

Description of strategy

At sobriety checkpoints, law enforcement officers use a system to stop drivers to assess their level of alcohol impairment. There are two types of sobriety checkpoints: (1) random breath-testing checkpoints where officers randomly select and test drivers for blood alcohol levels; and (2) selective breath-testing (SBT) checkpoints where officers must have reason to suspect a driver has been drinking before testing. SBT is the only type of sobriety checkpoint used in the United States (Guide to Community Preventive Services, 2012).

One tool used in conjunction with sobriety checkpoints is the passive breath sensor. Passive breath sensors or passive alcohol sensors are small electronic devices, usually built into police flashlights or clipboards that can detect alcohol in the ambient air of a vehicle. The sensors are quick, objective, and provide another source of detection to the officer which may aid in the identification of drunken drivers (Voas & Fell, 2011). Currently the sensors can only detect the presence of alcohol, not the level of alcohol present.

Discussion of effectiveness

Alcohol

Evidence supports the use of sobriety checkpoints in reducing alcohol-impaired driving, alcohol-related crashes, and associated fatal and non-fatal injuries (Guide to Community Preventive Services, 2012). Evidence supports effectiveness of sobriety checkpoints as an individual prevention strategy as well as a part of a multi-component strategy (Clapp et al., 2005).

Sobriety checkpoints are permitted and conducted in North Dakota.

Intervening Variables	
Retail Pricing	
Retail availability	
Social availability	
Law Enforcement	
Community norms	
Promotion & media	

References for description of strategy

- Governors Highway Safety Association. (2012). Sobriety checkpoint laws. Retrieved September 29, 2012, from: http://www.ghsa.org/html/stateinfo/laws/checkpoint_laws.html
- Guide to Community Preventive Services. (2012). Reducing alcohol-impaired driving: Sobriety checkpoints. Retrieved July 26, 2012, from: www.thecommunityguide.org/mvoi/AID/sobrietyckpts.html
- Voas, R. B., & Fell, J. C. (2011). Preventing impaired driving opportunities and problems. *Alcohol Research and Health, 34*(2), 225–35.

Evidence base

- Beck, K. H., & Moser, M. L. (2004). Exposure to the sobriety “Checkpoint Strikeforce” campaign in Maryland: Impact on driver perceptions of vulnerability and behavior. *Traffic Injury Prevention, 5*(2), 101–106. doi:10.1080/15389580490434908
- Clapp, J.D., Johnson, M., Voas, R.B., Lange, J.E., Shillington, A., & Russell, C. (2005). Reducing DUI among US college students: Results of an environmental prevention trial. *Addiction, 100*, 327-334.
- Fell, J. C., Lacey, J. H., & Voas, R. B. (2004). Sobriety checkpoints: Evidence of effectiveness is strong, but use is limited. *Traffic Injury Prevention, 5*(3), 220–227. doi:10.1080/15389580490465247
- Guide to Community Preventive Services. (2012). Reducing alcohol-impaired driving: Sobriety checkpoints. Available at: www.thecommunityguide.org/mvoi/AID/sobrietyckpts.html
- Saltz, R. F., Paschall, M. J., McGaffigan, R. P., & Nygaard, P.M. (2010). Alcohol risk management in college settings: The Safer California Universities randomized trial. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 39*, 491-499.
- Shults, R. A., Elder, R. W., Sleet, D. A., Nichols, J. L., Alao, M. O., Carande-Kulis, V. G., ... Thompson, R.S. (2001). Reviews of evidence regarding interventions to reduce alcohol-impaired driving. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 21*(4, Suppl. 1), 66–88. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(01)00381-6

Further reading

- Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2002). Passive alcohol sensors : A study focusing on their use, performance, effectiveness, and policy implications for traffic enforcement. Available at: <http://www.wistatedocuments.org/cdm/singleitem/collection/p267601col14/id/241/rec/1>