



Joint House Judiciary and Transportation Committees Hearing

**Regular Session of 2018
Commonwealth of PA
April 20, 2018**

RE: Joint public hearing to evaluate the effects of DUI and drugged driving laws and programs

I am pleased to submit to you the following testimony in support of pretrial bail programs like Target 25 in York County and DROP in Lancaster County.

As you heard from Judge Kennedy, repeat DUI offenders are a serious concern, and York County's statistics are not an anomaly. Once counties dig into their data, they, too, will likely discover they have a problem with repeat DUI offenders being rearrested while out on bail.

York County proves that bail conditions that require sobriety and monitor for it work.

The use of continuous alcohol monitoring devices that test for the consumption of alcohol every 30 minutes (48 times per day) is an effective tool at reducing the incidents of people who are charged with a repeat offense of driving under the influence.

This technology can and should be used in conjunction with ignition interlock devices, as they are both effective tools to reduce the incidents of impaired driving. However, little, if any, monitoring of these offenders takes place while they are on bail.

Although the continuous alcohol monitoring device does not stop the car from driving, it does deter the behavior of drinking. Nationally, **99.3% of SCRAM days are Sober Days**, meaning there are no confirmed drinking or circumvention events. Thus, when people are sober, they are not committing the crime of DUI.

There is published research to support the aforementioned data. A study conducted by the National Center for State Courts examined the effects of SCRAM bracelets on criminal recidivism. Flango and Cheesman (2009) compared re-arrest rates for 144 offenders who were placed on SCRAM to those of comparable offenders who were not placed on SCRAM. The groups were matched carefully by age, race, gender, county of residence, number of prior DUI offenses, and number of any prior offenses. The researchers found that **only 3% of offenders on SCRAM recidivated while they were wearing the device**, and repeat DUI offenders who were put on SCRAM for at least 90 days recidivated at half the rate as those not placed on SCRAM (10% vs. 21%, $p < .05$)¹.



As a resident of Bucks County, I applaud you for considering replicating Target 25 throughout the state. Such legislation will improve the safety of our roadways for all of us in Pennsylvania.

Tom Van Houten
Director, Sales, East
Alcohol Monitoring Systems
TVanHouten@SCRAMsystems.com

¹ Flango, V. E., & Cheesman, F. L. (2009). The effectiveness of the SCRAM alcohol monitoring device: A preliminary test. *Drug Court Review*, 6(2), 109–134.