**

**Administrative Data**

- Are ticketing penalties higher than court-ordered penalties for public nuisance offending?

To address this question we examined two sources of data:

1. Fines associated with tickets issued during the trial. This was based on all tickets issued from 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2009, derived from Queensland Transport administrative data.
2. Court-ordered fine for offences which were ticketable under the trial. This was based on fines registered with SPER in from 1 January to 17 November 2009. Only fines where the ticketable offence was the primary offence and there were no other charges associated with the fine were included\(^{16}\).

---

\(^{16}\) It is possible that non-ticketable offences were also included in those estimates as QPS and the Department of Justice of Attorney General employ different systems for coding and grouping offences. The SPER data reported here are based on the Department of Justice and Attorney General’s offence coding system, while the Queensland Transport data, is based on the QPS offence coding system.
The set fines for each of the offences included in the ticketing trial are presented in Table 1.1 in the Executive Summary.

Figure 7.15 illustrates the proportion of $100 and $300 tickets issued for public nuisance offences, public urination, and PPRA offences during the trial. As illustrated, 85% of tickets issued for a public nuisance offence (excluding public urination) involved a $300 fine, and the remainder (15%) a $100 fine. This equates to a mean ticket-issued fine for a public nuisance offence (excluding public urination) during the trial of $269. PPRA offences attracted a similar proportion of $300 and $100 tickets during the trial (89% and 11% respectively), equating to a mean ticket-issued fine for PPRA offences of $278. Finally, all tickets issued for public urination involved a $100 fine.

**Figure 7.15** Proportion (%) of $100 and $300 tickets issued during the 2009 trial period as a function of offence type.

Source: Queensland Transport
The mean court-ordered fine for a public nuisance offence was $286, for
ticketable PPRA offences, $258\textsuperscript{17}, and for public urination, $132. However, there
exists substantial variance in the amount of individual court-ordered fines. As
illustrated in Figure 7.16, court-ordered fines for public urination ranged from
$20 to $200, with 70\% of fines falling between $50 and $150. Fifty-five percent
(55\%) were greater than $100. For public nuisance offences, court-ordered fines
ranged between $30 and $1000, with 80\% of fines falling between $120 and
$480 (60\% between $100 and $300). Fifty-one percent (51\%) were less than
$300. Finally, for ticketable PPRA offences, court-ordered fines ranged from $10
to $1000, with 80\% of fines falling between $75 and $320 (65\% between $100
and $300). Seventy-two percent (72\%) were less than $300.

Figure 7.16 The proportion (%) of ticketable offences as a function of
amount of court-ordered fine in 2008

\textsuperscript{17} We limited our analysis to those PPRA offences court-ordered fines which were equal to or less
than $1000 (99.8\% of PPRA offence fines) to control for more serious offences which may have
been captured based on the Department of Justice and Attorney General’s offence coding system.
In sum, mean fines for tickets issued during the trial were similar to mean court-ordered fines for the same offences. Although court-ordered fines vary substantially, the bulk fall within the range set for tickets during the trial. At the same time, the vast majority of tickets issued for PPRA and public nuisance offences (excluding public urination) involved a $300 fine, whereas most court-ordered fines for these offences were less than $300. This suggests that most individuals issued a ticket for a PPRA or public nuisance offence during the trial were fined a higher amount than they would otherwise incur through the Magistrate Court process. In contrast, most court-ordered fines for public urination were higher than the set $100 ticket fine for this offence, suggesting that individuals are likely to receive a higher fine for public urination when the matter is dealt with through the Magistrate’s Court.

7.4 Potential Justice Issues

This section considers various justice-related implications of ticketing for public nuisance offending. Findings are presented based on the survey of police officers within the two trial districts and administrative data from the Department of Justice and Attorney General.

Police Survey

When asked to consider the following statement: “The introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences has reduced people’s ability to seek justice for alleged public nuisance offending”, 50% of South Brisbane officers and 55% of Townsville officers expressed disagreement with this view. A minority of surveyed officers (12% in South Brisbane and 9% in Townsville) agreed with the view that ticketing for public nuisance offending reduces the ability to seek justice.
Administrative Data

To further examine the impact of ticketing on the propensity of individuals to seek justice, we considered the proportion of tickets contested during the trial relative to the proportion of public nuisance charges contested when heard before a court.

As previously indicated in Chapter 3, only 1% of individuals issued a ticket during the trial chose to contest this by having the matter dealt with in court. To determine whether individuals are more or less likely to contest a charge when the sanction is a ticket, we examined administrative data pertaining to individuals who were charged with a ticketable offence dealt with through the Magistrates Court in Queensland in 2008\(^{18}\).

As outlined below, we were limited in our ability to draw relevant and accurate conclusions based on the data available to us. However, with this caveat, we have addressed the question and summarised the findings below.

Of the 49,118 adults charged with a ticketable offence which was brought before a Magistrates Court in Queensland during 2008:

- 67% submitted a plea of guilty. However, this may be an underestimation of the total number of individuals submitting a guilty plea as it does not include individuals who pled guilty in writing and had the matter finalised *ex parte* (i.e., in absence of the defendant). Unfortunately, based on the data available to us, it was not possible to ascertain the number of people falling into this latter category.

\(^{18}\)2008 was used as a comparison year as it was the most recent period prior to the trial. In addition, 2009 cases may systematically differ (e.g. be more “serious”) than ticketed public nuisance offenses, by the very nature of resulting from an arrest rather than a ticket. Thus 2008 public nuisance cases are more representative.
<1% of individuals submitted a plea of not guilty and had the matter finalised within the same year. However, this is likely to be an underestimation of the total number of individuals who submit a not guilty plea for the following reasons:

- 10% of individuals had their matter listed as still in progress and, based on the data available to us; it was not possible to determine the number of individuals within this group who had originally submitted a plea of not guilty.
- 18% of individuals had their matter finalised *ex parte* (i.e., in absence of the defendant) and, again, based on the data available to us, it was not possible to determine what proportion of these individuals had originally submitted a plea of not guilty but failed to appear at their final hearing.

To summarise, if we only consider matters heard before the court and finalised with the defendant present, the proportion of individuals (<1%) who plead not guilty (i.e., contest the charge) is similar to the proportion of individuals who contested tickets issued during the trial (1%). However, it should be stressed that this proportion most likely represents an underestimation of the total proportion of not guilty pleas and should be treated with caution until further examination of court data has been undertaken.

### 7.5 Procedural and training issues

**Police Survey**

We also considered what training officers received prior to the commencement of the trial.

All officers within the two trial districts received a copy of the Commissioner’s Circular detailing the ticketing procedures (see Appendix 1) prior to the
commencement of the ticketing trial. The vast majority of officers surveyed (88% of Townsville officers and 81% of South Brisbane officers) agreed that the Commissioner’s Circular provided sufficient information to enable them to implement these procedures.

Seven percent (7%) of officers surveyed in South Brisbane and 20% of officers surveyed in Townsville indicated that they received no additional directions from their Officer in Charge or the District Officer regarding the ticketing trial. In contrast, the majority of officers indicated that they received some directions primarily via email or other written documentation. Some officers indicated that they received directions in the form of a Standard Operational Procedure (SOP).

Whilst not prompted to directly address diversion, a proportion of officers stated that they received directions regarding diversion of public nuisance offenders (17% of South Brisbane officers and 6% of Townsville officers) and the use of diversion sheets. At the same time, 10% of Townsville district officers indicated that they did not know what a diversion sheet and/or a diversionary service was.

Thirty-seven percent of Townsville officers and 24% of South Brisbane officers indicated that they would have benefited from further training and/or information regarding the issuing of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending. Typical additional training/resources suggested by officers included:

- station-based or regional office face-to-face training and/or refresher course;
- clear and detailed instructions outlined in an email or posted on the Bulletin Board.

- Additional procedural issues

A large proportion of officers in both districts (64% in South Brisbane and 55% in Townsville) indicated that when issuing a ticket for a public nuisance offence
it was difficult to determine whether a person had already received one earlier that day.

Currently, tickets for public nuisance offending are recorded in an individual’s traffic history but not in their criminal history. Thirty-eight percent (38%) of South Brisbane and 39% of Townville officers indicated that this current system made it difficult to determine an individual’s amount of prior public nuisance offending. Some officers indicated that they would have benefited from additional training in this regard.

When asked to outline any perceived limitations with ticketing for public nuisance offending, procedural limitations which arose include:

- that previous ticketed public nuisance offences do not appear on an individual’s criminal history;\(^{19}\)
- issuing an ticket without issuing a move-on direction or otherwise removing the individual from the situation (i.e., by taking them to the station or watch house) is often ineffective as a means of discontinuing the offence;
- not being able to collect biometric information/particulars from offenders;
- a perception that the procedure for issuing tickets/processing ticketed offenders is still too time-consuming, in particular, still needing to complete a PAC report.

\(^{19}\)It should be noted that this is contradictory to the intent of ticketing for public nuisance, which includes diverting relevant individuals from the criminal justice system and not generating a criminal history for public nuisance offences. Payment of a fine is not deemed evidence of an offence being committed.
7.6 Summary of findings

- Data from the police survey, in conjunction with police consultations reported in Chapter 5, suggest that it may be difficult, in some cases, to reliably identify homeless status prior to issuing a ticket.

- Less than half of the officers surveyed indicated that they attempt to identify the homeless and/or Indigenous status of ticketed persons.

- Older, more highly ranked officers were more likely to attempt to identify the homeless status of individuals prior to issuing a ticket for public nuisance offending.

- A small proportion of individuals receiving tickets during the trial had a history of mental illness (2% in the South Brisbane district and 1% in the Townsville district). In both districts this was smaller than the proportion of individuals arrested or issued an NTA for a public nuisance offence with a history of mental illness. It was also smaller than, or similar to, the proportion of public nuisance offenders identified with a history mental illness over the past nine years.

- For non-Indigenous persons in both Townsville and South Brisbane, ticketing resulted in reduced arrest and NTA rates but an overall increase in public nuisance offending. This increase was consistent with the upward trend in public nuisance offending seen in the past five years for non-Indigenous persons in the Townsville and South Brisbane districts.

- The rate of public nuisance offending among Indigenous persons rose by 40% in the Townsville district and dropped by 20% in the South Brisbane district from 2008 to 2009. The reduction in South Brisbane was primarily driven by a reduction in arrest rates, and may reflect both a marked peak in 2008 as well the introduction of tickets for public nuisance offending. The rise in Townsville is similar to that seen from 2005 to 2006, but markedly larger than the two previous years. Unlike South Brisbane, and also unlike trends seen among non-Indigenous
persons, arrest rates among Indigenous persons also rose in Townsville from 2008 to 2009.

- Among Indigenous persons, the proportion of tickets issued for public nuisance offending relative to other action types was higher in South Brisbane (30%) relative to Townsville (15%) but for both districts was lower than that seen for non-Indigenous persons (44% in Townsville and 43% in South Brisbane).

- The rate of Indigenous public nuisance offending in Townsville during the trial was 13.7 times higher than the non-Indigenous rate, and in South Brisbane, 7.7 times higher. For Townsville, this is the highest Indigenous relative to non-Indigenous rate seen for the past five years, and in South Brisbane the lowest relative rate seen for the past five years.

- Most officers reported that the availability of tickets had not impacted on their use of diversion or issuing a caution in response to public nuisance offending.

- Findings from the police survey also suggest that a large proportion of officers do not accompany tickets with diversion sheets. In some cases this may be due to officers being unaware of the existence of diversion sheets and or/diversionary options. Older, higher ranking officers with more years of experience with QPS were more likely to accompany every ticket with a diversion sheet.

- Female officers were more likely to give diversion sheets to ticketed individuals who they assess as eligible.

- Twenty-four percent (24%) of officers indicated that there were no diversionary services/options in their area.

- Mean court-ordered penalties for public urination, public nuisance and ticketable PPRA offences were similar in magnitude to mean fines associated with tickets for these offences during the trial. However, findings also suggest that most individuals receiving a ticket for a PPRA or public nuisance offence during the trial would have incurred a lower fine had their charge been processed through Magistrate’s Court. The opposite
was the case for public urination, with most court-ordered fines for public urination exceeding the set $100 fine associated with tickets issued for this offence.

- Based on the current available data it was not possible to draw definitive conclusions regarding the effect of ticketing on an individual’s ability/propensity to seek justice.

- Whilst the majority of officers reported that the Commissioner’s Circular provided sufficient information for the ticketing trial procedures, a third reported that additional training/information would have been of benefit to them.

- Sixty percent (60%) of officers indicated that, when issuing a ticket, it was difficult to determine whether an individual had received a ticket earlier that day.
Chapter 8—Conclusion and recommendations

The purpose of conducting a trial of public nuisance ticketing in two QPS districts was to assess (1) whether the scheme operated effectively as a diversion from the criminal justice system for public nuisance offenders, (2) whether it was a cost effective alternative to other methods of dealing with public nuisance offending, and (3) whether the scheme resulted in any unintended or negative consequences. The evaluation has shown that, overall, ticketing was an effective strategy to divert individuals from the criminal justice system. Ticketing also represented an overall cost savings for the Queensland government. Moreover, stakeholders’ views were generally positive, and front-line officers were supportive of the ticketing option, and as a result, implemented it widely during the trial. However, we also found that the impact of ticketing varied between the two trial sites and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous populations. Time and data limitations also restricted our ability to thoroughly examine implications for vulnerable groups and potential justice issues. Consequently, if ticketing is to be extended statewide, ongoing monitoring of the impact of ticketing for public nuisance would be required, with careful consideration of regional variation, implications for vulnerable groups and potential justice issues.

In this chapter we present the key findings from the evaluation, and based on these findings, we make recommendations in the event of a possible statewide extension of the ticketing scheme in Queensland.

8.1 Key findings

The purpose of conducting a trial of public nuisance ticketing in two QPS districts was to assess (1) whether the scheme operated effectively as a diversion of public nuisance offenders from the criminal justice system, (2) whether it was a
cost effective alternative to other methods of dealing with public nuisance offending, and (3) whether the scheme resulted in any unintended or negative consequences. In this section we summarise key findings related to these assessment criteria.

The distribution and payment of tickets and the characteristics of ticketed persons

1. There were regional differences in the distribution and issuing of tickets during the trial.

Tickets were issued at a rate of 310 per 100,000 people living in the two districts. The rate was nearly twice as high in Townsville—408 tickets per 100,000 people—as in South Brisbane—225 tickets per 100,000 people.

Ticketing was concentrated geographically. The majority of tickets were issued within a small number of divisions located near the Townville and Brisbane CBDs. Ticketing was also concentrated at certain times. There was monthly and daily variation in the rate of ticketing, in part this variation could be explained by peak times for recreation, nightclubs and bars in both cities.

There was variation in the volume of tickets issued for each of the nine eligible offences. However, across both districts, public urination and disorderly offences represented the majority, together accounting for two-thirds of all tickets issued in the trial.

An examination of different action types used for all public nuisance offences that occurred during the trial revealed that ticketing was the most frequently used action type for public nuisance offending in South Brisbane, whereas, arrest was most frequently used in Townsville.
2. *Tickets were primarily issued to males aged 18 to 25 for public urination and public nuisance-disorderly offences, however, some variation existed between the two trial districts.*

In South Brisbane, public urination was the most commonly ticketed offence, accounting for well over half (58%) of tickets issued in this district. Although public urination also accounted for 25% of the tickets issued in Townsville, here tickets were most frequently issued for Public Nuisance-disorderly offences (34%). Males accounted for 89% of all tickets issued; however, the rate of ticketed females was five times higher in Townsville than in South Brisbane.

3. *Fine payments: Only one-third of tickets were paid within 28 days, the remainder were forwarded to SPER.*

The largest proportion of tickets in both districts were in default of payment and had been registered with SPER for enforcement (i.e., a Default Certificate)—56% of tickets in Townsville and 51% of tickets in South Brisbane. Ticketed persons were in default if they had not paid, elected to register for the Voluntary Instalment Plan, or elected to have the matter dealt with by a court within 28 days of the date of the ticket.

Payment was the second most common final status in both districts. Just over one-third (35%) of tickets issued in South Brisbane and 29% of those issued in Townsville had been paid by January 31, 2009. The proportion of tickets paid fluctuated slightly over the months of the trial—ranging from a low of 24% for those ticketed in February to high of 36% for those ticketed in September.

Tickets were issued and awaiting further action at Queensland Transport in about 7% of cases in Townsville and 9% in South Brisbane. If ticket amounts were over $200, and an initial instalment of $60 could be made within 28 days of the date of the ticket, ticketed persons could elect to register for the Voluntary Instalment Plan (VIP). This occurred for about 5% of tickets in Townsville and 3% in South Brisbane.
For the remaining 3% of tickets in both districts a variety of final status types were recorded including: (1) rejected by SPER and sent back to Queensland Transport for further processing, (2) waived, suspended or voided, or (3) listed with QPS to commence prosecution against the person.

4. Mean ticket fine amounts were similar to mean court-ordered fines issued for ticketable offences during the trial period, however, most individuals receiving a ticket for a PPRA or public nuisance offence were fined a higher amount than they would otherwise receive through the Magistrate Court process.

The mean ticket issued fine for a public nuisance offence (excluding public urination) was $269, for ticketable PPRA offences, $278, and for public urination, $100. The mean court-ordered fine for a public nuisance offence was $286, for ticketable PPRA offences, $258, and for public urination, $132. However, the vast majority of tickets issued for PPRA (89%) and public nuisance (85%) offences involved a $300 fine, whereas most court-ordered fines for these offences were less than $300 (72% and 51% respectively). This finding suggests that most individuals issued a ticket for a PPRA or public nuisance offence during the trial were fined a higher amount than they would otherwise incur through the Magistrate Court process. In contrast, most court-ordered fines for public urination (55%) were higher than the set $100 ticket fine for this offence during the trial period. This suggests that individuals are likely to receive a higher fine for public urination when the matter is dealt with through the Magistrate’s Court.

The operation of the ticketing scheme as a method of diverting public nuisance offenders from the criminal justice system

5. Diversion from the criminal justice system: Ticketing decreased police use of arrest and NTA in response to public nuisance offending.

Rates of public nuisance related NTAs dropped substantially in both the South Brisbane and Townsville districts (35% and 30% respectively) relative to 2008 rates. This reduction could not be accounted for by trends in the comparison
districts, statewide trends, or trends in recent years. The rate of public-nuisance related arrests also dropped in South Brisbane (27%) but not in Townsville. The apparent absence of an effect in Townsville could, however, be related to a regional increase in public nuisance arrest rates (15% increase in Cairns from 2008 to 2009) which may have negated an observable decrease resulting from the introduction of tickets.

The reduction in arrest and NTA rates in South Brisbane and NTA rates in Townsville during the trial period is consistent with findings from the police survey, with 44% to 64% of surveyed officers reporting a reduction in their use of arrest and NTAs in response to public nuisance offending since the start of the trial.

The cost effectiveness of the ticketing trial

6. Ticketing represented an overall costs-savings for the Queensland government.

Although the introduction of ticketing for public nuisance offending introduces monetary costs associated with the processing of tickets, this appears to be substantially offset by the monetary savings for QPS, and the courts as well as the increased revenue from ticket-derived fines. Specifically, Queensland Transport and SPER will see an increased workload, and thus, increased costs, however, their increased costs are much smaller than the savings to be experienced by QPS and the courts due to reduced public nuisance related arrests and NTAs. Overall, it was estimated that a statewide implementation of ticketing for public nuisance offending in 2009 would have resulted in monetary savings Queensland government of either $18 or 30 million based on projections derived from the two trial sites.
7. The introduction of ticketing led to an increased rate of public nuisance offending in the two trial districts.

A twenty percent increase in public nuisance offending was observed in both the Townsville and South Brisbane districts during the trial relative to 2008 rates. In South Brisbane, this was accompanied by an increase in common assault both of which could not be accounted for by trends in comparison districts (Brisbane Central and North Brisbane, or by trends in recent years. This pattern of findings suggests that rates did in fact increase in response to the ticketing trial and that this may in part be attributable to a greater detection of offences resulting from an increased police presence. This is consistent with the perceptions of police and other stakeholders that ticketing for public nuisance offending increases the amount of time police can spend “on the street” as well as the number of police “on the street” at any given time.

In Townsville, the increase in public nuisance offending was accompanied by a smaller, but still sizeable (12%), increase in Cairns. In contrast, common assault decreased in both Townsville and Cairns. These findings suggest that the increase seen in Townsville may in part be driven by a regional increase in public nuisance offending. However, as the Townsville rate increase was almost twice that seen in Cairns, it is also likely to reflect the introduction of ticketing, and consequently a greater police presence—i.e., officers have more time on the street which may have resulted in either greater detection of public nuisance related offences. The higher rate observed in Townsville may also be a consequence of tickets being issued for minor incidents of public nuisance offending which would have previously been overlooked.
8. A small proportion of individuals receiving tickets during the trial had a history of mental illness.

Only 2% of ticketed persons in the South Brisbane district and 1% in Townsville were identified as having a mental illness. In both districts this was less than the proportion of individuals arrested or issued an NTA for a public nuisance offence who were identified as having a mental illness. It was also less than or similar to the proportion of public nuisance offenders identified as having a mental illness over the past nine years. However, in the current evaluation mental illness was defined as any previous contact with mental health services. This definition fails to capture a large proportion of community mental health problems, and therefore does not fully assess the impact of ticketing on this broader group of individuals.

9. The overrepresentation of Indigenous people among Public Nuisance offenders increased in Townsville during the trial and decreased in South Brisbane.

The rate of Indigenous public nuisance offending in Townsville during the trial was 14 times higher than the non-Indigenous rate, and in South Brisbane, 8 times higher. For Townsville, this is the highest Indigenous relative to non-Indigenous rate seen for the past five years, and in South Brisbane the lowest relative rate seen for the past five years. The increased difference between Indigenous and non-Indigenous offenders in Townsville was not due to reduced non-Indigenous rates, as rates rose for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous persons. Instead, it was driven by a larger increase in the rate of public nuisance offending from 2008 to 2009 among Indigenous relative to non-Indigenous individuals (40% and 13% increase respectively). The impact of ticketing on arrest and NTA rates was also vastly different between Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals in Townsville. For non-Indigenous individuals, ticketing produced a clear reduction in rates of arrest and NTAs, while for Indigenous individuals arrest rates rose during the trial and NTA rates remained relatively stable. As well, tickets accounted for a much smaller proportion of all actions for
public nuisance offending among Indigenous (tickets represent 13% of all actions) relative to non-Indigenous individuals (tickets represent 44% of all actions).

There was less disparity between Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals in the impact of ticketing on arrest and NTA rates in South Brisbane. For both groups, rates of public nuisance related-arrests dropped from 2008 to 2009. For Indigenous individuals this may be partly related to a clear peak in public nuisance-related arrests seen in 2008. However, for both groups the reduction in public nuisance-related arrests also appears to reflect, at least in part, the introduction of the ticketing option. As in Townsville, tickets accounted for a smaller proportion of actions for public nuisance offending among Indigenous (tickets represent 30% of all actions) relative to non-Indigenous individuals (tickets represent 43% of all actions). However, again, the difference between Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals was less marked than in Townsville.

Finally, although the relative rate of ticketing between Indigenous and non-Indigenous individuals during the trial was lower than that reported above for overall public nuisance offending, individuals identifying as Indigenous were still 4 to 5 times more likely to be ticketed than non-Indigenous individuals.20

10. Potential justice issues with respect to access to legal advice and the capacity to contest tickets.

Legal services stakeholders voiced concern that ticketing would reduce the likelihood that individuals would contest a matter that would typically be challenged in court. By and large, this view was not shared by police, with half of the officers surveyed within the two trial districts indicating that they felt ticketing did not reduce an individual’s ability to seek justice. Examination of

20 For more context regarding the overrepresentation of Indigenous people as public nuisance offenders in Queensland see CMC (2008) and Walsh (2006a; 2008).
administrative data showed that a very small proportion (1%) of those who were issued a ticket during the trial elected to contest the ticket by having the matter dealt with by the court. This appears comparable to the proportion of individuals who plead not guilty among matters heard before a court and finalised with the defendant present (<1%). However, it should be stressed that this latter proportion may represent an underestimation of the total proportion of not guilty pleas and should not be considered reliable or valid without further examination of court data.

11. **Further officer training and guidance required, particularly with respect to diversion and the identification of vulnerable groups.**

Findings from consultations and the police survey indicate a need for further officer training and guidance, particularly with respect to diversion, move-on directions, taking individuals to the station/watchhouse, and discretion in issuing tickets over other action types.

Evidence from the police survey and consultations revealed variance in the use of diversion sheets by officers during the trial as well as officer knowledge of pre- and post-ticket diversionary options and procedures. Interestingly, older, more experienced officers were more likely to accompany every ticket issued for a public nuisance offence with a diversion sheet.

Findings from the police survey and consultations with police indicate that it may also be difficult for officers to reliably identify individuals eligible for diversion (i.e., homeless, Indigenous, mental health issues). Additionally, officers vary substantially in terms of their use of move-on directions as well as the proportion of ticketed individuals who are taken to the watchhouse or the station prior to ticketing. Legal service stakeholders also expressed concern regarding officer discretion in issuing public nuisance tickets versus diversion or other action types. Both police and legal service stakeholders commented that younger, less experienced officers may be less likely to exercise their discretion wisely.
Additional findings from stakeholder consultations

12. The need for greater public information and education.

In general, stakeholders felt that ticketing would only lead to an increase in community perceptions of safety/public order if statewide implementation was accompanied by extensive public information campaigns.

13. The need for coordinated efforts to reduce or prevent public nuisance offending before it occurs

Along with increased community education, stakeholders raised the need for a coordinated local government and community level effort to develop strategies which may reduce or prevent at least some of the more common types of nuisance offending. For example, in both Townsville and South Brisbane stakeholders suggested that problems with public urination in entertainment districts could be addressed by providing additional toilet facilities in these areas.

8.2 Recommendations

Overall, this evaluation has demonstrated that the ticketing scheme proved to be an effective means of diverting public nuisance offenders from the criminal justice system, as well as a cost savings for the Queensland Government; however, we also found that ticketing may have some adverse implications for certain vulnerable groups. Consequently, if ticketing is to be extended statewide, certain safeguards should be put in place to protect these groups.

We make the following recommendations based on the findings of the evaluation.
The findings in this evaluation indicated that a statewide extension of the ticketing program would represent an overall cost savings for the Queensland government. The amount of this savings would range between $18.0 and $31.1 million based on separate projections from the two pilot sites.

Overall, the time and resource savings for QPS and the courts were also greater than any increase in workload resulting from the introduction of ticketing. Certain legal services also experienced a significant reduction in the size of their caseload as a result of the reduction in public nuisance-related arrests and NTAs.

Analysis of data from the trial period also indicated that the ticketing option was an effective means of diverting public nuisance offenders from the criminal justice system. This was particularly the case in South Brisbane where findings from analyses of QPS data and a survey of police officers indicated that the ticketing trail had the effect of reducing public nuisance related arrest and NTA rates during the trial. Reductions in use of NTAs were observed in Townsville. Comparisons to other districts and preceding years suggested that these reductions may be largely due to the choice, by officers during the trial, to issue a ticket to individuals who they previously would have arrested or issued an NTA.

1. The Queensland State government should consider the benefits and implications of a wider extension of the program of ticketing for public nuisance offences in Queensland.

During the trial, the rate of public nuisance offending was up to 14 times greater for Indigenous than non-Indigenous persons. Although this difference was lower with respect to ticketing, Indigenous persons were
still five times more likely than non-Indigenous persons to receive a ticket during the trial.

For Indigenous persons in Townsville, ticketing did not diminish the overall rate of public nuisance-related arrests and NTAs. In fact, the arrest rate for Indigenous persons increased during the trial but decreased for non-Indigenous persons. Unlike effects seen for non-Indigenous persons, ticketing therefore did not function to divert Indigenous persons from the criminal justice system.

A different result was observed in South Brisbane where ticketing seems to have contributed to a reduction in arrest rates during the trial for Indigenous people. This finding points to potential regional variation in the impact of ticketing on vulnerable groups, such as Indigenous people. A lack of services in rural and remote communities could also contribute to this variation and, ultimately, to the overrepresentation of Indigenous people as public nuisance offenders.

There are a broad range of social and economic challenges facing vulnerable groups who are often overrepresented among public nuisance offenders. Although interventions such as ticketing are well-intentioned they do not address these underlying social and economic conditions. A broader social-welfare approach is needed to address the risks and needs of vulnerable groups.

2. Governmental agencies should work in partnership with local communities to address public nuisance offending in a coordinated approach which includes initiatives to reduce underlying social problems that give rise to this form of offending behaviour.
3. Consideration should be directed to understanding regional variation in the impact of ticketing particular to rural and remote communities, and communities with significant Indigenous populations.

The highest rate of public nuisance offences typically occur in known entertainment districts, for example West End in South Brisbane district (see Appendix 3) and the Brisbane Central district (see Appendix 4). A large proportion of public nuisance tickets issued during the trial were for public urination and disorderly behaviour. During consultations these types of offences were raised by police and community stakeholders as a particular problem for entertainment districts, but a problem for which clear community-level solutions could be developed—for example, providing additional public toilet facilities.

4. Governmental agencies should work in partnership with local communities to develop strategies for reducing the high rate of public nuisance offending in entertainment districts such as by providing additional public toilet facilities.

Any criminal justice program or intervention requires ongoing monitoring. Due to some of the constraints of the current evaluation, there is a need to explore further implications of the ticketing program. For example, an identifiable challenge related to identifying vulnerable groups at various stages of the ticketing process. Queensland Transport and SPER do not record Indigenous status and therefore it is not currently possible to examine payment outcomes for this group. In addition, in the current evaluation mental illness was defined as any previous contact with mental health services. This definition is restrictive and fails to
capture a substantial proportion of community mental health problems, and consequently, does not fully assess the impact of ticketing on this broader group of individuals.

Moreover, a relatively large proportion of ticketed individuals (46%) had no prior criminal history. Given the 12-month window of the trial, the current evaluation was unable to examine the possible deterrent effect (i.e., impact on rate of re-offending) of ticketing on first-time offenders. This would require a longer-term monitoring of ticketing and public nuisance re-offending rates.

The results of this evaluation revealed large variation between the two trial districts with respect to the nature and extent of ticketing, the effect on Indigenous people, and officer and stakeholder perceptions of the trial. These differences, as well as the challenges described above, stress the need to be aware of the variation in the effect of a statewide ticketing program, and the need for ongoing and improved data collection.

5. A statewide extension of ticketing for public nuisance should be accompanied by improved and on-going data collection and monitoring of the effect of the program. In addition to administrative data sources, this data collection should include consultations with community members and stakeholders.

Vulnerable groups regardless of their Indigenous status require access to diversionary options. Post-ticket diversionary options vary across Queensland. For example, in South Brisbane district, post-ticket diversion options include Murri Court and Special Circumstances Court; however, in Townsville, post-ticket diversion includes Murri Court only—there are currently no options for non-Indigenous vulnerable groups.
The directive regarding diversion sheets specified in the Commissioner’s Circular (no. 32/2008) provides an excellent safeguard for ensuring that vulnerable groups are appropriately diverted. However, information from the police survey and consultations revealed divergent practices in relation to the distribution of diversion sheets to ticketed persons. There was also evidence of variation in officers’ awareness of diversion sheets during the trial; the potential consequence being that some eligible ticketed persons were not receiving diversion sheets. One way of addressing this problem could be to issue diversion sheets to all ticketed persons. Indeed, evidence from the police survey and the consultations indicated that this practice is already occurring in some police stations.

6. In support of a statewide extension of the ticketing program, an assessment should be undertaken to ascertain the post-ticket diversionary options (e.g., Murri Court and Special Circumstances Court) available across jurisdictions that are suitable for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous vulnerable groups.

7. Diversion sheets should be provided to all ticketed persons.

Traffic infringement notices were used to ticket public nuisance offences for the purposes of the 12-month trial only. This eliminated the time and costs involved in producing a customised ticket book for public nuisance offences and the intent was to develop a specific infringement notice for public nuisance offences if the pilot was successful. By including relevant information, a dedicated public nuisance infringement notice could address issues related to the ticketing of vulnerable groups—specifically, by facilitating ongoing monitoring of the impact of ticketing on Indigenous
people—and the ease with which ticketed persons can contest or obtain additional information regarding the ticketing process.

8. That dedicated public nuisance infringement notices should be designed to include clear instructions for the ticketed person, including instructions on how and when to pay, formally contest tickets and for accessing further information from a government website. Tickets should also record key demographic information including the gender, age and Indigenous status of the ticketed person.

Police officers raised concerns about access to prior ticketing history. Currently, tickets are recorded in an individual’s traffic history, and are not easily accessible to officers undertaking routine criminal history checks.

9. Police information systems should be modified to ensure improved officer access to a person’s public nuisance ticketing history.
The contents of this Commissioner's Circular commence on 1 January 2009

TRIAL ISSUING OF INFRINGEMENT NOTICES FOR PUBLIC NUISANCE, PUBLIC URINATION AND ASSOCIATED OFFENCES

On 1 January 2009, a 12 month trial will be conducted in the South Brisbane and Townsville police districts permitting the issue of traffic infringement notices (PT56) for public nuisance, public urination and associated offences.

Queensland Transport will be the authority responsible for processing infringement notices issued by police as a result of the trial. Queensland Transport will be using the TRAILS computer system for the purposes of administering infringement notices issued.

POLICY

The contents of this Circular only applies to prescribed public nuisance offences committed within the trial areas, or associated offences. The policies and procedures contained in this Circular are set out in the format that will be used when incorporated into the Operational Procedures Manual in due course.

13.4.12 Issuing of infringement notices for public nuisance, public urination and associated offences

For the purpose of this Circular the following definitions apply:

prescribed public nuisance offence means an offence against ss. 6(1): 'Public nuisance' or 7(1): 'Urinating in a public place' of the Summary Offences Act, unless the offence also involves an offence against the person.

associated offence, in relation to a prescribed public nuisance offence, means an offence (whether committed within or outside the prescribed area) against
either or both of the following provisions, unless the offence also involves an offence against the person:

(i) s. 790(1): 'Offence to assault or obstruct police officer' of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act (PPRA), but only to the extent that it relates to obstructing a police officer in the performance of a police officer's duties in relation to a prescribed public nuisance offence;

(ii) s. 791(2): 'Offence to contravene direction or requirement of police officer' of the PPRA, but only to the extent that it relates to a requirement to state a person's correct name and address in relation to a prescribed public nuisance offence.

prescribed area means the trial areas of South Brisbane and Townsville police districts.

**Prescribed public nuisance offence**

**POLICY**

Depending on the circumstances of the prescribed public nuisance offence committed in the trial area, officers may:

(i) refer the person to an appropriate agency (see also ss. 16.6.3: 'Drunkenness' and 6.5.5: 'Potentially harmful things - volatile substance misuse' of the Operational Procedures Manual);

(ii) verbally caution the person;

(iii) issue an infringement notice to the person; or

(iv) commence a proceeding against the person.

Officers should consider alternatives to issuing an infringement notice or commencing a proceeding against a person suspected of committing a prescribed public nuisance offence.

Where a person commits a number of prescribed public nuisance offences in the one set of circumstances, officers should only issue one infringement notice for the most relevant prescribed public nuisance offence (see Appendix 1: 'Public nuisance, public urination and associated offence infringement notice codes and penalties' of this Circular).
**Associated offence**

**POLICY**

Officers are only to issue an infringement notice for an associated offence where an infringement notice is also to be issued for the prescribed public nuisance offence committed in a prescribed area.

An associated offence does not include an offence against the provisions of s. 791(2): ‘Offence to contravene direction or requirement of police officer’ of the PPRA that relates to a requirement the person give evidence of the correctness of the stated name and address in accordance with s. 40(2): ‘Person may be required to state name and address’ of the PPRA.

Examples of when an infringement notice for an associated offence, in addition to an infringement notice for a prescribed public nuisance offence, may be issued include:

(i) when the person obstructs a police officer dealing with that person's prescribed public nuisance offence;

(ii) when the person disobeys a requirement by a police officer to state their correct name and address in relation to the prescribed public nuisance offence; and

(iii) when the person is arrested for a prescribed public nuisance offence and later obstructs a police officer at a watchhouse (see 'Receiving custody of persons arrested for prescribed public nuisance offences' of this Circular).

An infringement notice for an associated offence may be issued regardless of whether the associated offence occurred inside or outside of a trial area.

For example, a person is arrested for a prescribed public nuisance offence committed in the South Brisbane police district. The person is then transported to the Brisbane City Watchhouse where the person obstructs a police officer. The arresting officer then decides to discontinue the arrest and serve infringement notices on the person for both the prescribed public nuisance and the associated offence (obstruct police) in accordance with s. 377: ‘Additional case when arrest of adult may be discontinue' of the PPRA. In this instance, an infringement notice has also been issued for the associated offence of obstructing a police officer, even though it occurred outside of the South Brisbane police district trial area.

**PROCEDURE**

Where an officer gives a verbal caution for a prescribed public nuisance or associated offence, the officer should:
(i) obtain the alleged offender's name and address; and

(ii) record in their official notebook or patrol log the full particulars of the alleged offender together with the time, date, location, type of offence and any other relevant particulars.

**Issuing an infringement notice**

**POLICY**

Where an officer is to issue an infringement notice for a prescribed public nuisance offence, and where applicable, an associated offence, each infringement notice is only to refer to one offence. Separate infringement notices are to be issued for a prescribed public nuisance offence and an associated offence.

Where an officer has made the decision to issue an infringement notice to a person for a prescribed public nuisance offence and where applicable, an associated offence, the officer should:

(i) issue a traffic infringement notice (PT56) in accordance with s. 8.8.5: 'Procedure for issuing Infringement Notices' of the Traffic Manual.

Before issuing an infringement notice, officers should ensure the person is positively identified by producing their photographic identification or other suitable identification. Where a driver licence is produced, officers should enter the relevant details on the front of the infringement notice. Where other identification details have been used to identify the person, such details should be recorded on the front of the infringement notice under the area titled 'Information about the offence';

(ii) prior to serving the infringement notice, clearly cross out the irrelevant information on the rear of the person's yellow copy of the infringement notice, see Appendix 2: 'Example of rear of yellow copy of infringement notice for public nuisance and associated offences' of this Circular;

(iii) additionally, where appropriate, officers are to give the person a copy of a court diversion options information sheet specific to their trial district and explain the contents (see also 'Court diversion options information sheet' of this Circular);

(iv) ensure that prior to submitting the pink and green copies of the infringement notice to their officer in charge, a QPRIME occurrence is created for the offence/s by contacting the Police Assistance Centre;

When obtaining the QPRIME occurrence number, ensure that each infringement notice number has a separate entry in the 'Miscellaneous ID' window; and
(v) enter the relevant QPRIME occurrence number on the front of both the pink and green copies of the infringement notice under the area titled 'Information about the offence' prior to the notice being forwarded to their officer in charge.

A copy of the relevant infringement notice codes and penalties is contained in Appendix 1: 'Public nuisance, public urination and associated offence infringement notice codes and penalties' of this Circular.

**Interstate residents or overseas visitors committing prescribed public nuisance and associated offences**

**POLICY**

Where overseas visitors and interstate residents commit prescribed public nuisance and associated offences when visiting Queensland they should not be treated any differently to Queensland residents.

The fact that an overseas or interstate resident may commit a prescribed public nuisance offence, and where applicable, an associated offence, and would be due to leave Queensland before such person is required to pay the infringement notice fine should not alone be considered sufficient cause to warrant the arrest of the person.

Officers who detect overseas residents committing prescribed public nuisance and associated offences may consider giving a caution where appropriate.

Where the issue of an infringement notice or caution is not considered appropriate, officers may consider commencing a prosecution by issuing a notice to appear, complaint and summons or making an arrest where justified.

**PROCEDURE**

Officers who issue infringement notices to interstate residents for prescribed public nuisance and associated offences should ensure that the person's name, address and date of birth are accurately entered on the infringement notice, including any driver licence details. The State Penalties Enforcement Registry (SPER) is unable to process infringement notices issued to interstate residents which do not contain a date of birth. However, it should be noted that there is no legislative power to require a person to state their date of birth.

Officers who issue an infringement notice to an overseas visitor should:

(i) where possible, show the alleged offender's current Australian address on the face of the notice; and
(ii) indicate on the prosecution copy of the notice the alleged offender's usual residential address and the date the alleged offender is due to leave Australia.

For offences not dealt with by the SPER, this information will assist if the infringement notice is returned unpaid to indicate whether the notice may be waived without the need for a report from the issuing officer.

Officers should be mindful of the contents of ss. 11.8: 'Diplomatic Privileges and Immunities Act' and 16.7: 'Foreign nationals' of the Operational Procedures Manual.

**Identifying particulars**

**POLICY**

There are no provisions for the taking of the identifying particulars of a person who has only been issued with an infringement notice for prescribed public nuisance or associated offences.

Officers are to be mindful that authority exists to take identifying particulars for prescribed public nuisance and associated offences in accordance with ss. 467: 'Taking identifying particulars of person in custody' and 468: 'Taking identifying particulars--proceeding started by notice to appear or complaint and summons' of the PPRA (see also s. 2.45.2: 'When to take identifying particulars' of the Operational Procedures Manual).

However, where an officer arrests a person for a prescribed public nuisance or associated offence, the officer may discontinue the arrest and issue an infringement notice for the offence in accordance with s. 377(2)(b)(i): 'Additional case when arrest of adult may be discontinued' of the PPRA. In this instance, if the identifying particulars of the person have been taken prior to the person's release, officers should determine whether the identifying particulars should be destroyed within a reasonable time in the presence of a justice in accordance with s. 474: 'Destruction of identifying particulars' of the PPRA.

**Court diversion options information sheet**

**POLICY**

District officers for the respective prescribed trial areas are responsible for developing and maintaining a current court diversion options information sheet relevant to their districts. District officers are to ensure that a copy of the information sheet is made available to officers under their command for issuing with infringement notices for prescribed public nuisance offences.
District officers should ensure that where a prescribed police officer at a police station, police establishment or watchhouse outside of the prescribed trial area may issue an infringement notice for prescribed public nuisance and associated offences (e.g. Brisbane City Watchhouse), then a copy of the information sheet should also be made available to such officers (see 'Receiving custody of persons arrested for prescribed public nuisance offences' of this Circular). In this instance a prescribed police officer is the officer referred to in s. 394(2)(ca) of the PPRA.

The court diversion information sheet should contain a list of available court diversion programs and instruct the person issued with the infringement notice to elect to have the matter dealt with by a court should the person wish to access such a program. For example, the Queensland Indigenous Alcohol Diversion Program (QIADP) operates in Townsville, and the Homeless Persons Court Diversion Program operates through the Brisbane Magistrates Court.

**Repeat offenders**

**POLICY**

Where officers become aware that a person has been issued multiple infringement notices for prescribed public nuisance offences, officers should consider alternatives to issuing further infringement notices.

**Receiving custody of persons arrested for prescribed public nuisance offences**

**POLICY**

A prescribed police officer at the police station, police establishment or watchhouse, may as soon as reasonably practicable, where a person has been arrested for a prescribed public nuisance offence committed, or reasonably suspected of being committed, in the prescribed trial area, issue and serve an infringement notice on the person in accordance with s. 394(2)(ca): 'Duty of police officer receiving custody of person arrested for offence' of the PPRA. In this instance a prescribed police officer is the officer referred in s. 394(2)(ca) of the PPRA.

A prescribed police officer may issue an infringement notice on behalf of the arresting officer in accordance with s. 394(2)(ca) of the PPRA regardless of whether they are in a prescribed trial area or not. For example, a prescribed police officer at the Brisbane City Watchhouse who receives a person arrested for a prescribed public nuisance offence committed in the South Brisbane district during the trial period may issue the person an infringement notice in accordance with s. 394(2)(ca).
Where the person issued the infringement notice elects to have the matter dealt with by a court, the original arresting officer is responsible for commencing court proceedings as if they were the issuing officer of the infringement notice.

PROCEDURE

Where a prescribed police officer determines that an infringement notice for a prescribed public nuisance offence, and where applicable an associated offence, is to be issued in accordance with s.394(2)(ca) of the PPRA on behalf of the arresting officer, the prescribed police officer is to:

(i) complete and issue the infringement notice in accordance with this Circular;

(ii) make appropriate notes on the rear of the pink copy of the infringement notice indicating the infringement notice has been issued on behalf of the arresting officer;

(iii) ensure a supplementary report in the relevant QPRIME occurrence is completed indicating the action taken;

(iv) ensure that the 'Miscellaneous ID' window in the relevant QPRIME occurrence is updated with the relevant infringement notice number;

(v) send a QPRIME task to the arresting officer's organisational unit advising of the action taken;

(vi) forward the pink and green copies of the infringement notice for processing to the officer in charge of their station or establishment; and

(vii) where any identifying particulars have been taken of the person in relation to the offence prior to the issuing of an infringement notice, determine whether the identifying particulars should be destroyed within a reasonable time in the presence of a justice in accordance with s.474: 'Destruction of identifying particulars' of the PPRA.

Court election

POLICY

Officers in charge of stations or establishments who receive advice that a person has elected to have their infringement notice for a prescribed public nuisance or associated offence dealt with in a court are to refer the matter to the officer who issued the infringement notice to consider commencing a proceeding against the person.
Where a prescribed police officer, who has issued an infringement notice on behalf of the arresting officer in accordance with s. 394(2)(ca) of the PPRA, receives notification that the person has elected to have the matter dealt with in court, such officer should forward the notification to the officer in charge of the arresting officer to consider commencing a proceeding against the person.

PROCEDURE

Officers who receive advice that a person has elected to have their infringement notice dealt with in a court should comply with ss. 3.4.2: 'The decision to institute proceedings' and 3.4.3: 'The discretion to prosecute' of the Operational Procedures Manual.

(See also s. 3.5: 'The institution of proceedings' of the Operational Procedures Manual.)

Children

POLICY

Officers considering issuing an infringement notice to persons under 17 years of age for prescribed public nuisance and, where applicable, associated offences, are to follow the policy and procedures contained in s. 8.8.2: 'Infringement Notice issued to persons under age of 17 years' of the Traffic Manual.

Officers in charge to forward issued infringement notices to Queensland Transport

POLICY

Officers in charge of stations and establishments should ensure that infringement notices issued by officers under their control for public nuisance and associated offences are forwarded to Queensland Transport in accordance with s. 8.8.8: 'Officers in charge to forward issued Infringement Notices to Queensland Transport' of the Traffic Manual.

Waiving and cancellation of infringement notices

POLICY

Officers in charge of stations or establishments seeking to waive or cancel infringement notices issued in relation to prescribed public nuisance and where applicable associated offences, are to follow the policy and procedures provided
for in s.8.9: 'Waiving and cancellation of Infringement Notices' of the Traffic Manual.

**Administrative**

Enquiries about the 12 month trial may be directed to the Policy Unit, Office of the Commissioner, telephone 3364 3796.

**ORDER**

Officers in charge are to note the contents of this Circular and bring them to the notice of all members under their control.

**KATHY RYNDERS**
**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER**
**(REGIONAL OPERATIONS)**
## Table A2.1: Queensland Transport ticket outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QT action/status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>Paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINSPER</td>
<td>Default Certificate has been accepted and registered with SPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIPSPER</td>
<td>Voluntary Instalment Plan (VIP) application accepted and registered with SPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIPSPERREJ</td>
<td>VIP application rejected by SPER and returned to Queensland Transport Processing Operations for further action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTPROS</td>
<td>Listed with QPS to commence prosecutions against alleged offender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIVED</td>
<td>Withdrawn by issuing authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTISS</td>
<td>Issued and is awaiting further action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPER</td>
<td>Default Certificate or VIP application details have been electronically sent to SPER (in overnight batch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPERREJ</td>
<td>Default Certificate has been rejected by SPER and returned to Queensland Transport Processing Operations for further action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUSPEND</td>
<td>Result suspended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL</td>
<td>Court result finalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOID</td>
<td>Customer unable to be located or created in Transport system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A2.2: SPER action/status codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SPER fine action/status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finalised</td>
<td>Finalised is a status of the actual debt/infringement with SPER. The debt is no longer outstanding. The debt could have been finalised by payment, by performing community service hours, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recalled</td>
<td>Recalled is a status of the actual debt/infringement with SPER. The debt is no longer outstanding with SPER as the issuing agency has recalled it from SPER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawn</td>
<td>Withdrawn is a status of the actual debt/infringement with SPER. The debt is no longer outstanding with SPER as the issuing agency has withdrawn it from SPER.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centrepay</td>
<td>Centrepay is a form of compliance with SPER. The offender has a deduction coming directly from his/her Centrelink benefit that is being sent to SPER to pay off their debt/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instalment Plan</td>
<td>Instalment Plan is a form of compliance with SPER. The offender has applied to pay off their debt/s in part payments. This can be by cash/cheque, from a bank account or credit account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Instalment Plan</td>
<td>Voluntary Instalment Plan is a form of compliance with SPER. A VIP is not a registered SPER debt but is an option an offender takes prior to the fine becoming overdue. The infringement is sent to SPER so that we can maintain the instalment plan on behalf of the issuing agency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Option Order</td>
<td>Fine Option Order is a form of compliance with SPER. The offender has applied to pay off their debt/s by performing unpaid community service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver Licence Suspension</td>
<td>Driver Licence Suspension is a form of enforcement that SPER has taken. We have suspended the driver licence of the offender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement Warrant</td>
<td>Enforcement Warrant is a form of enforcement that SPER has taken. We have issued an Enforcement Warrant for the offender - this means that we have registered an interest in the offender's vehicle or property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines Collection Notice</td>
<td>Fines Collection Notice is a form of enforcement that SPER has taken. We have issued a Notice to the offender's bank or employer requesting for a certain amount to be paid to SPER from the wage or taken from their bank account.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant of Apprehension</td>
<td>Warrant of Apprehension is a form of enforcement with SPER. This is a warrant issued to an offender who resides interstate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey of QPS Patrol Officers on Public Nuisance Ticketing

TICKETING FOR PUBLIC NUISANCE OFFENCES IN QUEENSLAND: AN EVALUATION
INFORMATION SHEET

Chief Investigator: Professor Paul Mazerolle
Researcher Officer: Dr. Jennifer Sanderson
Contact Details: Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance
 Mt. Gravatt Campus
 Griffith University
 Brisbane 4111

Griffith University has been contracted by the Queensland Police Service and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General to conduct an evaluation of the 12 month trial of ticketing for public nuisance offences. The trial has been implemented in Townsville and the South Brisbane Districts. The evaluation will provide information for the Queensland Cabinet about the effectiveness of ticketing for public nuisance offences and offer recommendations for improvements to the current system. The funding for this research has been provided by the Queensland Police Service and Department of Justice and Attorney-General.

Relevant staff from government and non-government agencies involved in the ticketing trial (e.g. Queensland Police Service, Magistrates Court, Department of Justice and Attorney-General, Legal-Aid Queensland, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service, and advocacy groups for vulnerable community members) will be asked about their opinions on the effectiveness of the ticketing trial. On some occasions this will be through a survey, or in other instances this information will be sought through interviews between the key stakeholders and researchers. The researchers will also be analysing relevant administrative data provided by the Queensland Police Service and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General.

At the completion of the evaluation a report examining the effectiveness of the ticketing trial will be provided to the Queensland Police Service. This report will also include recommendations for improving the policing of public nuisance offences. At a later date, the findings from the research may also be presented at relevant conferences and may be published in appropriate academic journals.
You are being asked to provide responses to a series of survey questions about your opinions on the effectiveness of the ticketing trial. Note that the return of your responses to the survey questions is accepted as an indication of your consent to participate in this research. All of your responses are anonymous and will only be used for the purpose of establishing the effectiveness of ticketing for public nuisance offences in Queensland. You cannot be identified as the survey respondent.

Only members of the research team will have access to the survey data. At all times your anonymity will be safeguarded.

All survey data is automatically entered into a spreadsheet without any identifying information. Responses will only be reported in aggregate form. The QPS is facilitating distribution of the online survey through the internal email system but will not be involved in accessing or analysing the data. Your participation in this research is voluntary. You do not need to answer any question unless you wish to do so. The survey results will be destroyed after a period of five years. Only members of the research team will have access to the survey data. At all times your anonymity will be safeguarded.

If you have any further questions about the research please contact either Professor Paul Mazerolle on (07) 37356994 or Dr. Jennifer Sanderson on (07) 37356995. For any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of this research project you should contact the Manager, Research Ethics on (07) 37355585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

A final written report of the evaluation findings will be provided to Queensland Cabinet.
INSTRUCTIONS:

An important part of the evaluation currently being conducted on the ticketing for public nuisance offences trial is gauging the opinions of key stakeholders. Police officers represent a key stakeholder in this regard, thus your opinions of the trial will provide a valuable and important contribution to the evaluation process.

The following set of questions relate to the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences. Please be aware that your responses to these questions reflect your opinions and impressions of the trial. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

- Please circle, tick, or fill in the blanks to indicate your response to each question.

Each of the following statements relate to your expectations regarding the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences before the trial had commenced. Please specify how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the relevant number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to the start of the Infringement Notice trial period, I thought Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences would be useful in my duties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to the start of the Infringement Notice trial period, I thought Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences would increase my workload</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior to the Infringement Notice trial, I thought that Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences would be an effective deterrent against public nuisance re-offending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the following statements relates to your *current observations and impressions* regarding the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences. Please specify how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling the relevant number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>My supervisors encourage me to use Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences as much as possible</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>There is no difference in terms of time efficiency between taking someone to the watchhouse and issuing an infringement notice</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences are more time-efficient than issuing a Notice to Appear in Court</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>The availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences has reduced the amount of paperwork I have to do</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>The availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences maximises the amount of time I can spend &quot;on the street&quot; during a shift</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences are effective in providing an <em>immediate penalty</em> for illegal behaviour</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>Overall, Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences are an effective deterrent against reoffending</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences have been an effective deterrent against reoffending for Indigenous offenders</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d</td>
<td>Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences have been an effective deterrent against reoffending for offenders who have been affected by alcohol</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4e</td>
<td>Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences have been an effective deterrent against reoffending for mentally offenders</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4f</td>
<td>An Infringement Notice is a greater deterrent against reoffending than an arrest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4g</td>
<td>A Notice to Appear provides a greater deterrent against reoffending than an Infringement Notice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>At this point in the Infringement Notice trial period, I find them to be useful in my duties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>I have used Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences to de-escalate a situation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>To diffuse a situation, it is more effective to issue an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence to a “ringleader” of a group than to arrest him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>The availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences lets me serve the public better</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences improve the timeliness of police responses to anti-social behaviour</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>The availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences enhances community perceptions of safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6d</td>
<td>The availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences enhances community perceptions of public order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6e</td>
<td>The availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences has no impact on public order</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6f</td>
<td>The availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences increases community safety</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6g</td>
<td>The availability of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences reduces public disorder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Issuing an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence rather than making an arrest sends the wrong message to offenders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td>Prior to issuing an Infringement Notice for a public Nuisance offence it is difficult to determine whether a person has already received an Infringement Notice for a similar offence earlier that day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7c</td>
<td>The way that Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences are recorded in the system make it difficult to determine a person’s amount of prior public nuisance offending</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Now that Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences are an option, I am taking more formal action for more public nuisance offences than before</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>Now that Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences are available I am able to respond to more incidents of public nuisance offending than previously</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td>Now that the Infringement Notice trial has commenced I am diverting more people (e.g., taking to a shelter) for public nuisance offences but taking no other action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>There is no reliable way to figure out whether someone is homeless, prior to issuing an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td>I typically ask an offender for his/her address, and if she/he does not have one, I assume she/he is homeless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9c</td>
<td>I try to determine if someone is homeless, while issuing an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences are a useful tool for dealing with Indigenous offenders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>I try to determine if someone is Indigenous, while issuing an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I give Diversion sheets to everyone I issue an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence

When issuing Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences, I give Diversion sheets only to those who I assess are eligible for diversion

The introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences has reduced peoples’ ability to seek justice for alleged public nuisance offending.

13. Please estimate the number of Infringement Notices for public nuisance you would issue in a typical week. **Please provide an estimate in whole numbers only.**

14. Over the last 30 days, out of the Infringement Notices you have issued for public nuisance offences, what proportion have been accompanied with a Move-On direction? Please provide an estimated percentage:

15. Over the last 30 days, how many times have you issued more than one ticket to the same person during the one shift? Please provide an estimate.

16. Over the last 30 days, what proportion of offenders did you transport to a watchhouse prior to issuing an Infringement Notice for public nuisance offences? Please provide an estimated percentage.

17. What are typical reasons you transport public nuisance offenders to a watchhouse?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________
18. During the last 30 days, what proportion of offenders did you transport to your station prior to issuing an Infringement Notice for public nuisance offences? Please provide an estimated percentage.

________%

19. What are typical reasons you transport public nuisance offenders to your station?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

20. Since the commencement of the Infringement Notice Trial on 1 January 2009, how many times have you had to prepare a brief of evidence in response to an Infringement Notice for a Public Nuisance offence? Please provide an estimate.

_____

21. Since the commencement of the Infringement Notice Trial on 1 January 2009, how many times have you had to testify in court in response to an Infringement Notice for a Public Nuisance offence? Please provide an estimate.

_____

22. Over the last 30 days, how many times have you responded to an incident of public nuisance offending with Diversion only (i.e., take to a relevant local service or have someone come and collect the person)? Please provide an estimate.

_____

23. Over the last 30 days, out of the Infringement Notices you have issued for public nuisance offences, what proportion have you accompanied with a Diversion sheet? Please provide an estimated percentage.

______

24. What Diversionary services are available in your area? Please list these below.

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
25. During your work, you deal with many types of people. Over the last 30 days, what proportion of people engaging in Public Nuisance offences that you have encountered:

(Please provide an estimated percentage for each case).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ...were Juveniles?</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ...were homeless?</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ...had a mental illness?</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ...were under the influence of alcohol?</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. ...were under the influence of drugs?</td>
<td>__________%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Listed below are some possible responses to incidents of public nuisance. Please indicate (by circling the appropriate number) whether the introduction of Infringement Notices for public nuisance offending has increased or decreased your use of each response listed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible responses to incidents of public nuisance</th>
<th>Significantly decreased</th>
<th>No change</th>
<th>Significantly increased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Diversion: take to a relevant local service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Diversion: have someone come and collect the person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Issue a Move-on direction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Issue a Caution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Issue a Notice to Appear in Court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Take to the watchhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Take to the station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Arrest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. *On average*, how long do you take to complete the following tasks related to policing *public nuisance offences* at this point in time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Diversion: taking someone to a relevant local service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Diversion: have someone come and collect the person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Issuing a caution to a juvenile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Issuing a caution to an adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Issuing an Infringement Notice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Issuing a Notice to Appear in Court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Booking an offender at the watchhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Transporting someone back to the station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Transporting someone to the watchhouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Arresting the offender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Preparing a brief of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Testifying in court</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
28. Did you find that the Commissioner’s circular detailing the Infringement Notice procedures provided sufficient information for you to implement the procedures? *(please tick)*

1 □ Yes  
2 □ No

29. What directions did your District Officer or Officer in Charge give you for issuing Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences (e.g. process for issuing Diversion sheets)?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

30. What additional training or information regarding issuing Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences would have benefited you?

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________

31. On the whole, do you think that the introduction of Infringement Notices as an option for responding to public nuisance offences has made it easier to deal with public nuisance offending? Please *circle* the number under the statement which most accurately represents your thoughts on this matter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>significantly more difficult</th>
<th>no difference</th>
<th>significantly easier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
32. What **advantages** are there to having Infringement Notices as an available option for dealing with public nuisance offences?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

33. What **limitations** are there to issuing Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences under the current procedures?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

34a. Are there any situations you have encountered for which you think having Infringement Notices as an option for responding to other offences, would have been beneficial, had they been an available?

1 [ ] Yes  
2 [ ] No

34b. If you selected ‘Yes’ above, please specify what these situations were:

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

35. Would you support a state-wide implementation of Infringement Notices as an option for policing Public Nuisance offences?

1 [ ] Yes  
2 [ ] No
36. Any further comments?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________
37. Which district do you serve in?  
1 □ Townsville  1 □ South Brisbane

38. What station do you serve at? ____________________________________________

39. What is your rank? ________________________________________________

40. Type of duties? ___________________________________________________

41. Do you consider policing public order form part of your core duties?  
1 □ Yes  2 □ No

42. How many years have you been with the Queensland Police Service (including your time as a recruit)?  
_________ years

43. What is your sex?  
1 □ Male  2 □ Female

44. What is your year of birth?  
______________________________

45. Which of the following best describes the highest level of education that you have completed? (please tick only one)

1 □ Less than Year 12  6 □ Graduate Diploma
2 □ Senior High School (year 12)  7 □ Masters degree
3 □ TAFE/Trade certificate  8 □ PhD degree/ Doctoral degree
4 □ Tertiary Certificate/Diploma  9 □ Other (specify) ____________________________
5 □ Bachelor degree

THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE SURVEY.
Appendix 3: Overview of the trial—additional results

Table A3.1: Divisional ticketing rates for Townsville district
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Number of tickets issued</th>
<th>% of tickets issued in the district</th>
<th>Rate per 100,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>1,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirwan</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundingburra</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowen</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnetic Island</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charters Towers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughenden</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayr</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuart</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeragun</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palm Island</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Hill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collinsville</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollingstone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prairie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrens Creek</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenswood</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giru</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenvale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>991</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>408</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average division rate</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>364</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table A3.2: Divisional ticketing rates for South Brisbane district

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Number of tickets issued</th>
<th>% of tickets issued in the district</th>
<th>Rate per 100,000 population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West End</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>2,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutton Park</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>1,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Mount Gravatt</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland Park</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morningside</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coorparoo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annerley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>627</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>225</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average division rate</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>399</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A3.3: Distribution of offence types, districts, and total, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offence Type</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>rate&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Urination</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>102.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Nuisance - Disorderly</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>140.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Nuisance - Violent</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Nuisance - Offensive</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resist arrest, incite, hinder, obstruct police&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Nuisance - Language Offences directed toward police</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Nuisance - Threatening (includes threatening behaviour toward police)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State False Name or Address&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>991</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>408.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. PPRA offences
2. Includes ticketed public nuisance offences for which no offence classification was recorded
3. Rate of tickets per 100,000 population within each district, 2009 population estimates (QPS)

Source: QPS
Table A3.4: Distribution of unique offenders and multiple ticket receivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of tickets received</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>200.8</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>263</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total unique ticketed people

|               | 898 | 100.0 | 370 | 592 | 100.0 | 212 | 1,490 | 100.0 | 286 |

1. Count of unique offenders in the police data.
Source: QPS
**Table A3.5: Unique offenders who received multiple tickets during the same and different incidents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Townsville</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of people issued multiple tickets</td>
<td>% of all ticketed people</td>
<td>% of people issued multiple tickets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different incident</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same incident</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rate of repeat ticketing during the trial**

|                | | 6.1 | | | 1.9 | | 4.4 |

1. Percentage of ticketed people who received tickets during more than one incident.
Source: QPS
### Table A3.6: Distribution of Indigenous status by district, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Townsville</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Rate¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>1,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Indigenous</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>898</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Rate per 100,000 population of the same category, based on ABS 2006 Census estimates.

Source: QPS
## Appendix 4: Effects of Ticketing on Offence, Arrest and NTA Rates

### Table A4.1: Total public nuisance offence rates per 100,000 population for the South Brisbane, North Brisbane, Brisbane Central, Townsville, Cairns districts and Queensland from 2001 to 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>North Brisbane</th>
<th>Brisbane Central</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
<th>Cairns</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>207.6686</td>
<td>284.2698</td>
<td>4053.181</td>
<td>571.1094</td>
<td>1866.806</td>
<td>539.0546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>252.3561</td>
<td>277.8509</td>
<td>4119.883</td>
<td>760.6994</td>
<td>1829.782</td>
<td>566.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>290.7996</td>
<td>253.1669</td>
<td>3891.608</td>
<td>799.6728</td>
<td>1328.193</td>
<td>584.1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>308.0882</td>
<td>288.798</td>
<td>5043.203</td>
<td>747.7406</td>
<td>1684.843</td>
<td>662.6915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>318.3901</td>
<td>358.6856</td>
<td>6428.149</td>
<td>859.386</td>
<td>1637.007</td>
<td>713.6424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>375.3253</td>
<td>402.6706</td>
<td>8662.353</td>
<td>1160.161</td>
<td>2085.993</td>
<td>831.7713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>420.891</td>
<td>401.4665</td>
<td>7767.196</td>
<td>1180.016</td>
<td>1913.895</td>
<td>890.6856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>471.8663</td>
<td>449.1807</td>
<td>7819.353</td>
<td>1276.235</td>
<td>1951.841</td>
<td>973.2377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>572.7376</td>
<td>463.3648</td>
<td>7294.524</td>
<td>1557.241</td>
<td>2189.064</td>
<td>976.5186</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nb.** Public nuisance offence/Arrest/NTA rates pertain to offences that were ticketable under the public nuisance ticketing trial – including ticketable
Table A4.2: Total public nuisance arrest rates per 100,000 population for the South Brisbane, North Brisbane, Brisbane Central, Townsville, Cairns districts and Queensland from 2001 to 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>North Brisbane</th>
<th>Brisbane Central</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
<th>Cairns</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>153.1914</td>
<td>169.3218</td>
<td>2753.67</td>
<td>427.8464</td>
<td>1552.651</td>
<td>398.6281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>179.3373</td>
<td>174.4208</td>
<td>2876.228</td>
<td>612.2819</td>
<td>1505.175</td>
<td>428.8255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>190.3201</td>
<td>148.07</td>
<td>2524.77</td>
<td>573.5455</td>
<td>1037.751</td>
<td>421.9768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>198.8041</td>
<td>174.4821</td>
<td>2961.164</td>
<td>518.0939</td>
<td>1194.137</td>
<td>444.7424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>180.1418</td>
<td>180.03</td>
<td>4383.969</td>
<td>522.7894</td>
<td>1183.129</td>
<td>454.1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>234.3439</td>
<td>184.3497</td>
<td>6863.994</td>
<td>712.2085</td>
<td>1480.667</td>
<td>533.6468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>255.119</td>
<td>190.2389</td>
<td>5816.85</td>
<td>615.2664</td>
<td>1170.077</td>
<td>535.2503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>250.3038</td>
<td>199.3431</td>
<td>5586.17</td>
<td>739.0949</td>
<td>1233.348</td>
<td>567.0816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td><strong>183.5928</strong></td>
<td><strong>203.8287</strong></td>
<td><strong>5076.037</strong></td>
<td><strong>739.1685</strong></td>
<td><strong>1412.196</strong></td>
<td><strong>534.8155</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Public nuisance offence/Arrest/NTA rates pertain to offences that were ticketable under the public nuisance ticketing trial – including ticketable PPRA.*
Table A4.3: Total public nuisance NTA rates per 100,000 population for the South Brisbane, North Brisbane, Brisbane Central, Townsville, Cairns districts and Queensland from 2001 to 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>North Brisbane</th>
<th>Brisbane Central</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
<th>Cairns</th>
<th>Queensland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>53.65796</td>
<td>111.6093</td>
<td>1276.429</td>
<td>130.1508</td>
<td>308.7849</td>
<td>134.3641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>99.69147</td>
<td>103.2286</td>
<td>1344.952</td>
<td>218.6054</td>
<td>281.4458</td>
<td>156.1477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>106.5714</td>
<td>110.1505</td>
<td>2066.979</td>
<td>217.1457</td>
<td>482.5492</td>
<td>210.6688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>136.3441</td>
<td>174.5329</td>
<td>2017.307</td>
<td>327.9892</td>
<td>442.9119</td>
<td>251.1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>136.107</td>
<td>212.8855</td>
<td>1766.094</td>
<td>436.8861</td>
<td>594.1491</td>
<td>290.6445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>162.0799</td>
<td>208.1017</td>
<td>1930.81</td>
<td>556.978</td>
<td>737.558</td>
<td>348.7146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>217.5606</td>
<td>245.8858</td>
<td>2218.723</td>
<td>529.9728</td>
<td>703.6726</td>
<td>399.3791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>143.7905</td>
<td>254.354</td>
<td>2172.5</td>
<td>370.2847</td>
<td>768.3435</td>
<td>420.4992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Public nuisance offence/Arrest/NTA rates pertain to offences that were ticketable under the public nuisance ticketing trial – including ticketable PPRA offences.*
Table A4.4: Total common assault rates per 100,000 population for the South Brisbane, North Brisbane, Brisbane Central, Townsville, Cairns districts and Queensland from 2001 to 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>North Brisbane</th>
<th>Brisbane Central</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
<th>Cairns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33.17782</td>
<td>34.34131</td>
<td>348.5366</td>
<td>93.72799</td>
<td>334.9645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>34.50337</td>
<td>37.14082</td>
<td>344.9715</td>
<td>75.87905</td>
<td>258.1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>31.52299</td>
<td>42.50589</td>
<td>292.4675</td>
<td>90.73301</td>
<td>237.1084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>42.62855</td>
<td>39.80228</td>
<td>271.0792</td>
<td>83.8025</td>
<td>218.9983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>40.75088</td>
<td>43.51869</td>
<td>263.3606</td>
<td>98.75917</td>
<td>219.3236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>50.24334</td>
<td>45.29478</td>
<td>273.405</td>
<td>96.93826</td>
<td>227.0708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>31.75142</td>
<td>42.87073</td>
<td>257.2243</td>
<td>85.92141</td>
<td>252.1128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>33.10704</td>
<td>35.56563</td>
<td>297.2222</td>
<td>76.73432</td>
<td>222.2991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td><strong>38.76515</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.88076</strong></td>
<td><strong>290.8228</strong></td>
<td><strong>68.58378</strong></td>
<td><strong>192.2575</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nb.** Public nuisance offence/Arrest/NTA rates pertain to offences that were ticketable under the public nuisance ticketing trial – including ticketable
### Table A6.1: Projected statewide costs in 2009 of implementing a ticketing program for public nuisance offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Costing information</th>
<th>Sources of data</th>
<th>Projected statewide costs based on South Brisbane’s experiences</th>
<th>Projected statewide costs based on Townsville’s experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>Time spent issuing public nuisance tickets</td>
<td>0.27 hours/ticket (SB) 0.34 hours/ticket (T) Two officers/ticket $38.12/hr. per officer *</td>
<td>QPS ticketing survey QPS representative</td>
<td>$257,745.46</td>
<td>$617,109.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>Time taking public nuisance ticket recipients to watchhouse</td>
<td>2.27% of ticket recipients (SB) 11.98% of ticket recipients (T) 0.68 hours to watchhouse Two officers/transport $38.12/hr. per officer *</td>
<td>QPS ticketing survey QPS representative</td>
<td>$14,735.40</td>
<td>$147,859.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>Time taking public nuisance ticket recipients to station</td>
<td>4.41% of ticket recipients (SB) 3.59% of ticket recipients (T) 0.58 hours to station Two officers $38.12/hr. per officer *</td>
<td>QPS ticketing survey QPS representative</td>
<td>$24,417.09</td>
<td>$37,792.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>Time for QPS to prepare brief of evidence for public nuisance ticket</td>
<td>1.73% of tickets (SB) 1.12% of tickets (T) 3.50 hours/brief of evidence (SB) 3.45 hours/brief of evidence# (T) $38.12/hr. per officer *</td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data QPS ticketing survey QPS representative</td>
<td>$28,900.90</td>
<td>$35,066.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>Time for QPS to testify in court for public nuisance ticket</td>
<td>1.73% of tickets (SB) 1.12% of tickets (T) 8 hours (i.e. full shift) Two officers $38.12/hr. per officer *</td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data QPS representative</td>
<td>$132,118.41</td>
<td>$162,626.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QPS</td>
<td>Time for Police Prosecutor to attend to contested tickets</td>
<td>1.73% of tickets (SB) 1.12% of tickets (T) $841.25/full trial ((FOOTNOTE: As all of these court cases are contested tickets, all were treated as going to full trial, rather than pleading guilty or otherwise being concluded early in the process.))</td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data QPS representative</td>
<td>$182,228.18</td>
<td>$224,307.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
<td>Adding public nuisance offences to their roster (i.e. the set-up and testing of new infringement codes, reporting</td>
<td>$1,500/initial start-up</td>
<td>Queensland Transport representative</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Processing costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Queensland Transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Queensland Transport</strong></td>
<td>$10.87/ticket</td>
<td></td>
<td>$136,104.95</td>
<td>$258,779.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16.22/initiated account**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,845.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.31% of tickets from Queensland Transport lodged with SPER††† (SB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$215,946.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.05% of tickets from Queensland Transport lodged with SPER††† (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80.99% of accounts were non-finalised ††</td>
<td>SPER representative</td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$21.40/finalised account**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$31,229.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61.31% of tickets from Queensland Transport lodged with SPER††† (SB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$66,874.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69.05% of tickets from Queensland Transport lodged with SPER††† (T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.01% of accounts were finalised ††</td>
<td>SPER representative</td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAG</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.73% of tickets (SB) ((FOOTNOTE1: All of these contested tickets were assumed to be found not guilty.))</td>
<td></td>
<td>$324,923.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.12% of tickets (T) ((ANOTHER COPY</td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data</td>
<td></td>
<td>$399,953.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

††: Percentage of tickets or accounts.</p>
nuisance tickets:
Full trial
$1,500/case  
((FOOTNOTE2: As all of these court cases are contested tickets, all were treated as going to full trial, rather than pleading guilty or otherwise being concluded early in the process.))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAG</th>
<th>Each public nuisance offence not receiving a court-ordered fine</th>
<th>JAG administrative data</th>
<th>$905,991.11</th>
<th>$1,860,858.91</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>SPER administrative data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$322.13/case avg. fine amount†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.15% of mandated fine amounts were collected†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,140,741.26</td>
<td>$4,028,673.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nb. SB = South Brisbane, T = Townsville

*Hourly personnel costs are based on the QPS pay scale, plus ongoing or overhead costs, for a single officer averaged from a typical ratio of one sergeant, two senior constables, and six constables, addressing public nuisance offending based on estimates by sergeant at Townsville and West End station

**Note that these two costs are mutually exclusive, rather than additive

#The average time of 3.49 hours to prepare a brief of evidence reflects one officer’s response of 72 hours being recoded to the next-highest time of 10 hours. The median response was three hours.

† As the court administrative data does not specify from which police district a case originates, the average value of fines, and the rates of payment of fines have been assumed to be consistent across Queensland.

†† Rates of payment are based on March transactions in the SPER administrative data: March, April, and May have similar quantities of accounts (January and Feb. had a minimal number) resulting from the ticketing trial; March, being the earliest of these, contained accounts with the greatest amount of time to reach completion by the end of 2009 (the end of the available data).
††† Reflects Queensland Transport data from 1 Jan 2009 to 31 Oct, 2009. Although the available Queensland Transport administrative data included data up to 31 January 2010, it was decided that the offence date should be at least three months before the end of the available Queensland Transit data, to allow time for the account to be lodged with Queensland Transit, and for the payee to default on their obligation.
### Table A6.2: Projected statewide benefits in 2009 of implementing a ticketing program for public nuisance offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Costing information</th>
<th>Sources of data</th>
<th>Projected statewide costs based on South Brisbane’s experiences</th>
<th>Projected statewide costs based on Townsville’s experiences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| QPS          | Less time spent by police issuing NTAs to public nuisance offenders | 0.35 hours/NTA (SB)  
0.96 hours/NTA (T)  
Two officers/NTA  
$38.12/hr. per officer * | QPS ticketing survey  
QPS representative | $95,224.86 | $669,872.14 |
| QPS          | Less time spent by police making public nuisance arrests | 1.50 hours/arrest (SB)  
1.44 hours/arrest (T)  
Two officers  
$38.12/hr. per officer * | QPS ticketing survey  
QPS representative | $363,368.70 | $516,379.29 |
| QPS          | Less time spent by police filling in QP9 form for public nuisance arrests | 52.5 minutes/QP9 form#  
One officer  
$38.12/hr. per officer * | QPS representative | $105,982.54 | $156,886.07 |
| QPS          | Less time spent by police transporting public nuisance arrestees to watchhouse | 1.01 hours/arrest (SB)  
0.62 hours/arrest (T)  
Two officers/arrest  
$38.12/hr. per officer * | QPS ticketing survey  
QPS representative | $244,668.26 | $222,329.97 |
| QPS | Less time spent by police at watchhouses with public nuisance arrestees | 1.50 hours/arrest (SB)  
1.21 hours/arrest (T)  
Two officers/arrest  
$38.12/hr. per officer * | QPS ticketing survey | QPS representative | $363,368.70 | $433,902.04 |
|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| QPS | Less time spent by watchhouse staff on processing arrestees: original intake | 1 surveillance @ 2 hrs @ $70.95/hr  
1 charge sergeant @ 20mins @ $45.50/hr  
1 key person @ 20 mins @ $49.37/hr  
The “+1” @ 20 mins @ $49.37/hr | QPS representative | $603,644.50 | $893,575.64 |
| QPS | Less time spent by watchhouse staff on processing arrestees: releasing on police bail | 70% of arrestees get police bail  
1 charge sergeant @ 20min @ $45.50/hr  
1 key person @ 20min @ $49.37/hr  
The “+1” @ 20min @ $49.37/hr | QPS representative | $106,938.94 | $158,301.83 |
| QPS | Less time spent by watchhouse staff on processing arrestees: denied police bail, held for Magistrate | 30% of arrestees remain in custody for court  
1 property officer @ 15min @ $49.37/hr  
1 key person @ 15min @ $49.37/hr  
The “+1” @ 15min @ $49.37/hr  
1 biometrics @ 45min @ $70.95/hr  
1 key person @ 45min @ $49.37/hr  
The “+1” @ 45min @ $49.37/hr  
1 key person @ 20hrs## @ $49.37/hr  
1 electronic surveillance @ 20hrs## @ $70.95/hr  
1 personal needs officer** @ 20hrs## @ $70.95/hr | QPS representative | $3,803,069.97 | $5,629,688.78 |
<p>| QPS | Less time spent by watchhouse staff on processing arrestees: Magistrate appearance to decide bail | 30% of arrestees remain in custody for court 3 escorting officers @ 1hrs @ $38.12/hr ###, *** 4.5 court holding cell officers @ 4hrs @ $47.82/hr ###, *** 3 escorting officers @ 1hr @ $38.12/hr ###, *** | QPS representative | $1,038,517.65 | $1,537,318.85 |
| QPS | Less time spent by watchhouse staff on processing arrestees: released on court bail | 75% of those who see the Magistrate are released on court bail † 1 key person @ 20 mins @ $49.37/hr The “+1” @ 20 mins @ $49.37/hr 1 charge sergeant @ 20 mins @ $45.50/hr | QPS representative | $34,373.23 | $50,882.73 |
| QPS | Less time spent by watchhouse staff on processing arrestees: denied court bail | 25% of those who see the Magistrate remain in custody † 1 key person @ 2.5 times/hr @ 3 mins/hr @ 24 hrs @ 6.5 days @ $49.37 ###, † 1 surveillance @ 24 hrs @ 6.5 days @ $70.95/hr † 1 personal needs officer** @ 24 hrs @ 6.5 days @ $70.95 † | QPS representative | $5,504,653.27 | $8,148,544.47 |
| QPS | Less time spent by police preparing court documents (i.e. brief of evidence) for public nuisance offences that go to full trial | 18.93% going to full trial † † † 3.50 hours/brief of evidence/arrest (SB) 3.45 hours/brief of evidence/arrest$B (T) One officer $38.12/hr. per officer * | QPS ticketing survey | $170,380.31 | $344,953.03 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Time Spent</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QPS</strong></td>
<td>Less time spent by police attending court for public nuisance cases</td>
<td>18.93% going to full trial††, †††</td>
<td>$778,881.42</td>
<td>QPS representative &lt;br&gt; 8 hours (i.e. full shift) &lt;br&gt; Two officers &lt;br&gt; $38.12/hr. per officer *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QPS</strong></td>
<td>Less time by police prosecutors processing public nuisance cases: pleaded guilty</td>
<td>81.07% pleading guilty (or other early termination of case)††, †††</td>
<td>$1,599,782.18</td>
<td>QPS representative &lt;br&gt; $160.30/guilty plea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QPS</strong></td>
<td>Less time by police prosecutors processing public nuisance cases: full trial</td>
<td>18.93% going to full trial††, †††</td>
<td>$841,294.98</td>
<td>JAG administrative data &lt;br&gt; $841.25/full trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAG</strong></td>
<td>Less workload by court staff for public nuisance cases: Pleading guilty (or otherwise completed early in the process)</td>
<td>81.07% pleading guilty (or other early termination of case)††, †††</td>
<td>$1,915,533.40</td>
<td>JAG representative &lt;br&gt; JAG administrative data &lt;br&gt; $300/case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAG</strong></td>
<td>Less workload by court staff for public nuisance cases: Full trial</td>
<td>18.93% going to full trial††, †††</td>
<td>$3,934,406.60</td>
<td>JAG representative &lt;br&gt; JAG administrative data &lt;br&gt; $1,500/case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fewer lodgements from Magistrates Court</td>
<td>Fewer lodgements from Magistrates Court finalised</td>
<td>Fines collected from tickets from Queensland Transport</td>
<td>Fines collected from tickets from SPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPER</strong></td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court received fines</td>
<td>67.71% non-finalised ††††</td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>53.13% of the $100 tickets were lodged with SPER‡ (SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>32.29% finalised ††††</td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>75.47% of the $300 tickets were lodged with SPER‡ (SB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>32.29% finalised ††††</td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>54.31% of the $100 tickets were lodged with SPER‡ (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>32.29% finalised ††††</td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>77.58% of the $300 tickets were lodged with SPER‡ (T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>32.29% finalised ††††</td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>$56.20 avg. per lodgement of the $100 tickets‡‡, ‡‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>32.29% finalised ††††</td>
<td>64.97% of ticketable public nuisance cases that went to court receiving fines</td>
<td>$154.23 avg. per lodgement of the $300 tickets‡‡, ‡‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAG administrative data</strong></td>
<td>SPER administrative data</td>
<td>$48,135.38</td>
<td>$98,867.58</td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPER administrative data</strong></td>
<td>SPER administrative data</td>
<td>$30,286.04</td>
<td>$62,205.97</td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Queensland Transport representative</strong></td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data</td>
<td>$616,170.57</td>
<td>$1,262,593.73</td>
<td>Queensland Transport administrative data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL...</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL...</strong></td>
<td>$769,694.24</td>
<td>$2,075,744.84</td>
<td>$20,184,568.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**nb.** SB = South Brisbane, T = Townsville, Queensland Transport = Queensland Transport

*Hourly personnel costs are based on the QPS pay scale, plus ongoing or overhead costs, for a single officer averaged from a typical ratio of one sergeant, two senior constables, and six constables, addressing public nuisance offending based on estimates by sergeant at Townsville and West End station.*
**Personal needs officer refers to the officer in charge of the food, bedding, medication, and hygiene of prisoners**

***Number of officers is the average of the range supplied by the QPS contact.***

**** The hourly personnel costs for an escorting officer is assumed to be same as the average for officers addressing public nuisance offending.

# This typical length of time (52.5 minutes) is the average of “45 minutes to an hour”, as supplied by a QPS representative.

## 20 hrs = avg. of 0-40 hrs. holding time

### Time is estimated

‡ Time is the average of the range of times supplied by the QPS contact.

‡‡ The average time of 3.49 hours to prepare a brief of evidence reflects one officer’s response of 72 hours being recoded to the next-highest time of 10 hours. The median response was three hours.

† This proportion is an over-estimate, as very few public nuisance offences are denied bail.

†† The administrative data supplied by JAG was coded into two categories: cases that were completed early in the process (e.g. pleaded guilty) (71.22%) and those that went to full trial (18.93%). The remaining 9.85% of cases were ambiguous in their stage of the court process, given the bulk handling required to categorise the cases. The uncategorised cases were assigned to the “early completion” category, as this is the more conservative option. Cases from 2008 were used, as the distribution of 2009 cases were influenced by the ticketing trial in two police districts, and cases could not be positively identified by the originating police district.

††† As the JAG data does not specify which police district originated a charge, statewide percentages were used. Each charge was treated as a separate case. Figures reflect cases originating in 2008; proportions are assumed to be comparable for 2009.

†††† Proportions for account final status are based on January 2009 SPER administrative data. Choosing an early month allowed the maximum chance for the account to be finalised.

‡ The proportion lodged with SPER includes both those not paying to Queensland Transport and those requesting a Voluntary Instalment Plan.

‡‡ The average rate of payment across the two trial sites was used, as the originating district is not included in the SPER administrative data. In the SPER administrative data, used the $100 and $300 “original amounts” (as opposed to “SPER original amount”) to calculate the rates of payment for the $100 and $300 tickets, as all other values are not valid under the ticketing trial.

‡‡‡ Rates of payment are based on March transactions in the SPER administrative data: March, April, and May have similar quantities of accounts (January and February had a minimal number) resulting from the ticketing trial; March, being the earliest of these, contained accounts with the greatest amount of time to reach completion by the end of 2009 (the end of the available data).
Appendix 6B: Limitations of the economic cost-benefit analysis

There are several cautions and limitations with respect to the economic data. The administrative data would have yielded results of greater validity if extracts including most of 2010 had been available for analysis. However, this was not possible given evaluation deadlines.

Police Survey

The average time required to make a public nuisance arrest was based on the QPS survey item asking how long it typically takes to make a public nuisance arrest. The wording does not make clear whether this includes only the arrest, or accompanying tasks such as escorting the arrestee to the watchhouse. Although subsequent questions asked about how long it takes to bring arrestees to the watchhouse, responses to the length of time it takes to make a public nuisance arrest were treated as including travel time and waiting at the watchhouse, and as such, were not included in the watchhouse costs.

QPS Data

The arrest rates and rates of notices to appear supplied by QPS did not include data for December 2009 -- a month which experiences a disproportionate number of public nuisance offences. The figures for December 2009 were estimated by assuming that the 2008 ratio for December, compared to January through November, also held true in 2009. Any estimation error resulting from this process would have led to inaccuracies in the resulting statewide figures.

JAG Data
Because the court administrative data does not specify which police districts contributed to which court cases, we cannot calculate the specific rates of fines imposed, and payments of court-ordered fines completed, for the two trial sites. Instead, statewide averages were used. These averages were derived from 2008 figures (the year preceding the ticketing trial), as not all arrests and court cases during 2009 (the period of the ticketing trial) would have been seen to completion, and cases originating during December may systematically differ from those during the earlier part of the year. To the extent that 2008 proportions were not comparable to 2009, this would affect the results of the analyses.

There are likely to be a few ineligible cases inadvertently included in the constructed “ticketable public nuisance offences” filter within the administrative data supplied by JAG: “Obstructing a Police Officer” is ticketable, while “Assaulting a Police Officer” is ineligible for ticketing. With this in mind, “Assaulting a Police Officer” was excluded from the analysis, but “Assaulting or Obstructing a Police Officer” was retained, although some of these cases may have been for assault, rather than obstruction.

In addition, there were 9.85% (n=4,840) cases that appeared to be still in progress, or were ambiguous as to their stage of completion. These uncategorised cases were assigned to the “early completion” category, as this is the more conservative option: a reduction in the number of less-expensive court cases would result in a smaller net savings than a reduction in more-expensive (i.e. full trial) cases. Although it is possible that the actual stage of completion of many of these cases could have been determined by examining all associated electronic records visually, this was not feasible, given the large number (n=4,840) combined with the timeline of this evaluation. However, our sensitivity analysis (see Appendix 8), which examines the impact of re-categorizing these ambiguous cases to “full trial”, indicates that a substantial statewide cost savings would still occur.

**Watchhouse figures**

Watchhouse costs are based on the average of the range of possible classifications (and therefore, hourly rates) of persons occupying that position. Typical fortnightly weekend
shift allowances and overtime pay for the civilian workers have been pro-rated across a 37.5 hour work week.

The typical proportions of different routing outcomes (e.g. being denied police bail) supplied by a QPS representative reflect typical public nuisance offenders who are arrested. However, these proportions may differ from those performing ticketable public nuisance offences.

The typical length of time provided by a QPS representative for the length of time held to see a Magistrate, if denied police bail, was “zero to forty hours”. This range was averaged to the midpoint of twenty hours. Although the actual distribution of the number of hours held is not available, if a large proportion of public nuisance offending occurs on Friday and Saturday nights, and arrestees must thus wait until Monday morning to see a Magistrate, then twenty hours may be an under-estimate. If so, then the savings due to reducing the number of arrestees (and thus, held in Remand until seeing a Magistrate) is also an under-estimate: the figure of “twenty hours” will therefore yield conservative results.

Queensland Transport Data

The study examines the number of Queensland Transport tickets processed. This variable was derived from the Queensland Transport administrative data for 2009. In this dataset a total of 33 tickets (1.56% of the total for 2009) were coded to police districts not participating in the ticketing trial. These public nuisance tickets were retained in the analyses and proportionately allocated to the two trial districts: 38% of the mislabelled tickets were allocated to South Brisbane, and the remaining 62% were allocated to Townsville. Retaining these tickets in the analyses provided a better estimated projection of ticketing rates from the trial districts to Queensland as a whole.

In the Queensland Transport data, five tickets with a latest offence status of “VOID” were retained in the count of the number of tickets processed by Queensland Transport: these tickets corresponded with the tally of all tickets with a suburb of “Unknown”.
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They were retained on the basis that they still contribute to Queensland Transport's total workload.

Queensland Transport provided administrative data for all of 2009 and up to 31 January 2010. The figures for the rate of payment and the rate of lodgement with SPER were based on tickets issued from January 1, 2009 to Oct 31, 2009: Accounts within this timeframe had a reasonable length of time (three months) to be paid, finalised, or forwarded to SPER for lack of payment, and still be included in the available data.

**SPER Data**

The administrative data received from SPER did not contain identifiers for the originating police district for outstanding fee. Thus, the rate of payment for court fines is based on the statewide figures for the court-ordered fines; and the rate of payment for ticketable public nuisance offences is based on accounts resulting from ticketed public nuisance offences (i.e., both trial sites combined).

Due to the inherent handling delay in tickets reaching SPER from Queensland Transport, and the length of time permitted to pay one’s fine through the Voluntary Instalment Plan, the final status of SPER accounts lodged from the Magistrates Courts was derived from the tickets issued from January 2009. This allows the maximum amount of time for an account to be finalised within the timeframe of our available data. SPER accounts resulting from public nuisance tickets, however, were based on tickets issued in March 2009: as the ticketing trial began on 1 January 2009, March was the earliest month in which a representative number of tickets were lodged by Queensland Transport would have reached SPER.

In the SPER administrative data, only accounts with $100 and $300 “original amounts” (as opposed to the “SPER original amount”) were used to calculate the rates of payment for the $100 and $300 tickets: all other initial values were excluded from this specific calculation as not valid under the ticketing trial.
Appendix 6C: Economic analysis—sensitivity analysis

We conducted a sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of the results with respect to potential variation in estimates surrounding rates of arrests, notices to appear, ticketing for public nuisance offences, and the statewide impact of the contested tickets being found guilty, rather than found not guilty in the South Brisbane and Townsville sites.

Our method of aggregation is identical to methods employed in earlier analyses in this chapter, but the base rates of arrests, NTAs, ticketing, and contested tickets have been re-calculated based on a +/- 10% confidence interval. That is, if the true state-projected ticket/NTA arrest rates was in fact 10% less or more than what we estimated, how would this impact on the projected outcomes?

In Table 6A.3, we provide a summary of results for rates of arrests, NTAs, and ticketing for public nuisance offences for South Brisbane and Townsville sites. Detailed results for QPS patrol officers, watchhouse staff, police prosecutors, Magistrates Courts, Queensland Transport, and SPER for South Brisbane and Townsville sites are provided in Appendix 6A.

Results from the analysis demonstrate that our estimates are stable and do not approach the break-even point—the point where costs exceed benefits. In short, the use of ticketing as a means of dealing with public nuisance offences will result in net economic benefits to the state. There are moderate differences between stakeholder results; however these differences are in the expected direction. As in earlier results, Queensland Transport and SPER are directly affected by an increase in number of
tickets, which affects processing, and lodgement (SPER) costs that results in a net cost increase to both parties. We note, however, that our results do not account for indirect benefits/costs or intangible benefits as discussed earlier.

Table A6.3 Statewide net present values resulting from the sensitivity analysis examining the impact of over- or under-estimating the statewide rates of arrests, NTAs, and tickets by ten percent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Underestimated by -10%</th>
<th>Over estimated by +10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QPS: Patrol officers and watchhouse staff (net benefit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brisbane</td>
<td>$12,755,155.07</td>
<td>$11,479,639.56</td>
<td>$14,030,670.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>$19,361,963.36</td>
<td>$17,425,767.02</td>
<td>$21,298,159.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QPS: Police prosecutors (net benefit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brisbane</td>
<td>$1,768,747.71</td>
<td>$1,591,872.94</td>
<td>$1,945,622.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>$3,782,896.43</td>
<td>$3,404,606.79</td>
<td>$4,161,186.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JAG/courts (net benefit)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brisbane</td>
<td>$3,231,309.85</td>
<td>$2,908,178.86</td>
<td>$3,554,440.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>$6,904,366.97</td>
<td>$6,213,930.28</td>
<td>$7,594,803.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Queensland Transport (net cost)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brisbane</td>
<td>$137,604.95</td>
<td>$123,994.45</td>
<td>$151,215.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>$260,279.40</td>
<td>$234,401.46</td>
<td>$286,157.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPER (net cost)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brisbane</td>
<td>$53,654.38</td>
<td>$48,288.94</td>
<td>$59,019.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Revenue (net benefit)</td>
<td>$121,747.29</td>
<td>$109,572.56</td>
<td>$133,922.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Brisbane</td>
<td>$479,873.70</td>
<td>$431,886.33</td>
<td>$527,861.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>$1,477,479.67</td>
<td>$1,329,731.70</td>
<td>$1,625,227.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Net Present Value (NPV)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Brisbane</td>
<td>$18,043,827.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$16,239,294.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$19,848,359.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td>$31,144,679.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$28,030,061.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$34,259,297.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, we conducted a sensitivity analysis to test the robustness of our results with respect to contested public nuisance tickets. Earlier in the chapter, it was noted that 1.73% (South Brisbane) and 1.12% (Townsville) of public nuisance tickets were challenged in court. In the earlier analysis, all of these tickets were treated as having been found not guilty. We chose the not guilty option as it was the most conservative option given that we had no current means to classify them correctly.

Table A6.4 provides the results of our sensitivity analysis of the impact of an alternative scenario: that a proportion of these cases were found guilty, had a fine imposed, and some of these fines were paid. This scenario would have implications for SPER (for the administration of the payments), and for the state general revenue fund (due to fine payments received).

Table A6.4 continues the assumption that these cases would go to full trial rather than result in a guilty plea, due to the nature of challenging a ticket. However, this assumption reflects the maximum difference from the original assumption of all cases being found not guilty, as this does not allow for some cases being dismissed or dropped. The calculations which produced the figures in table A6.4 used the same rate...
of being found guilty, distribution of accounts being lodged and being finalised, and average rate of payment of fines, as used elsewhere in this chapter.

**Table A6.4 Sensitivity analysis examining the statewide impact of contested tickets being found guilty, rather than not guilty.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projected number of additional cases (statewide) resulting from challenged tickets</td>
<td>216.62</td>
<td>411.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected number of additional cases (statewide) receiving court-ordered fines after challenging tickets</td>
<td>140.74</td>
<td>267.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Workload: Net costs (NC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPER - Increase in lodgements for contested public nuisance tickets: finalised</td>
<td>95.29</td>
<td>181.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPER - Increase in lodgements for contested tickets: non-finalised</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>86.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monetary: Net Costs (NC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPER Cost increases, due to increased lodgements for contested public nuisance tickets</td>
<td>$1,545.64</td>
<td>$2,938.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPER: Cost increases, due to increased finalised accounts for contested public nuisance tickets</td>
<td>$972.49</td>
<td>$1,849.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cost to SPER due to projected additional accounts</td>
<td>$2,518.13</td>
<td>$4,787.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monetary: Net Benefits (NB)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in contested public nuisance ticket-based revenues</td>
<td>$29,091.53</td>
<td>$55,312.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Brisbane</th>
<th>Townsville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Present Value (NPV)</td>
<td>$26,573.40</td>
<td>$50,524.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results demonstrate that SPER would incur an additional projected cost if a proportion of these contested tickets had resulted in a guilty verdict and the resulting fines are administered by SPER. However, there would also be an increase in public nuisance ticket-based revenues. Due to the small projected number of cases (n=141 for South Brisbane; n=268 for Townsville), the projected 2009 monetary impact upon SPER is relatively small: $2,518 based on South Brisbane’s experiences, or $4,788 based on Townsville. In addition, if the anticipated proportion of contested tickets result in court-ordered fines, these projected statewide revenues ($29,092 or $55,312, for South Brisbane and Townsville, respectively) exceed the costs incurred by SPER.

In summary, this sensitivity analysis indicates that although SPER will incur additional costs if a typical proportion of these court cases are found guilty, the costs will be minimal, and outweighed by the revenue derived from the additional number of court-ordered fines.
Appendix 7: Demographic analyses for police survey

Prior to examining the impact of gender, age, rank and years of service on responses to selected items from the police survey (see Appendix 2), the five response categories: Agree/Strongly Agree/Neither Agree nor Disagree/Disagree/Strongly Disagree were collapsed into three categories: agree/disagree/undecided. To determine whether age and years of service were significantly related to response categories, we conducted a series of one-way ANOVAs, with age and years of service as the dependent variables and the three response categories as the levels of the between-subjects independent variable.

Significant ANOVA findings were followed up with Tukey’s HSD post-hoc tests. Officers were categorised according to the following ranks: Constable, Senior Constable, Sergeant and Senior Sergeant. The relationship between rank, gender and responses to survey items was examined with chi-square and logistic regression analyses comparing those individuals who agreed with those individuals who disagreed. Findings are reported in the tables below, with statistically significant findings (p<0.05) flagged with asterisk (*).
Response to statement 9a: “There is no reliable way to figure out whether someone is homeless, prior to issuing an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>37.39 (7.13)</td>
<td>37.04 (7.35)</td>
<td>35.62 (7.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service with QPS</td>
<td>10.74 (7.47)</td>
<td>10.88 (9.50)</td>
<td>8.28 (7.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable (n=79)</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Constable (n=29)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant (n=37)</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant (n=5)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (% male)</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>83.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Higher ranked officers were more likely to agree than disagree with this statement.
Response to statement 9b: “I typically ask an offender for his/her address, and if she/he does not have one, I assume she/he is homeless”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>35.66 (7.12)</td>
<td>36.93 (7.53)</td>
<td>36.75 (7.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years of service with QPS</strong></td>
<td>8.09 (7.37)</td>
<td>11.17 (9.68)</td>
<td>9.68 (7.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable (n=80)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Constable (n=29)</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant (n=37)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant (n=5)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender (%)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (n=139)</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (n=30)</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to statement 9c: “*I try to determine if someone is homeless, while issuing an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence*”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>36.76 (6.73)†</td>
<td>37.94 (7.36)*</td>
<td>33.10 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service with QPS</td>
<td>9.49 (8.15)</td>
<td>11.21 (9.20)</td>
<td>8.14 (7.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Constable</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individuals who disagreed with this statement tended to be younger than those individuals who remained undecided and those individuals who agreed with this statement. When age was entered into a logistic regression predicting Agree/Disagree, it emerged as a significant predictor, confirming that younger officers were less likely to try and determine if someone is homeless while issuing an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence.*
Response to statement 10b: “I try to determine if someone is Indigenous, while issuing an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>37.07 (6.52)</td>
<td>36.49 (7.76)</td>
<td>36.09 (7.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service with QPS</td>
<td>9.74 (7.45)</td>
<td>11.04 (8.96)</td>
<td>8.34 (8.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable (n=79)</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Constable (n=29)</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant (n=37)</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant (n=5)</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to statement 4e: “Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences have been an effective Deterrent/Penalty against reoffending for mentally ill offenders”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>33.60 (7.83)</td>
<td>36.83 (7.33)</td>
<td>36.41 (7.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service with QPS</td>
<td>11.00 (9.92)</td>
<td>10.08 (9.16)</td>
<td>9.36 (7.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable (n=80)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Constable (n=30)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant (n=37)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant (n=5)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to statement 11a: “I give Diversion sheets to everyone I issue an Infringement Notice for a public nuisance offence”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age*</td>
<td>43.50 (9.77)</td>
<td>37.17 (6.25)</td>
<td>35.60 (7.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service with QPS*</td>
<td>19.57 (12.54)</td>
<td>10.15 (8.33)</td>
<td>8.87 (7.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (%)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable (n=79)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Constable (n=29)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant (n=37)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant (n=5)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Individuals who agreed with this statement had significantly more years of service with QPS than those individuals who indicated that they either disagreed or were undecided. Individuals who agreed were also significantly older than those individuals who disagreed, but not those who were undecided. There was no significant difference in age or years of service between individuals who disagreed and those who were undecided. Higher ranked officers were also more likely to agree than disagree with this statement.
Response to statement 11b: "When issuing Infringement Notices for public nuisance offences, I give Diversion sheets only to those who I assess are eligible for diversion".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>37.29 (7.95)</td>
<td>36.72 (6.77)</td>
<td>35.90 (7.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service with QPS</td>
<td>9.09 (9.66)</td>
<td>10.20 (8.00)</td>
<td>9.72 (8.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable (n=79)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Constable (n=29)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant (n=37)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Sergeant (n=5)</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (%) *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Female officers were more likely than males to agree than disagree with this statement.
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