1	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
3	* * * *
4	House Bills 892 and 1684
5	* * * *
6	House State Transportation Committee
7	
8	Main Capitol Building Majority Caucus Room 140 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
9	
10	Tuesday, April 3, 2018 - 1:35 p.m.
11	000
12 13	COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
14	Honorable John Taylor, Majority Chairman Honorable Rosemary Brown Honorable Mindy Fee
15 16	Honorable Kate Harper Honorable Doyle Heffley Honorable Tim Hennessey
17	Honorable John Lawrence Honorable Jim Marshall
18	Honorable Ron Marsico Honorable Greg Rothman
	Honorable Todd Stephens
19	Honorable William Keller, Minority Chairman Honorable William Kortz
20	Honorable Ed Neilson Honorable Michael Schlossberg
21	nonorable mionaer benrebberg
22	
23	1300 Garrison Drive, York, PA 17404
24	717.764.7801
25	

1	STAFF PRESENT:
2	
3	Eric Bugaile Majority Executive Director
4	
5	Meredith Biggica Minority Executive Director
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	Key Reporters———————————————————————————————————

1	INDEX OF TESTIFIERS TESTIFIERS	PAGE
2		11102
3	Opening comments by Majority Chairman Taylor	5
4	Remarks of Representative Karen Boback	J
5	presented by Representative Kate Harper	9
6	-	
7	Eileen Miller, Mother of Paul Miller Paul Miller, Father of Paul Miller	13 28
8	Major Edward Hoke, Director Bureau of Patrol, PA State Police	32
9	Gavin E. Gray, P.E	36
10	Highway Safety Section Chief-PennDOT	3 0
11	Steve Blackistone	63
12	Transportation Safety Board	
13 14	Ted Leonard, Executive Director AAA Federation	69
15	Joseph Regan, Recording Secretary FOP, PA State Lodge	7 4
16	David Kerr, Regional Vice President External Affairs - AT&T	99
17	Sam Marshall, President/CEO	105
18	PA Insurance Federation	100
19	Pennsylvania State Grange	
20	Vince Phillips, Legislative Director Wayne Campbell, President	112 117
21	mayne campacit, ficolachettittitt	I I ,
22	SUBMITTED WRITTEN TESTIMONY	
23		
24	(See other submitted testimony and hando online.)	outs
25		

1			REQUESTS	FOR INFORM	IATION		
2	PAGE	LINE	PAGE	LINE	PAGE	LINE	
3	40	15-18	42	12-18	49	9-11	
4	55	4-6		4-6	49	9 11	
5	55	4 – 6	90	4-6			
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
		_					
	∟Key R	eporter	's		karranartan	s@comcast.ne	

1	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Good
2	afternoon, everyone. Thank you for being here at
3	this hearing of the House Transportation Committee.
4	I'm Representative John Taylor from Philadelphia.
5	I'm joined by my colleague, Chairman Bill Keller,
6	from Philadelphia.
7	How's the championship there, Mr.
8	Chairman?
9	MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: How about
10	that? Another break.
11	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Two in a
12	couple months here.
13	What we're here to talk about is some
14	serious business. This committee has tried to
15	harness some of the various bills that have come up
16	over the years on distracted driving. We're going
17	to talk about a few today. Eventually, I think
18	there will be a bill. There will be a new law in
19	the books that prohibits people from doing some of
20	the very things we know they do each and every day.
21	Whether or not they're perfect bills or whether or
22	not they're completely enforceable, and it was
23	another matter.
24	But I think we're going to hear,
25	particularly from Mrs. Miller today, that if some

of that might have been on the books, maybe someone thinks another way about whether or not they should pick up that phone, or any other distraction that we go through. I think this committee, throughout this particular session, is focused on safety and we're going to continue to so do.

Chairman Keller.

2.1

MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I just want to thank you, as you've been doing with this committee, bringing up important subjects and having hearings. I think every time we've had a hearing we've learned more, and it helps us move legislation forward. So, thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: I'd like to start on my far left. Majority Caucus Room where we're always a little spread out, and have our members introduce themselves.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. State Representative Doyle Heffley, 122nd District, Carbon County.

REPRESENTATIVE FEE: Good afternoon.

Mindy Fee, 37th District, northern Lancaster.

REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Good

1	afternoon. Representative Jim Marshall, 14th
2	District, parts of Beaver County, parts of Butler
3	County.
4	REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Good afternoon.
5	Ron Marsico. I represent parts of Dauphin County,
6	105th Legislative District.
7	MR. BUGAILE: Eric Bugaile. I'm the
8	Executive Director of the transportation committee
9	for the Republicans.
10	MS. BIGGICA: Meredith Biggica. I'm the
11	Executive Director of the transportation committee
12	for the Democrats.
13	REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Ed Neilson,
14	174th Legislative District, Philadelphia County.
15	REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Good afternoon,
16	everyone. My name is Representative Bill Kortz,
17	38th District, Allegheny County.
18	REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: Kate Harper,
19	Montgomery County.
20	REPRESENTATIVE SCHLOSSBERG: Mike
21	Schlossberg, 132nd District, Lehigh County.
22	REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Rosemary Brown,
23	189th District, Monroe and Pike counties.
24	REPRESENTATIVE LAWRENCE: John Lawrence,
25	southwestern Chester County and a part of Lancaster

County.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Everybody should be aware as well that we're being recorded, video and audio.

With that, I think we're going to start off with, we have at least three bills that are specific to this particular hearing. We're going to start out with Representative Rosemary Brown.

Both Representative Murt and Representative Boback had some emergencies that kept them from being here, but we're going to deal with Representative Boback's statement through Chairman Harper in a second. Rosemary.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to thank both of the chairmen and the committee and members who are here today to listen to the testimony regarding several of the bills, but especially House Bill 1684, which I have, which is for hands-free cellphone use in Pennsylvania.

I'm hoping that the hearing today will offer some more details, and we can kind of vet out the bill in all different fashions; any concerns that we may have so we will have a possibility of moving the bill forward. The real goal of the bill

is to ensure that our roadways are as safe as possible as we have all this wonderful technology and different ways that we're using this technology, but really, we have to be concerned about public safety and our roadways. That is really the goal of the bill is to try and get that accomplished and make the use as safe as possible.

So, I thank all the testifiers being

So, I thank all the testifiers being here, and again, Mr. Chairman, for having this hearing to allow us to gain more details to the bill.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Chairwoman Harper.

REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative Boback, who couldn't be here today, has a bill that would add a 25-dollar penalty to people convicted of being a distracted pedestrian while using an interactive device, leave the curb or other place of safety. She's given me a statement to read to the committee, if I might, Mr. Chairman.

This is Representative Boback's words:

Good afternoon. Thank you to Chairman
Taylor for inviting Representative Boback to
address the committee today. I am sure, like me,

2.1

most motorists have experienced a careless pedestrian using a device while crossing the street or walking their busy roadways. Distracted pedestrians have become a menace to motorists who have little control of a person stepping into the path of a moving vehicle.

This blatant activity puts walkers, as well as motorists and their passengers at risk. As a result, Representative Boback has proposed legislation to address the issue of a distracted pedestrian and their impact on drivers.

Her legislation would create a penalty for distracted pedestrians who are using an interactive communication device and suddenly leave a curb or place of safety and walk or run into the path of a vehicle so close as to constitute a hazard and distracted pedestrians who are using an interactive communication device while crossing a roadway at any point, other than a crosswalk, and do not yield the right of way to vehicles on the roadway.

The problem of distracted walking is very real and a serious issue. Technology has invaded every aspect of our life and people stop paying attention to their surroundings and now

2.1

stare at small digital screens. People need to pay more attention, as too many are being hurt and injured in careless situations.

While the below statistics don't reflect distracted walking alone, they do shed light on the dangers pedestrians face. According to the Center for Disease Control and Prevention, according to Representative Boback, in 2015, 5,376 pedestrians were killed in traffic crashes in the United States. 129,000 pedestrians were treated in emergency departments for nonfatal crash-related injuries in 2015.

Most pedestrian deaths occur in urban areas, non-intersection locations and at night.

This issue has become such a problem that some towns, such as Fort Lee, New Jersey, have banned texting while walking. If caught texting while jaywalking in that town, violators face up to an 85-dollar fine.

In London, England, some lampposts have been padded in order to protect the large numbers of people using mobile devices while walking. Ever New York City has lowered the speed limit in some areas as a way to cut down on the number of pedestrian injuries. Just last week NBC News

2.1

reported that in 2016, nearly 6,000 Americans were killed while walking, according to a new study. Experts say distracted drivers and distracted pedestrians are both to blame. Both distracted driving and distracted pedestrians cause many problems. And Representative Boback fears, if we don't address these issues, more Pennsylvanians will be harmed.

According to Representative Boback, we need to work to create common sense solutions to discourage this reckless, irresponsible behavior, and she believes that her legislation is the first step in that process.

Thank you, members of the committee and chairmen, for hearing me out on Representative Boback's bill in her words. Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Thank you, Chairman Harper.

The testifiers today are also prepared to talk about House Bill 896 (sic), which has been introduced by Representative Tom Murt. Basically, for the edification of our audience, 896 (sic) is really an add-on bill. It creates an added fine and an added set of duties to careless driving.

So, if you are convicted of using any

2.1

1 type of device, as well as food in your car, a drink in your car, anything that distracts you, 2 there will be an additional fine over and above 3 that which is assessed to careless driving. It also creates a driver education 5 6 program with those fines that PennDOT can 7 administer. Is there any member who wants to comment 8 on those bills before we move to our panels? 10 (No response). 11 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: With that, I 12 had the pleasure of meeting Paul and Eileen Miller 13 a few weeks back, who are very brave parents, who 14 are willing to talk about the death of their son and the reasons that his death occurred. And I 15 16 think, particularly Eileen, has gone over and above 17 that which could be expected of any grieving parent 18 to educate the public about that which is going on 19 in our society and drivers, particularly, with young folks. She's here to testify today. 20 21 Eileen, thank you again for coming. 22 MS. MILLER: Thank you. 23 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: When you're 24 ready, we'll be glad to listen.

25

MS. MILLER: Good afternoon, Chairman,

and members of the committee. I would say good afternoon, and thank you for having me. I'm going to tell you a little bit about my family.

This is my husband, Paul, here sitting next to me. We were blessed to have two beautiful children. I have a daughter, Nicole, and we just had our first granddaughter who will be nine months old.

I had a beautiful son, Paul. His whole life he wanted to become a police officer from the time he was like 5 years old. That's all my son wanted to do. So, he set out to school, he was 21 years old, and tried to get in to become a police officer when he came right out of high school. But, he wound up that he was right out of high school, in the program, the Act 120 program at Lackawanna College.

He found out while he was going through the program that he was too young to be able to shoot the gun because he was too young. So he switched all of his credits into the criminal justice program. So he did two years of college at Lackawanna College and that brought him to East Stroudsburg.

He was a very loving, caring person.

2.1

His whole life everybody, once you met him, you fell in love with him. He had a wonderful smile and always, always, always knew what he wanted to do in his future.

So, on July 4th, he had two jobs while he was still going to school. He worked for me, which is a cleaning service. He worked at Gerrity Supermarket. On July 4th he came in the door after work at 3 o'clock, kissed and hugged me like he always did, and said, mom, I'm going to a party at ESU. Kissed me, hugged me and said, I love you, and walked out the door. I never knew in a million years that would be the last kiss and hug that I would ever have from my son. He left. He went to go to a party with friends at ESU.

My son did everything right that night.

He stayed overnight. He wound up being all the way down in Bethlehem, which was further. He had two beers. But more than anything, he was tired and he didn't know his environment. So, he stayed overnight.

The next morning he was on his way back.

Again, he called Gerrity, showing his

responsibility and how mature he was and said, I'm

going to be late. I was further than where I was.

2.1

I didn't know my surroundings. I'm going to be late. His boss said, Paul, take your time. It's the 5th of July. Go home and take a shower; when you get here you get here.

Meanwhile, I was having a party for my friends, and it was a quarter to 12 and I was sitting at my porch. All of a sudden, two state troopers pulled up in front of my house back to back. Right out of a movie scene, your heart sinks.

Two state troopers walked up and said, is this 1407 Fig Street? And I said yes. Deep in my heart I was already saying, is there something wrong with my son, and they wouldn't say anything. They said, is your husband home? I said yes. We walked inside, and right away they were like, do you have a Toyota Corolla? What would it be doing down on Route 33? We were, like, Route 33? Where is that? They said, it's down by East Stroudsburg University. Right away I kept saying, it's my son, it's my son.

But they weren't right away. What had happened is, they pulled up my husband's registration, and they looked at it and it did not match it, so they pulled up my son's. But there's

2.1

a lot of things going on. At the time we did not realize that he was hit and what had happened.

So what had happened is, my son was coming back and he was going north on Route 33 and a tractor-trailer was coming south. For miles people had witnessed that tractor-trailer off the road, lane switching, and he was going 69 in a 45-mile construction zone. He had crossed over two lanes of highway, a grassy medium, and hit my son head-on and had pushed him back into an embankment.

And then following behind my son was a van full of 12 people, and they had then hit that tractor-trailer. So, there we were sitting with two state troopers. They had a reason to believe it was my son because it was my husband's car, but we weren't understanding why they couldn't really understand it was him. So they were asking us, did he have markings on his body? We said, yes, he had three tattoos. He had a big Celtic cross, the word trust and faith. What we didn't realize is that, his body was dragged out and down along the highway from the force of the impact of the tractor-trailer had hitting him.

So, it took us a while. I just remember screaming on my knees, not my son; not my son; not

him. To find out that, there we were. I wanted to go see him. They kept telling us, no, we couldn't because he was considered a criminal case now. But I told them, I'm coming down. I'm going to view my child, he's mine, and I want to see him. We could not go down until after 3 o'clock because it happened at 7:55 in the morning. And due to the reconstruction of the accident, three helicopters were life-lined in.

I did go down to see him. That's no way you should ever view your child in your life is to see him at a morgue where you can't even identify him. They had him in the body bag with just his head and I couldn't even identify him. I had to tell the coroner that I had to unzip the body bag to look at his clothes from the night before when he walked out the door. And that's how I identified my child, and nobody should ever in their life have to view their child like that.

Then I asked for a priest to come in, and then I said a prayer with him, and I whispered in his ear that day that I would fight for change when I found out what had happened to him, and that's what I have been doing ever since. It was not even then we found out. It was not until we

2.1

started going to court. They were never going to prosecute him.

I kept being told by the district attorney's office, I didn't want to hear he was tired. I didn't want to hear, the sun was in his eyes. It was not until our civil case that we started to find out what it was. It was not until I got his statements; until I heard he had a ping on his one phone to his other phone, and that's when he looked up, and he never even knew he hit my son. It's was when he was looking for his phone that his statement said, and that's when I started looking. It wasn't even that he was on his phone. He was reaching for it.

So, that's when everything started to really click for me. He never said he was sorry; never anything. I had to fight for justice through the system. That was another hard thing was that, they never wanted to file charges. He was speeding. He was going through a construction zone and everything else.

I met him through the victim's dialogue program through the victim's advocacy just last year. He did admit to me everything; that he was distracted. I forgave him. I don't want to ever

hold that hate. I'm doing good work. I'm out speaking to everybody about not reaching for that phone, not being on that phone.

In my heart of hearts, I know people believe that it's never going to be them. People think it's never gonna be them. Then again last year, since then, a year -- almost within a year my husband started tripping, falling, walking into walls, and my husband was diagnosed with ALS.

So it's not something that the doctors a hundred percent can say that this happened, but I slowly watch. Because somebody did something so horrific and so bad, all because of something that was so preventable that my husband was then diagnosed with ALS, and it was definitely the stress and anxiety of that. It was a trigger.

So then, August of 2016, we were again on Route 80 going down the highway, slow, fast, slow, fast. And again, ba-boom, we got hit by another distracted driver on his phone. So the new handicap van that we had just got for my husband, we got hit a second time. So, we were both taken by the ambulance.

When I looked in the rear-view mirror, he was on his phone again. I told the state police

2.1

he was on his phone. The state trooper again said to me, if we doesn't admit to it, we can't say that he was on it. We're not going to go and search and get a search warrant. I said to him, he was on it. I know he was. So when we went to hospital, again, we got there and he came back and the state trooper said, Mrs. Miller, he admitted he was distracted. So that's two times we were hit by distracted driving.

When my son was killed, on the coroner's report, he was not listed as -- he's just a road crash fatality, so my son was never listed as a distracted driving fatality. But in court, thank God, the judge told him he was distracted and he admitted it. This time it's actually listed as a distracted driving in 2016.

So it's not a matter of if you're going to be affected. It's just a matter of time when you are going to be affected by somebody being on a cell phone. It's going to happen. It's not if. It's when it's going to happen to you and your family, and we are the living proof of it.

The numbers are going up. It's happening more and more and more all the time. You do not want to be on the phone. It's time for

2.1

Pennsylvania, it's time for us to step up. I've been fighting for this six years. Everybody is addicted to their phones. Six years. It's time for us to pass the bill, the hands-held bill.

Believe me, I want you to understand

this. I've been all over; I speak all over. These are petitions I've been having everybody sign.

People want the bill. They want it. I'm telling you, hands free is not risk free. You're still distracted in your brain, but it's a step up.

Law enforcement can actually enforce it.

If they see you on your phone and you have the hands-held bill, they'll be able to pull you over.

Now, you can't tell whether you're texting, scrolling, e-mailing. It will be a big step in saving lives, I'll guarantee it. It will.

Also, I don't know if you saw on the back. When I told you that I met the man that killed me (sic) -- Jennifer Storm was going to be here today but she couldn't because she was in State College. She strongly, strongly supports the bill as well.

I just want you to know, the aftereffects of losing your child is devastating. I
think about him every minute of every day and what

he would have been doing. He would have become that police officer. He always planned on going back to do that. He never got that opportunity. In one second his life was taken. One second, my whole life was shattered. I think about him every minute of every day, and especially now with my husband being sick, I could use his physical strength. I miss him more than anything.

Everybody on the road when they're driving, their one and only task is to just drive. Get in that car, get from A to B and just drive. Nobody today is doing it. Nobody gets in that car and just drives. Everybody is always on their phone. No matter what they're doing, they're doing it. They're looking -- every stop sign you can go to; everywhere you go, everybody you see.

tell you, 10 cars that go by, eight of them are on their phone; eight of them. They're so addicted to them. When I'm out speaking to all these kids, adults -- Companies are calling me. The companies are even saying to me, I have everybody on their phone all the time. They're driving their forklifts, they're on their phones.

Everybody please come; please come and

speak and tell your story. I tell everybody, I want you to PAASS for Paul. I use the letters PAASS for Paul: P for no phone, no alcohol, no anything addictive, no speeding, and always, always, always wear your seat belt. If you did these four things, you would go home alive and arrive alive every day.

There's nothing more important than a life, and this is an opportunity for Pennsylvania to lead the step. All our surrounding states have it. Every one of us -- Everyone around us. New York -- Everybody says to me, I don't want to go to New York, because when I go to New York, I'll get an 800-dollar fine. I won't touch my phone if I go to New York.

Do the same in Pennsylvania. Do the same thing here. Step up. It's time for us to pass this thing. You can save lives. You guys can all be life savers here. You can save a life if you pass this bill.

It's important -- everybody says -- I'll say to them, what can you do not to touch that phone? They all say, I'll do it if I get a high fine and points off my license. Perfect bill.

Perfect bill. I'm begging you. I've been begging,

please every time we get to the house everything goes dead. This is the time for us to step up and please pass this bill. Do it -- I can't beg any more.

Remembering my son and all the people who have died and injured due to distracted driving, I'm begging you to pass this bill from my heart in memory of my son.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Thank you, Eileen. We all understand how hard it is for you to do what you're doing and to make these statements. I think at the beginning of any hearing, we want to establish why; why would we consider these bills. I think your testimony is powerful enough that it's very clear as to why.

The how is sometimes a little trickier, but I think we're going to get to that. I think, in Paul's memory, we're gonna to pass meaningful legislation.

MS. MILLER: I really hope so. I don't want this to happen to anybody sitting here. Every time I see a crash on TV and I see they cross that center line, I know what they were doing. I know what they were doing.

I just don't want -- Every time I turn

2.1

on the TV, I don't even want to turn it on. Every time I drive by and I see somebody on their phone,
I run over to them, I'm like, don't do it. You don't want to be living my life.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Chairman

Keller.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Miller, thank you for not only your testimony, but for your bravery. I know how hard this must be for you. I don't think -- At times you must be totally frustrated. But if you think about it --

I think one of the best lobbying organizations in the country is MADD. I think that started just like what you're doing. So, when you get disgusted, just think about what happened, just people like you staying at it and never giving up.

MS. MILLER: I'll never give up. Even when this law is passed, I'll keep trying for stronger and harder laws, and harder and harder. I don't want it to ever let go. It's always a life. This is not a Democratic/Republican issue. It's a human life issue. That's what I want it to be. I just don't want it to happen to anybody else.

1 MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: Again, thank 2 you. Thank you very much. MS. MILLER: Thank you. 3 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: 4 Representative Brown. 5 6 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Eileen, I just 7 want to say thank you again. I know we have met many times. And, Paul, thank you for coming. I do 8 know, obviously, after our conversations that 10 you've worked very hard. Eileen was very active with us on our Safe 80 Task Force in Monroe County 11 12 as well. She's offered a great amount of expertise 13 and assistance with us. 14 One thing I just wanted to point out 15 that Eileen did mention to other members of the 16 committee, there are 15 other states that now have 17 hands-free cellphone legislation. I believe that's 18 now 16 as of yesterday, because I think Georgia --19 MS. MILLER: Just passed it yesterday or 20 the day before. 21 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: That's something 22 that came up to me I was reviewing yesterday. It's 23 growing. 24 If you look at the northeast, you'll see 25 our border states, New York and New Jersey and West

Virginia, Rhode Island. Then you look at the West Coast is where you'll see some of the other states that have it.

But, it's very difficult for a driver going through, especially in the area that I have with a lot of commuters going to New York and New Jersey, it's almost -- as well as an enhanced safety that we need to have and also fairness to the driver on a regional aspect that there's consistency in some of our laws as well.

I just wanted to point that out to the members. We now have 16 other states with this. It is enforceable, which I think is a very important point.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I didn't come here today to talk today, but I think I should say at least two things.

My name is Paul Miller. I have ALS, five and a half years. Normally you have two to five years to live. About three years ago, I was told not to drive anymore, so I haven't. When I get in the car with my wife, I'm scared to death to be on that road. I feel helpless because I'm not driving.

You see it. People are back and forth.

2.1

What about the drivers that are making the phone call and smoking? Their hands aren't even on the wheel.

All I can say is, Pennsylvania needs to stay focused; be ahead of the game. Don't be a follower for these other states. It's easy for me. I just tell people, turn the dang thing off because if it rings, pings, you're going to want to look at it. I only have a flip phone, and I spend \$100 for the year. It's only in case I'm doing something. If I fall, I could call somebody. It's an easy cure.

I'm so proud of my wife because she goes to high schools and speaks to the kids. We figured there was no loss coming, so her way is to educate the youth before they get to drive.

Me, I thank you for having this today.

I just wanted to say a couple things. But we need stronger laws, and they have to be enforced so these people don't keep picking up their phone when they're driving.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR:

Representative Kortz.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you, Mr.

2.1

1	Chairman.
2	And Mr. and Mrs. Miller, let me offer my
3	sincere condolences to you both on the loss of your
4	son.
5	MS. MILLER: Thank you.
6	REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Unfortunately, it
7	takes tragedies to get things changed. It's sad,
8	but it's the truth of the situation.
9	I agree with you a hundred percent. We
10	need to put this into law. I commend
11	Representative Brown for bringing this bill
12	forward. A number of years ago, as you know, we
13	put into law, you can't text and drive.
14	MS. MILLER: I know.
15	REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: But people still
16	do it.
17	MS. MILLER: I know.
18	REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: You're exactly
19	right. If you drive down the highway leaving here,
20	you will see folks coming the other way, they're
21	texting and driving.
22	MS. MILLER: I know.
23	REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: It's time to put
24	more teeth in that law.
25	Now, several years ago, that being said,

1 we did pass a law called Daniel's Law, a gentleman 2 on a motorcycle, distracted driver. He was killed. MS. MILLER: I know that. 3 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: We tried to put 4 5 more teeth in that law, again, from a tragedy. I 6 hope we, as a committee and as the House of Representatives, take this up and push this forward. 8 Thank you for your testimony. Again, my 10 deepest sympathies to you and your family. 11 MS. MILLER: Thank you kindly. 12 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Thank you, 13 Eileen. We'll move on to the state police and our 14 PennDOT panel. 15 Thank you kindly. MS. MILLER: 16 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: I'm sure 17 we'll be talking soon. Thanks again. 18 MS. MILLER: Thank you very much, and 19 everybody be safe. 20 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Next we have 2.1 Major Edward Hoke, the Director of the Bureau of 22 Patrol with the Pennsylvania State Police, along 23 with Gavin Gray, who is our Highway Safety and Section Chief of PennDOT. 24 25 We're also joined by Chairman Hennessey

and Representative Stephens. Anybody new?

(No response).

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Gentlemen, good afternoon. Thanks so much for being here. It doesn't matter to me, but on my list, Major, you're first. If you would like to start, we will be glad to listen.

MAJOR HOKE: Good afternoon. Before I begin, I want to offer my condolences as well as to the Miller family. Their courage is tremendous.

To step forward and to bring this issue to light under the circumstances which they live every day, is truly commendable.

Good afternoon, Chairmen Taylor and
Keller, and members of the House Transportation
Committee. I am Major Edward Hoke, the Director of
the Bureau Control of the Pennsylvania State
Police. I appreciate the opportunity to offer
testimony this afternoon on PSP's perspective
regarding House Bills 892 and 1684, which focus on
prohibiting distracted driving.

The responsibility of improving highway safety is a core function of policing, and is one that is taken very seriously by all Pennsylvania law enforcement agencies. The PSP and municipal

police officers from across the Commonwealth work hard every day to enforce the traffic laws to prevent crashes and to improve highway safety.

According to the Pennsylvania

Department of Transportation, 2016 statewide crash statistics, there were 129,395 reportable crashes, in which 1,188 people lost their lives and another 82,971 people were injured. To put these numbers into perspective, the total for reportable crashes in 2016 was the 13th lowest since 1950 when 113,748 crashes were reported.

While the causes of the crashes often vary, the use of alcohol and/or drugs and speeding have been identified as the two most frequent contributing factors in fatal crashes. Of particular interest to this discussion is the fact that distracted driving was also identified as a causal factor in 2016 in 61 of the fatal crashes that claimed the lives of 69 people.

PennDOT's distracted driving crash statistics also show that a hand-held cellular phone was in use in 1,146 crashes resulting in eight fatalities and 701 injuries. To a lesser degree, a hands-free cellular phone was determined to be in use in 83 of the crashes, resulting in one

2.1

fatality and 70 injuries.

2.1

A distracted driving crash is one in which the investigating law enforcement agency has confirmed that the primary causal factor for the crash was inattentive driving. While distracted driving is most commonly thought of today as texting and driving, it also includes such actions as eating, grooming or talking to passengers in the vehicle or on a cellular phone. Any action or activity that causes a driver to divert or focus their visual, physical or cognitive attention away from the conscious act of controlling a vehicle while navigating the road can significantly increase the likelihood of a crash occurring.

For example, a vehicle moving at 65 miles per hour travels at approximately 95 feet per second. In the few seconds that it would take a driver using a hand-held phone to complete a call, it is not hard to conceptualize how a crash can occur even if the driver's distraction was brief. Drivers need to focus all of their attention on the dynamic task of operating a vehicle to avoid potentially deadly consequences.

While the current crash statistics for distracted driving are alarming, the true magnitude

of this problem may be underreported. Law enforcement often faces many challenges when trying to determine if a driver's distraction was truly a contributing casual factor in a crash.

The passage of House Bill 1684, which seeks to prohibit a driver from using a hand-held cellular phone while the vehicle is in motion imposes a presumption that the driver was engaged in a call if the device is held to or in close proximity to the operator's ear would certainly serve to reduce the opportunity for distraction by the driver by prohibiting the conduct completely except for in emergency situations.

The passage of House Bill 892 and 1684 would be an important step forward in helping to reduce the likelihood of distracted driving crashes. By prohibiting a specific action, the legislation is also lessening an opportunity for distraction. If the legislation were to pass, voluntary compliance would seem to be encouraged by the consequence of the assignment of points upon a conviction for a violation.

Well-crafted legislation is essential to ensuring that police officers have the statutory authority necessary to keep our highways safe.

2.1

Both bills would enhance that authority.

2.1

Regardless of the challenges now and into the future, the Pennsylvania State Police and our municipal law enforcement partners remain committed to protecting and serving the citizens of this Commonwealth.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our perspective. I would be happy to answer any of your questions.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: If it's okay with you, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to go right to Gavin and then we'll have questions.

MR. GRAY: Good afternoon. Again, my name is Gavin Gray. I'm the chief of the highway safety section within the Department of Transportation. I'll be giving a brief overview of the written testimony that we've previously provided.

The department overall is supportive of any action that really focuses on distracted driving and the reducing of crashes and fatalities associated with that, because it not only impacts the traveling public within the Commonwealth, but it also impacts our workers within work zones within the Commonwealth.

Overall, we've seen that state crash data has shown an eight and a half percent increase from 2013 to 2017, which mirrors national numbers that we've seen from our federal partners with the National Highway Safety Traffic (sic) Administration. Unfortunately, both -- One of the things that NHTSA and also PennDOT experiences with trying to report this information and trying to accurately develop countermeasures to support it, is that, we feel like the state police have previously testified to, that the information is generally underreported. The way that we collect the crash report information and are able to analyze that information, a lot of times, involves whether there was a witness or evidence, and then that kind of skews the data that we have to take action against.

So, generally speaking, I think both at the national level and within the Department of Transportation, we feel that those numbers, while representative, are probably underreported with the information that we utilize.

One of the things that NHTSA has come out and said that 94 percent of all the crashes that they have observed nationally interact with

1

2

3

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

some type of human behavior in some fashion. They do have data that basically supports the need to deal with things like these proposed bills are introducing.

So, one of the things that we really focus on with reducing the distracted driving starts with the Commonwealth strategic highway safety plan. That is a combination of things of all safety stakeholders within the Commonwealth. One of the safety focus areas within that document specifically talks to distracted driving and the things that can be done to reduce and act as countermeasures to curb that both proactively and reactively. So, one of the things that we really focus on with those partners, the educational and outreach component, is the proactive. The enforcement partners deal with more -- some of the reactive nature of some of the things we have to deal with with distracted driving.

So, overall, with our coordination with our local safety partners, there's a couple of things that we currently do within regards to the confines of these bills that I wanted to make everyone aware of. So, distracted driving certainly starts with an educational component and

2.1

making sure that people understand what's happening so that they can actually change their behavioral habits, because if that doesn't happen, unfortunately, we'll always be in the reactive state with what we're doing with safety relative to distracted driving.

So, this month is a national month relative to distracted driving awareness, so there's a lot of events happening nationally from campaign perspective with NHTSA and also that we support here at PennDOT. But we do things throughout the year using federal funding through mechanisms of grants to provide outreach to the public. That can be at schools. It can be going to different events throughout the Commonwealth to bring awareness to these issues so that people have that general understanding of kind of the facts, if you will, with regards to distracted driving, so that they're informed; they can make good conscious decisions when they are behind the wheel because it all starts with them as the drivers.

So overall, I'd like to thank everyone for your continued interest in this topic and also other safety issues that you've brought to committee in the past. Our only suggestion

2.1

relative specifically to House Bill 1684, there's 1 specific guidance within the NHTSA requirements 2 relative to language that could be added to bills 3 like these that would allow for additional funding to come to the Commonwealth that could support our 5 6 programs. 7 It is a fairly significant dollar figure that would support the continuing education 8 components of what these bills are trying to 10 introduce. So, there's some minor modifications 11 that would make Pennsylvania eligible for that 12 grant funding at the national level. 13 At this time, I'd be open to any 14 questions that the committee might have. 15 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: And, Gavin, 16 could you make sure that -- I'm sure we might have 17 it. Make sure we have that language. MR. GRAY: Certainly. 18 19 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Chairman Keller. 20 21 MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: Thank you, 22 Mr. Chairman. 23 Major, in 2014, we passed Act 85 that bans hand-held devices for people who have a CDL 24

license. Do you have any statistics on how many

traffic violations were issued to CDL drivers for violating that law?

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{MAJOR}}$$ HOKE: I can certainly get that information for you, sir.

But, to speak to that piece of legislation, it was a very important step forward. Obviously, the operator of an 80,000-pound commercial motor vehicle, the level of responsibility that those operators bear with operating a vehicle that size is certainly much more significant than the operator of a passenger vehicle, just from the perspective that a vehicle that size can cause a tremendous amount of damage when it is involved in a crash.

I would suggest to you that, respectfully so, if this body saw fit to pass legislation with regard to commercial vehicles, the next step in that direction would be to also pass legislation comparable to the operation of passenger vehicles.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: I understand that, and we all agree with you, of course. People that operate an 80,000-pound vehicle, of course, it's more important that they're not allowed to do it.

1	I was just wondering if you had any
2	statistics, because, one of the arguments against
3	this is that it is not forcible. We already have a
4	law on the books for commercial drivers. I was
5	just wondering how many violations there were that
6	could help us prove that it is enforceable.
7	MAJOR HOKE: Sir, I don't necessarily
8	know that looking at pure statistics for a
9	violation with regard to a commercial motor
10	vehicle
11	MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: How about
12	this? I'm wondering if there are any violations.
13	MAJOR HOKE: Yes, there are. I can say
14	that
15	MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: And you will
16	be able to get us how many?
17	MAJOR HOKE: I can certainly do that for
18	you, yes.
19	MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: Thank you
20	very much. Send it to the Chairman of the
21	committee so we can share that.
22	MAJOR HOKE: Yes, sir.
23	MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: Thank you.
24	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR:
25	Representative Schlossberg.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHLOSSBERG: Thank you, Chairman. And thank you to everyone who has testified.

I come at this from a couple of different angles. First, to someone who four weeks ago had their car totaled by a distracted driver. So, that was fun. Fortunately, everybody was fine, but a fun experience nonetheless.

Second, in my previous livelihood, I was a member of Allentown City Council. I was a senior at Muhlenberg College when a friend of mine, who was a young woman named Jacy Good, was a freshman. That name might sound familiar to some of you.

Jacy's parents were killed in a head-on car accident the day she graduated college by a distracted driver, unfortunately. And working with Jacy on Allentown City Council, we passed a law banning hand-held phone use while driving.

Unfortunately, that law was struck down in the courts.

But, this is one I've had a passion for and pay a lot of attention to, so I'm very grateful for all of the representatives to have introduced this legislation.

My question is this: There are many

2.1

states now that have enacted these laws. It seems that there are -- they're in a variety of different structures. Some are complete hand-held bands.

Other have it as a secondary offense.

I'm very curious about what's the best way -- if you two are able to answer this -- what the best way to design such a law should be? How hard should the penalties be? Who should it apply to? What's the most affected way, according to the data out there, to create a law like this?

MR. GRAY: One of the things that we rely on resources from the federal government for, there's different associations and administrations that deal with that, and they communicate to the states to try to have somewhat a consistency with that.

So, to start with, one of the things -one of the requirements that I mentioned to be
eligible for the federal funding, one of the things
that they found to be a best practice, one of the
requirements of their funding is that the offenses
be able to be a primary offense. That's one of the
pieces that, first and foremost, if you don't have
a law that supports that, it won't make us eligible
for the federal funding within regards to those

2.1

categories.

So, from the national level, they would say that it starts there. But then, there's other more finite elements like the discussion of, when we're talking about some of the GDL language that's in the bills and having total cell phone bans for those under 18, they would also advocate for anyone that has a GDL license to be included in that as well. So that's somebody that's an inexperienced driver that maybe would be over 18 that would then also have those same restrictions.

So, there's a myriad of best practices that we can certainly get additional information from NHTSA to provide that information, if that would be something that the committee is interested in. We can certainly share that type of information with everyone.

REPRESENTATIVE SCHLOSSBERG: Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Chairman

Harper.

REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: My question is along the same lines, and I think it goes to Major Hoke.

We have a law against distracted driving, and we have a law against cell phone use

by CDL drivers. But the problem seems to be growing instead of shrinking. Is there something wrong with the way the current law is written that makes it different to prosecute those offenses?

MAJOR HOKE: In follow-up to

Representative Keller's question here a minute ago,

the law's very clear when it comes to commercial

motor vehicles, and it's very easy for law

enforcement to enforce those two provisions of the

code.

With regard to 3316, prohibiting textbased communications, from a law enforcement
perspective, enforcing that law is much more
difficult because of the requirements of that piece
of legislation. It's very difficult to be able to
determine with any great degree of certainty
without actually ascertaining the phone from the
operator that they were, in fact, reading, sending
or writing a text while that vehicle was in motion.
So there is a distinction between the types of
vehicles and the pieces of legislation; one being
more difficult to enforce than the other.

REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: And that's what I'm trying to get at in order to see that we write the law better the next time. So I guess I have

2.1

two questions.

If the driver who gets hit was looking in the rear-view mirror, as Mr. Miller testified, and saw somebody on the phone, you can't use that testimony?

MAJOR HOKE: It would certainly aid us in the investigation, and we could certainly use that information to potentially obtain a search warrant at some point, if necessary. But, there are those additional investigative steps we would have to take in that instance.

But, if you change one of those details in that entire scenario; if you eliminate that testimony or that witness account from us, then we are basically left to basically ask the operator, were you, in fact, using your phone at the time of the crash?

REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: Just one follow-up, Mr. Chairman, if I might.

I'm a lawyer also. I recognize that seizing somebody's cell phone has Fourth Amendment implications to it. At the same time, driving on Pennsylvania's highways is a privilege; not a right. Is there anything we can do to make it

easier for you to get the cell phone evidence after a crash or something like that?

MAJOR HOKE: I've looked at a number of bills here in the past that suggests that or offer that as a means to further an investigation for law enforcement. Again, we're governed by the Constitution, so it would have to fall in line with that -- obviously, that premise.

Certainly, it would be a tool for us to aid an investigation when we -- when we think an operator was involved with a crash because of distracted driving through the use of that phone.

That would certainly aid us.

REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: I also would think that you would instruct anybody investigating an accident to ask the witnesses if they saw the phone in use.

MAJOR HOKE: Long before -- Many years ago, actually, the state police began to tabulate information at crash scenes, where before it actually became part of a report, an official report, we would ask them, were you using a cell phone at the time of the crash? So we were dialed into that possibility for quite some time.

REPRESENTATIVE HARPER: Thank you.

2.1

1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR:

Representative Brown.

2.4

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Harper actually touched on most of my questions. It really was from a law enforcement standpoint and a PennDOT standpoint.

And I would second the fact on the NHTSA guidelines, if I could get a copy of that with them as well because that's very helpful information.

Is there something on a law enforcement end that you would write the bill differently as far as for an enforcement or for a fine structure, or something based on your experience from that law enforcement? You pretty much touched a little bit on that, but is there anything additional?

MAJOR HOKE: Yes, Representative.

With regard to House Bill 1684, this pertains to a definition in both instances here.

It's the definition of a law enforcement officer and a first responder are not defined in that piece of legislation. That could be problematic for us moving a case forward in court, because those roles are not clearly being defined by definition. That

1 could certainly aid the law enforcement community with a prosecution. 2 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you. We'll 3 definitely look at that. Thank you. 4 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: 5 Representative Heffley. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 8 Over here. Just an inquiry, I guess. 10 When you do the investigations and you 11 can access the cell phone and you see somebody was 12 on the cell phone in a certain time frame -- I know 13 in court for motor vehicles, they'll have some kind 14 of on-board recording device. I know E-logs are mandated now, so they all have some kind of 15 16 on-boarding recording device. I know that Ford 17 Motor Company puts an on-board recording device in 18 every vehicle, and they data mind that information 19 for their own use. 20 Are you ever able to access that 2.1 information to cross-reference whether a vehicle is 22 moving while the cell phone was being used? MAJOR HOKE: I don't want to speak to 23 the ability of what our crash reconstructionists 24

have the ability to do, but we do have the ability

to download the data recorders that are on board 1 2 the vehicles. And I'm not sure whether that actually is a data that's actually captured by that 3 device or not. So I don't want to misspeak, but it's certainly something that I could look into and 5 6 follow up with you and provide you with that 7 information. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: 8 Representative Neilson. 10 REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Thank you, Mr. 11 Chairman. 12 Major, if I could follow up on 13 Representative Keller's question a little bit. I 14 drive down the turnpike a lot, back and forth to here, and I can't see inside a truck to see if 15 16 somebody is using a phone. How do you? 17 He asked you for a list of violations. 18 Are these violations that are gonna come after the 19 occurrence, or actually people that were pulled 20 over for offending that act? Because I mean, you 21 can't see. That's real. I can't see in their 22 right hand. I pass the quy. We don't know what's 23 in his hand. MAJOR HOKE: Sir, everything is in 24

perspective. In other words, what would be your

perspective of the trooper alongside the road as a vehicle is approaching, can they view the operator side? Are they off on that side of the berm where they can see that vehicle approaching? If it's at night, the phone give off a glow; it will emit a glow.

So, there are indicators there that would give a trooper an idea that the operator may be engaged with a cell phone holding it up to his ear, something of that nature.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Can you also when you're getting that stats together, can you also give us the stats on Act 98 of 2011 and how many drivers got ticketed along our highways by the state police just for texting?

But if you could break it down a little further for me, I'd like to make sure that's the only fine they were issued. I mean, they were pulled over for speeding and then someone says, hey, you were texting. I want to keep it in perspective that people were pulled over for texting, so to say.

MAJOR HOKE: One of the problems that I had mentioned here earlier was with the under-reporting, the aspect of crash investigations.

Along those lines, one of the things that when we, as an agency, began to tabulate the statistics for distracted driving, there's six sections of the code that pertain. Two of them, reckless driving and the other one, um -- reckless driving, careless driving. I'm sorry.

What we did with our TraCS database, which is the software program that we use to issue and track our citations, electronic citations, we built into that program a means for our troopers to indicate that it was being issued for a charge of careless driving, but the driver was distracted. So whether that action was one with -- involved the use of a hand-held phone or whether that involved the act of engaging in a conversation where you're looking at the passenger and not concentrating on the road. But clearly, their behavior was indicative of distraction.

We ask them to now indicate that on the citation so we have a better means of gauging what is distracted driving and how often, where, in previous -- previous to that program being modified, careless distraction citation could have included a multitude of other things that didn't deal with distractions or the reckless aspect of

2.1

operating a vehicle. It could have been intentionally being driven in a manner that was unsafe. But we would not have a means to recognize that.

So now, in the last year or so, we've been able to track them more accurately; get a sense of where we're at with distracted driving.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Thank you. You read the proposed legislation at your dispose --

MAJOR HOKE: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: -- in detail because you've made some suggestions on definitions.

MAJOR HOKE: Yes, sir.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: How about definitions -- I couldn't help but notice Gavin has an Eyewatch on next to you. This talks about phones and stuff like that. It doesn't really talk about devices. I mean, Gavin probably can answer his phone right from his wrist right now as we talk.

What's going to define that? Can you get us a list of citation -- suggestions on what you would actually define as a device that should be banned from a driver from using? I don't know

2.1

how many times I drive with my iPad next to me. We do a lot of stuff here. I don't have my laptop open, but it's something that devices have to be more exploratory. If you can get us a list of what you think we should be looking for, that would be great.

Then I'll switch to you Gavin since I picked on your Eyewatch a little bit. How much funding do you spend annually on distracted driving on education?

MR. GRAY: I would have to get you the specific number because it's broken down into different components. Some of it, like part of this month, we do a campaign that focuses on public education, so there's one component there. But then we also have grant funding that comes through us through NHTSA so that -- To add all those up for the specific components of it, I'd have to get you a specific number relative to that.

But, like I said, there's different components of our different programs that focus towards distracted driving in the education. And then there's also indirect things that we do with supporting state and local police with different enforcement events, which some of the events that

2.1

1 they do are targeted towards distracted driving as 2 well. 3 So, to sum all of those up, I'd have to get back to you with an exact number on that. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Thank you very 6 Thanks for your testimony. Thank you, Mr. 7 Chairman. MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: 8 Representative Kortz. 10 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you, Mr. 11 Chairman. Thank you, gentlemen, for your 12 testimony. 13 Major, in the case of a vehicular 14 accident where there's a fatality, does that scene become a criminal scene right then and there? 15 16 MAJOR HOKE: Yes. 17 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Okay. Since it 18 is a criminal scene, you're going to collect all 19 the evidence necessary, right? 20 MAJOR HOKE: Correct. 21 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Okay. Isn't part 22 of that evidence the cell phones, or do you have to 23 go out and seek a warrant on those cell phones to see what they were doing? I mean, that is part of 24 the evidence. 25

MAJOR HOKE: It could be part of the evidence. In order for us to actually seize that cell phone, we would have to have some clear-cut indication that that phone was in use at the time of the crash.

MAJOR HOKE: Well, unlike the vehicle.

That's the distinction here. The vehicle that was involved that caused the fatality clearly is evidence because we know that was involved in the commission -- potentially in the commission of a homicide by vehicle.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: You have to?

Making that leap to that cell phone is a tougher distinction because of the lack of probable cause that we would have. Again, if we have that probable cause, we could certainly use that information to further the information. We could seize the cell phone if we had probable cause, and then obtain a warrant to get into that phone and obtain the phone records down the road. But in just --

Simply because somebody has a cell phone in their possession and is involved in a crash where there's a fatality does not necessarily mean that that phone was in use at the time. We've got

to make that -- We've got to bridge that gap if we're going to say this was truly a distracted driving crash because of the use of that cell phone. There's got to be some indication there to us that that phone was in use at the time.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Do we need to change something in the law to give you that?

Because everything at that scene is part of the crime scene; the black box in the truck or car that tells the vehicle's speed and all that. I mean, that cell phone is right there.

Is there something we can do through legislation to allow you to take a look at that cell phone, compare the time stamp to what was going on to the time of the crash? I mean, that would be a clear indicator if you could link those two together on a time line.

MAJOR HOKE: If this body saw fit to potentially draft legislation with regard to providing law enforcement with that authority, that would certainly prove to be, I believe, beneficial at some point. But again, it would have to fall within the parameters of --

The courts have already gone on record indicating the cell phone is much more than just a

2.1

phone per se because of all the things people keep within that -- within that device. You know, many folks, their lives are intertwined within that device. And to allow law enforcement to simply access that device without a warrant, again, without a law in place to allow us to do that, we can't pursue that.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR:

Representative Stephens.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you so much for your testimony. Again, following up on this issue of enforceability, is the only prohibition in our crimes code -- I'm sorry, in our vehicle code on this subject, the texting while driving provision, is that the only bold-face provision that we find an outright prohibition?

MAJOR HOKE: It's the only one, sir, that deals with the act of using the hand-held device to read, send or text a message. The other provisions that are mentioned are 1622 and 1621, which are the prohibition for the use of hand-held

devices by commercial vehicle operators, and then the others that I had mentioned with regard to distracted driving were the careless and reckless sections.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: So I guess -And I recall this debate occurring when the
discussion on the texting legislation was moving
forward, and the whole question came down to
enforceability. And I get it.

I was frustrated then with the fact that I didn't feel like we were going to be able to do a great job enforcing that statute, for the simple reason that, you know, right now, I'm looking at my phone and I'm doing a lot of things, but I'm not texting and I'm clearly not able to drive while I'm looking down at my phone and looking up a phone number or searching Facebook or checking the weather, or whatever I might be, or texting Representative Neilson -- or, I'm sorry, calling Representative Neilson or something like that.

I don't know how familiar you are with the laws in the neighboring states, but I think in New Jersey, it's a crime just to have the phone in your hand, period. At least that's how I was advised by a nice state police who stopped me to

2.1

inform me of that about a year or so ago. But, look, I mean, it worked. Obviously, I didn't pick up the phone for the rest of the trip.

Is that something -- Is that type of a bright line rule something that you would find very helpful in terms of enforcement?

MAJOR HOKE: You just demonstrated a very clear distinction when you demonstrated the act with your phone.

An operator is permitted to use the phone to, perhaps, call up a voice interactive number or scroll through their Rolodex until they find a number they want to complete a call with by simply manipulating those buttons on the phone.

It's a permissible act, but yet, it looks as if the operator of the vehicle could potentially be texting and driving in violation of the other provision of that law.

From a law enforcement perspective, I can tell you I attended training down in Quantico, Virginia, and in passing through both Maryland and Virginia, their law is very clear. I knew that I could not engage in the operation of a hand-held cell phone. As soon as you enter those states, there's signs clearly posted, hand-held phones

2.1

prohibited.

So there is -- There is no ambiguity in the law. It's very clear-cut. It's very, you know, very straightforward.

So, to answer your question, I think that, you know, a ban is a ban. So it prohibits the conduct -- It would eliminate a means of distraction.

REPRESENTATIVE STEPHENS: Okay. Thank you very much.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Gentlemen, thank you very much. I think there will be some other folks that can answer more technological questions that I think this group will have.

I mean, I'm always amazed that -- This is Samsung; not on this, but on the iPhone. But if I'm driving, it comes across the bottom it will not receive any messages at all. I don't know how it knows I'm driving. Seriously, you can disable it by saying you're not driving, but it comes up that you're not getting. Maybe we'll get to the point where driving -- the mechanism in the vehicle will completely disable the phone.

But, until that time, we appreciate your testimony. We appreciate the advise on 684, for

example, and we'll make those adjustments. So, thank you.

I'm going to take the liberty, since our next three testifiers are here, I'm going to ask them all to gather together. Their testimony is a little different each, but we're going to ask Steve and Ted and Joe, I know you're all here, if you could all take a seat.

(The testifiers complied).

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Thanks to all three of you for being here. Steve, I have you as going first, so there must be some logic to that from my staff's perspective. If you could just identify yourself for the record, and then you can proceed.

MR. BLACKISTONE: Thank you, Chairman
Taylor and Chairman Keller. I'm Steve Blackistone.
I'm in charge of State and Local Liaison for the
National Transportation Safety Board from
Washington, D.C.

Before I start my statement, let me say, as echo as many others have, thank you to

Mrs. Miller for her powerful testimony. In what has been a very difficult challenge, difficult time for her. But her statement really brings home the

importance of significance of some of the numbers you'll hear from us, some of the abstract investigations that I'll be talking about. I think it's very important to keep in mind the things that she has said.

Having said that, I appreciate the opportunity to talk to you about some of NTSB's recommendations regarding distracted driving.

These recommendations represent over 15 years of experience and lessons that we've learned from a number of accident investigations that we've conducted involving crashes where portable electronic devices were involved.

As a result of our investigations, we've seen firsthand that distraction is a growing and life-threatening problem. To reduce the crashes and injuries and deaths, drivers and other operators need to completely disconnect from portable electronic devices.

NTSB is an independent federal agency charged by Congress to investigate transportation accidents, determine their probable cause and make recommendations on preventing their reoccurrence. And these recommendations are our most important tool for bringing about change.

2.1

2.4

More than 37,000 people were killed on our nation's highways in 2016, and it's estimated that almost one in 10 of those deaths occurred as a crash -- in a crash that involved distracted driving. However, while data is being collected, currently there is no reliable method accurately to determine exactly how many crashes involve portable electronic devices or other distractions, so it really is impossible to know the true scope of the problem.

Portable devices are ubiquitous.

According to industry sources, there are almost

396 million wireless subscriber connections as of
the end of 2016. That's more than one for every
man, woman and child in this country, and we use
them while we're driving.

Since 2002, we have investigated at least six major highway crashes in which distraction, due to the use of a portable electronic device, contributed to the outcome, and I've described these crashes for you in my written statement. But given the accelerating frequency of these accidents and the dangerous habits that we've discovered from our investigations, in 2011, we called for a nationwide ban on the use of portable

2.1

electronic devices while driving. That is, any use, hand held or hand free in any type of vehicle.

Epidemiological, driver simulator, naturalistic studies, all types of research have shown that the risk of crash is higher when the driver uses an electronic device. These studies have been conducted by a variety of different institutions, and they've made the case that portable electronic devices used by motor vehicle operators is dangerously distracting.

Drivers don't just experience a visual or a manual distraction when they're using a cell phone. They also suffer a cognitive distraction. Recent studies by the Triple A Foundation for Traffic Safety show that a hands-free is not risk free. A driver's level of cognitive distraction is about equal whether using a hand-held or a hand-free device. Even voice-based systems may not totally eliminate the distraction and may have unintended effects.

There's no doubt that the adoption of a safe-driving behavior, free of electronic device use, will require a cultural shift. If change is to happen, it's going to require a three-pronged approach: Good laws, good education and good

enforcement. We've seen this kind of approach work before in other areas. One particular example is the widespread use of seat belts.

Before states required vehicle occupants to use seat belts, only about 14 percent of occupants used them. After states started passing seat belt laws, belt use jumped to 59 percent in eight years. Today, with stronger seat belt laws, high visibility enforcement and education campaigns, seat belt usage nationally is about 90 percent; although it's somewhat lower than that here in Pennsylvania. States with the strongest laws, those enabling primary enforcement, have the highest use rates.

Distraction is unsafe. It takes the driver's attention away from the driving task.

NTSB is especially concerned about distractions from the use of electronic devices, both because of our investigations and because of the data that we've seen regarding use in the general population. With more and more drivers using the devices, instead of focusing on safety, everyone on the road is at risk, and we certainly have seen that illustrated here today.

And distraction is not just about

2.1

holding a device or in a hand or glancing away from the road for a minute. It's about straying away mentally from the driving task. Even a momentary distraction of a driver's attention, such as reading a text message, can have catastrophic consequences.

NTSB believes that a significant number of lives can be saved and injuries avoided if Pennsylvania expands and strengthens its law to include all nonemergency use of all portable electronic devices.

I thank you for the opportunity to testify for your consideration of this important issue, and I'll be glad to respond to any questions that you have.

Before doing that, though, I would like to respond to a question I believe Representative Neilson raised to about how best to define the terminology that we're talking about here. NTSB has always used the term portable electronic device, which captures a variety of different devices. One of the things to recognize is, we know what the technology is today. We don't know what the technology will be in 10 years.

You made reference to the Apple watch

2.1

that Gavin is wearing. In 10 years, it may be something totally different. It's impossible to capture that change in technology without some sort of generic language such as that. So, that would be our recommendation to you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: I'm going to ask all three to testify, and then we're going to have some questions. Ted.

MR. LEONARD: I would like to extend my condolences as well to Mr. and Mrs. Miller on the loss of your son, having lost a mother-in-law in similar circumstances a couple years ago. I completely understand your pain.

Good afternoon, Chairman Taylor and
Chairman Keller, and members of the House
Transportation Committee. My name is Ted Leonard.

I'm the Executive Director of the Pennsylvania
Triple A Federation, which is the state association
of the eight Triple A clubs in Pennsylvania
encompassing 3.2 million member-motorists.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to provide information on the important issue of distracted driving. Any task that requires a driver to take their eyes or attention off the road is a distraction and should be avoided while the

vehicle is in motion, including the use of handheld or hands-free cell phones.

Distracted driving tops drivers' list of growing dangers on the road according to a survey released just last week by the Triple A Foundation for Traffic Safety. Their Annual Traffic Safety Culture Index shows that 88 percent of drivers believe distracted driving is on the rise, topping other risky behaviors like aggressive driving, drivers using drugs and drunk driving.

The proportion of drivers who report talking on a cell phone regularly or fairly often, when behind the wheel, jumped 46 percent since 2013. Nearly half of drivers report recently talking on a hand-held phone while driving, and nearly 33 percent have sent either a text message or an e-mail.

Despite their behavior, nearly 58

percent of drivers say talking on a cell phone

behind a wheel is a very serious threat to their

personal safety, while 78 percent believe that

texting is a significant danger. A recent study by

the Triple A Foundation showsdrivers talking on a

cell phone are up to four times likely to crash,

while those who text while driving are up to eight

times likely to be involved in a crash.

In 2015, the Triple A Foundation released two studies on distracted driving. The first study found that a driver has finished making a call, tuning a radio or composing a text message via voice command, that distraction can last for an additional 27 seconds.

Second study found that 58 percent of teen driver crashes were due to driver distraction. The risk of a 16- or a 17-year-old driver being killed in a crash increases 44 percent when one passenger younger than 21 is in the vehicle; doubles when he's carrying two passengers younger than 21, and quadruples when three or more passengers are in the vehicle.

The study also showed that in 50 percent of rear-impact crashes, the driver exhibited no reaction at all before the crash; meaning, there was no braking or steering to avoid the crash.

While Triple A strongly supports texting bans, we do not have a national position on hand-held bans. Based on the Triple A Foundation's extensive research into cognitive distraction,

Triple A warns drivers not to use a cell phone whether it be hand held or hands free while behind

the wheel. Hands-free is not risk fee.

2.1

Having said that, there are two sections of House Bill 1684 that I would like to note. The first is that the ban only applies when the car is in motion. The Triple A recommends that drivers not use cell phones for nonemergency calls while operating a vehicle, even if the car is stopped. Research found that potentially unsafe mental distractions can persist for as long as 27 seconds after dialing, changing music, or sending a text using voice commands.

At the 25-mile-an-hour speed limit that was used in the foundation study, drivers travel the length of nearly three football fields. During this time, motorists could miss stop signs, pedestrians or other vehicles while the mind is readjusting to the task of driving.

Secondly, the bill only bans engaging in a call while on a hand-held phone. The definition of engaging in a call is somewhat narrow. The term does not include holding a hand-held mobile telephone to activate, deactivate or initiate another function of a phone. This may allow for using the phone for other functionalities, such as taking a picture or playing a game.

I would note that in our most recent survey of Triple A members in Pennsylvania,

85 percent would favor passing a state law banning the use of hand-held cell phones while driving.

Triple A has supported in the past comprehensive distracted driving bills. I believe Representative Ross, Chris Ross, in the past sessions has introduced such bills and we've testified on behalf of those bills.

Distracted driving not only increases the risk of a crash, but also may increase the severity of a crash. For this reason, we would appreciate your consideration of a standard or primary seat belt law. Appropriate seat belt use is the single most effective driver and passenger behavior that reduces deaths in motor vehicle crashes.

According to PennDOT's 2016 Crash Facts, of the total number of fatalities in vehicle crashes, 52.2 percent were not wearing a seat belt. According to NHTSA, states with a primary seat belt law had higher seat belt use rates 92 percent in 2016.

Our experience with drunk and drugged driving and other serious safety issues tell us

2.1

discouraging dangerous behaviors requires a multipronged approach, as Steve has mentioned: Good legislation, effective enforcement and effective public education.

Triple A supports educational efforts to inform drivers of the safest practices to cell and smart phone use and other integrated in-vehicle communication, information and entertainment devices, as well as the many other forms of distraction.

Any level of risk is too high when it comes to safe driving. Tasks that require a driver to take their eyes or attention off the road or hands off the wheel while the vehicle is in motion should be avoided.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Thank you, Ted. I'm sure there will be questions for both Steve and Ted. Joe. Good afternoon.

MR. REGAN: Good afternoon,

Representative. My name is Joe Regan. I'm a

retired veteran of Lower Merion Township Police

Department in Montgomery County. I served for

28 years and I retired in 2011. I also serve as

Recording Secretary and Legislative Committee

2.1

Chairman of the Fraternal Order of Police,
Pennsylvania State Lodge, which represents 40,000
law enforcement professionals throughout
Pennsylvania.

I'd liked to thank the committee

Chairmen, Taylor and Keller, and other members of
the House Transportation Committee, along with the
executive directors as well, for their work on
matters of concern of Pennsylvania's police
officers.

I appear before you today to discuss the Pennsylvania FOP's position on two pieces of legislation intended to address the dangers imposed by distracted driving. I especially want to thank Mr. and Mrs. Miller today for their testimony and their comments that they made.

House Bill 892 creates a new summary offense of distracted driving in cases where a driver is also found to be driving carelessly. It also creates an awareness fund from fines generated related to violations.

House Bill 1684 goes further by imposing a prohibition on hand-held mobile phone calls while driving, except with the use of hands-free accessories, or in all cases for minors under

2.1

18 years of age.

2.1

Both House Bill 892 and 1684 are intended to respond to the growing problem of distracted driving. There are several potential reasons for distracted drivers: Texting while driving, use of a hand-held mobile phone, prohibited use of hearing impairment devices, talking to a passenger, putting on makeup, and the list goes on and on.

The National Highway Traffic Safety

Administration reports that distracted driving was a factor in almost 400,000 traffic accidents across the United States in 2015, resulting in 3,500 deaths. That same year here in Pennsylvania, distracted driving was a factor in almost 15,000 crashes and 61 deaths. In 2016, sadly, that number increased to over 16,000 distracted driving crashes.

For perspective, the number of crashes in which distracted driving was a factor is almost 60 percent higher than crashes in which alcohol was a factor. Clearly, distracted driving is a serious problem in Pennsylvania.

As a police officer, I have seen firsthand the aftermath of an accident involving a

distracted driver. Having advanced training in accident investigation, one of the many causes of vehicular accidents I investigated is the reaction time of the driver. Perception/reaction time is important for safe driving, and this diminishes with the use of devices and other distractions resulting in drivers taking their eyes off the road.

By way of example, the average perception/reaction time that is accepted by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation officials is 2.5 seconds. That's 1.5 seconds for perception and one second for reaction, 2.5 seconds, and that's on the high-end. Many investigators go as low as 1.6.

So, thinking about how fast you're driving, someone going 25 miles per hour, in 2 seconds you travel 73.3 feet. If you add in perception/reaction time using 2.5, to bring the vehicle to a complete stop it's 183 feet, and that's at 25 miles per hour. At 55 miles per hour, using all those factors, 403.15 feet, which is pretty close to about a football field, just to bring a vehicle to a complete stop. You add in that with any type of texting or any other

2.1

distraction, and it just brings it way up.

2.1

The destruction doesn't end with the vehicles. Families and lives are ruined in an instant. Distracted driving is not a fad or something that's going away quickly. Sadly, it's here to stay, and as technology advances, the chances of distracted driving are only going to increase.

The Pennsylvania Fraternal Order of Police supports House Bills 892 and 1694 because they take meaningful steps to curb distracted driving. Driving is a privilege and should be taken seriously by everyone. There's nothing more important than what's happening when you're behind the wheel.

We can't stop technology from advancing, but we can stop distracted driving, and House Bills 892 and 1694 take strong first steps here in Pennsylvania to do just that. The Pennsylvania FOP supports these bills sponsored by Representative Brown and Representative Murt.

Thank you very much.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Thank you,

Joe. I'm going to turn to members now, and I would

ask that if you have a specific panelist that you

1 want to answer your question, please note that. not, we'll see who would like to answer. 2 3 Representative Fee. 4 REPRESENTATIVE FEE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 5 6 First I'd like to extend my sympathy and 7 admiration to the Miller family. I appreciate them coming here today to testify. 8 I guess my question is: Out of the 15 10 states, now 16 with Georgia as of yesterday, I'm 11 not sure how many of those states have had the ban 12 with hands free. But, do we have any particular --13 any specific data with a reduction in crashes from 14 any of those states over time and how long of a period? I guess anybody can answer. 15 16 MR. BLACKISTONE: Representative Fee, at 17 this point it's difficult to develop any data. 18 Most of those laws have been adopted just in the 19 last few years, and there hasn't really been enough 20 time yet to be able to study the impact on them. 21 know the National Highway Traffic Safety 22 Administration is looking at that. 23 The other problem is, it's very difficult to measure any particular -- the effects 24

of any particular counter measure, simply because

there's so much going on in the highway safety world at any one time. It's hard to tease out what the effect of one thing is.

If a state has, for example, seen a big economic downturn in recent years, that, typically, is associated with reduction in traffic fatalities. It has nothing to do with the traffic law enforcement or nothing to do with what's happening in the highway world. It just is a correlation that's been fairly commonly identified.

If there had been other enforcement campaigns or other types of initiatives that have been undertaken, those can have an effect. So it's very difficult to tease it out, but I know there are efforts underway.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR:

Representative Heffley.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I thought I would come over here
rather than hiding behind the podium.

I just want to also express my sympathy to the Millers. Thank you for coming down and continuing this fight. I log many miles on Route 33. I know the road. I'm very familiar with it.

I guess the question I had, right now

2.4

there is technology available through an app that you can download on your phone as the Chairman had alluded to earlier, in which it will -- it senses when the phone is traveling at a certain speed, and it will block any kind of text messages or anything from coming in.

Would that be something -- I know I want to put it on my daughter's phones and everything else. But is that something that, you know, putting that kind of technology -- obviously, as technology develops, also they put safeguards in. Would that be something that could, potentially, save lives if that was kind of mandated -- or maybe just on -- for youth to begin with -- for younger drivers or to expand it onto different age groups.

MR. LEONARD: There's not been a lot of research and study. I'm familiar with the apps that you're talking about, having had four teenagers myself. It does not only block the text messages incoming, but can block outgoing cell phone calls while the vehicle is in motion.

There's also some discussion at one time, I believe NHTSA was talking to the OEMs about building this in in-vehicle technology so that cell phone calls would be blocked with a 9-1-1

override while the vehicle was in motion. But, we're not aware of a whole lot of research of how effective those have been.

It does seem like it would be something that would be very useful or helpful and wanted by parents of teen drivers and, perhaps, by employers who don't want their employees driving in the company vehicle and using cell phones and so forth.

REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: And we talk about distracted driving, and we primarily point to cell phone use and texting. But just to shift a little bit over some of the other distractions, I've witnessed all kinds of things that have distracted people from spilling a coffee in a vehicle to causing an accident to an animal in the front seat. And now, in more and more of the cars they have touch screens for heat control and everything else. I find that to be very distracting.

With the overall phrase of distracted driving and the dis -- if we're looking at this, I'd like to look at it in the entirety of distracted driving. Are there other -- Like the Garmin, I see people that have this thing, you know, stuck on his windshield while they're

1 driving, which, from my understanding they were never allowed to even have those fussy dice thing 2 from the rear-view mirror, but yet, they have 3 something stuck on their windshield. 4 How often is that captured in that 5 6 overall phrase of distracted driving? 7 MR. LEONARD: The Triple A Foundation has done a study leaning towards the sort of 8 infotainment systems and the other systems that are 10 in the vehicle. They've rated specific systems 11 which are higher cognitive distractions than 12 others. In fact, they've rated even specific 13 vehicles which have a higher degree of these 14 cognitive distraction devices embedded in them. 15 I'd be happy to get you that. 16 REPRESENTATIVE HEFFLEY: All right. 17 Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Chairman 19 Marsico. 20 REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Thank you, Mr. 2.1 Chairman. 22 Steve, as the National Transportation 23 Safety Board -- on the board, you've had a chance I'm sure to look up the other states that have 24 25 enacted similar legislation or laws --

1	MR. BLACKISTONE: Yes, we have.
2	REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: for
3	distraction.
4	Are there any states that really stand
5	out in your mind that maybe Pennsylvania should
6	model, as far as their laws that have been enacted?
7	MR. BLACKISTONE: I probably The
8	answer is not really. All of the states that have
9	adopted Now 16 states that have adopted a
LO	hands-free cell phone requirement would be the
L1	states I'd tell you to look at first.
L2	There are some variations in the law. I
L3	haven't looked at enough detail to be able to tell
L 4	you that any one particular law stands out above
L5	the others.
L 6	Our concern is that, hands-free usage is
L7	distracting just as is hand-held usage. So for us,
L8	the states that will stand out is the state that's
L 9	willing to say to its drivers, no, you shouldn't be
20	talking even on a hands-free phone.
21	REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: So, do any
22	other states now have
23	MR. BLACKISTONE: No other No state
24	has yet taken leadership on that.
25	REPRESENTATIVE MARSICO: Okay. Thank

you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2.1

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: I'd just like to follow up on what Representative Heffley mentioned.

You know, GPS, Google search, commercial vehicles, whether they be cabs, Uber, Lyft, all depend on that device for navigation, which, without such a device could be a safety concern as well.

I mean, how do any of you feel about that in terms of banning the device completely when, in fact, it seems to be the preferred method rather than even the -- I use it instead of my vehicle mapping.

MR. BLACKISTONE: NTSB's recommendation is that states prohibit the use of any portable electronic device, except for those that are used in the driving task, so that would enable you to use a --

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: It could be as dangerous as any other activity actually when you're kind of plug in a -- I mean, one, if they're being prudent, would pull over and do it. So, that's already written into, like, say these other states that Ron was talking about, that's an

1	exception to the hand-held ban?
2	MR. BLACKISTONE: That is what we have
3	recommended. I don't necessarily know that any
4	states have written it in precisely that language.
5	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Okay. Thank
6	you.
7	MR. LEONARD: Mr. Chairman, I just want
8	to mention that I have a navigation device in my
9	car that will not allow me to program it while the
10	vehicle is in motion.
11	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Yeah, I think
12	that exists for a lot of them. People try to do it
13	at red lights or Does it prohibit you from,
14	like, while you're in
15	MR. LEONARD: While the car is in
16	motion, if I try to program it
17	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: If it's in
18	motion; not if it's in drive.
19	MR. BLACKISTONE: tells me to pull
20	over.
21	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: It makes
22	sense to do that. Sometimes that's not available
23	either as a maneuver.
24	MR. LEONARD: Right.
25	MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR:

1 Representative Kortz. 2 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you, Mr. 3 Chairman. Gentlemen, thank you for your testimony 4 Mr. Blackistone, you had testified that 5 since 2002, you've investigated at least six 6 highway crashes where there were fatalities. Obviously, you read through here, they're very, 8 very horrific crashes. But you state in here that 10 it was because of a hand-held device. How were you 11 able to prove that? If it was so horrific and the device was 12 13 destroyed, did you go back to the phone company and 14 ask them to see if they were using it at that point 15 in time of the crash --16 MR. BLACKISTONE: Yes. 17 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: -- based on the 18 black box that's in the vehicle? 19 MR. BLACKISTONE: It would have been 20 based on a variety of different factors that would 2.1 be different in each of the cases. For example, in 22 the Alexandria, Virginia crash, the driver 23 acknowledged that he was using his device. But yes, we, as part of our 24 25 investigative authority, have the power to subpoena

any recording device or any electronic device that's in a vehicle. So we were able to get those and then download the usage from the device so we could put together a timeline on when it's used. And that has become a fairly standard part of every accident investigation that we conduct.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: That's standard procedure for the NTSB?

MR. BLACKISTONE: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: You go to the phone company, or whichever provider, and you don't necessarily want to know what they were texting.

You just want to know that it was being activated; is that correct?

MR. BLACKISTONE: A text was received at this time. A text was sent. A voice message or voice conversation was conducted at this time.

We try and put together a timeline of the operator's activities typically for the 72 hours prior to the accident so we can look at issues like fatigue and drug use. But, we will specifically look at the use of any electronic device, whether it be a cell phone or portable CB radio or anything else.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Okay. Separate

1 question. CB usage by truckers, where do you guys 2 stand on that? Have states banned that? I don't 3 know. MR. BLACKISTONE: I don't believe -- I 4 don't know the answer affirmatively. I don't 5 6 believe states have banned it. As I said, our 7 recommendation is any use of any portable electronic device by the operator. 8 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Okay. Thank you. 10 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: 12 Representative Brown. 13 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Thank you, Mr. 14 Chairman. 15 I think this is for Steve. Steve, as a 16 follow-up to Representative Fee asking about the 17 other states that have passed hands-free 18 legislation and the reduction in crash statistics, 19 I know that's still in the works and trying to 20 gather that. 21 But I remember reading an article, it 22 was a few months back, talking about the -- as you 23 were talking about the multi-pronged approach, so when passing a law and then behavior changes and 24

also a public relations sort of program.

article had mentioned that the states that were passing laws, they were noticing a behavioral change in drivers where they're actually -- when they took the survey, they were less likely to use their phone, period. Obviously, we talked about during this hearing the best fix is no phone, but until we get to that point, at some point, you know, with technology.

Do you have any information on that?

Because it seemed to be that, just passing the law for a hands-free legislation changed the behavior in the mindset of drivers where they stopped using their phones, based on surveys.

MR. BLACKISTONE: Yes, we have seen that in a number of areas. The mere fact that a state passes a law sends a message to the people in that state, this is the right thing to do. Many people -- most people will obey the law simply because that's what it is.

We have seen -- And the best example
here is in child safety seats. People look to the
law for guidance. I don't know if you're a parent
or not, but many parents that I know will put their
kids in a particular type of child seat because
that's what the law says. That must be the right

2.1

thing to do.

So, that same type of mentality carries over to cell phone use as well. The law is much more about -- is about much more than just enabling the law enforcement community to make arrests.

It's also in and of itself a very strong educational tool.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR:

Representative Neilson.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen. Teen drivers, I have two of them right now; both have their permits. We talked a lot about that. I've taken them up to get their driver's license, and they did not take as part of their testing or part of them to get their driver's license nothing about distracting driving; nothing.

Are you guys aware of any other states that have mandatory education for kids that are just about to get their license, and maybe like a 15-minute video or a half-hour video they have to see to -- If they would just hear the Millers'

story -- I mean, I'm going to make my children watch this. When I get home, they're going to watch this. They're going to see your testimony, okay.

Is there any other states do you know of that make that part of a requirement to get their driver's license, instead of just knowing what a stop sign is, what a yield sign is, what a dotted line is?

MR. BLACKISTONE: I'm not aware of any.

There are sources we can check with such as the

American Association of Motor Vehicle

Administrators, who very well may have that kind of information. I'm confident there are a number of states that do have those kinds of programs, even if it's not written into the law.

There's some states, and Virginia is one that comes to mind, where, when the teenager gets his driver's license, he actually has to go before a magistrate of the court to receive it. It's a court procedure, and the magistrate gives a little lecture on safe driving. I'm sure that varies from one jurisdiction to another, but it's intended to do exactly that.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: That wouldn't

2.1

work here because my city -- I'm from Philadelphia.

Living here, I'm bigger than our whole state. So,

we don't have magistrates --

MR. BLACKISTONE: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: --

unfortunately. The (inaudible words) legislator eliminated 'em.

To get back on national stuff, you are both national organizations. What's going on in Washington? I mean, you make recommendations according to your charge by Congress and by seeing such a problem nationwide. Is there anything going on in Washington that we should be aware of, like, to move this in a different direction?

MR. BLACKISTONE: I am not aware of any legislation in Congress that might address this in particular, such as mandating the states passage of distracted driving law or they would lose highway construction funds.

On the regulatory level, National
Highway Safety Administration I know is putting -has been working very diligently in this area
putting together educational programs, best
practices guides for law enforcement and that sort
of thing.

2.1

1 REPRESENTATIVE NEILSON: Well, thank 2 you, gentlemen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 3 MR. BLACKISTONE: If we do hear of things in Congress, we'll certainly be glad to let 4 you know. 5 6 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Chairman 7 Hennessey. REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: 8 Thank you, 9 Mr. Chairman. To the Miller family, our sympathies, 10 11 and thanks for the courage that you showed and the 12 fortitude and strength to come in here and testify 13 about something as tragic as all that. 14 Joe, Ted, Steve, not to -- I appreciate all your testimony, but the statistics really do 15 tell stories here. The statistics that Ted, you 16 17 used to say the risk for a 17-year-old driver being 18 killed goes up by 44 percent when there's a one 19 young passenger in the car, and I think doubles when there's two and quadruples when there's three. 20 That's something very easy for people to get their 21 22 arms around. 23 As a parent I can talk to my young children about, you know, why it's dangerous. 24

can show it's dangerous statistically.

Joe, I think yours would be the testimony -- the part of your testimony that struck me the most was that the number of crashes involving distracted driving is 60 percent higher than drunk drivers having crashes. That again is something that somebody could relate if you're a parent to teenage drivers and say, this is what -- here we have empirical proof of what's going on.

With all that being said, I agree that any distracted driving is dangerous driving. But it would seem to me intuitively that texting has to be more dangerous than reading your e-mails, for example, on the phone. Although my eyes are getting bad in my older age, so it's hard to read those.

But texting would seem to me more dangerous than reading e-mails than talking on a hand-held phone, and maybe the least dangerous would be talking on a hand-free phone.

If you could break down any of your statistics with raw numbers and give us those raw numbers, I think it would help the debate. Because if texting proves, as I suspect it will, to be the most dangerous activity, we could then decide that that would be a more serious offense and it would

carry a higher punishment than something which is lesser. All right?

So, in grading is important in the work that we do up here in passing legislation. If you can flesh out those details for us and get that information to us, it might be very helpful.

MR. LEONARD: We have done studies on various causes of distraction. I believe, if I recall, the number 1 distraction is like reaching for a moving object within the car; actually a higher level than talking on a cell phone.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: I understand that, but I don't know if we can prevent people from doing that. But we can craft legislation that says if you're texting, you get a more serious punishment than if you're simply talking on a hands-free phone, because we have to grade it.

Yes, I agree that all kind of distracted driving is dangerous, but some, seems to me, has to be more dangerous than others. We should know that and have statistics to back it up so we can craft the legislation properly.

So, if you can go back to your organizations to see whether or not you could flesh that out for us, it would be helpful.

1 MR. LEONARD: We will do that. 2 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. Thank you very much. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. 3 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Anyone else? 4 5 (No response). 6 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Gentlemen, 7 thank you. I appreciate your testimony. I would point out that Steve's written testimony that he 8 submitted, saying this to members, is filled with a 10 lot of details that we should review as well. 11 thank you. 12 MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, one comment. 13 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Sure. 14 MR. REGAN: In doing research for this 15 hearing, I was coming up the turnpike. 16 115 miles. I think like many adults, you want to 17 be responsible. You don't want to be texting. The research that I had done with our 18 19 accident reconstruction guys, he said there are studies out there now. I have a two-hour drive to 20 2.1 Harrisburg. I'm going to call so and so and I want 22 to discuss some issue, something personal. But the 23 conversation gets really long. Studies out there now are saying that 2.4 25 the longer you're in that conversation, it's

starting to gear it towards, that you're like in a DUI mode. You're getting completely distracted the longer the conversation goes on. Personally, I never thought that. I'm on a long ride. I have to take care of some business. I'm going to make that phone call because this guy talks long or whatever.

But the studies are out there now; that the longer the conversation goes on, the more distracted you're getting. It really is something I think as adults we have to think about, because I do it, and it really made me think today on that ride up about, you know, you have a lot of time on your hands and doing so many things, and we're all busy. But that's something that I think to take home. Think about that.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Joe, I have two friends, very smart folks; two different walks of life, told the same story. You're on the phone for a long conversation, hands free. They're on their way to Harrisburg. Both described, that's weird. I don't remember tunnels on the way to Harrisburg. Two different folks got on the Northeast Extension coming east on the turnpike and instead of going straight, ended up in the Poconos

2.1

1 during the conversation. 2 So, I guess it happens. How two different people told me that same exact story, 3 it's something we better be aware of. 4 5 Well, thank you, gentlemen. 6 (Thank-you response). MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: I'm going to 7 do the same thing, if there's no objection, and ask 8 Dave and Sam, as well as our friends from the 10 Grange, Wayne and Vince, to assemble together. 11 (Testifiers complied). 12 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Gentlemen, thank you. I have Dave ready to go first. If you 13 14 can just identify yourself, Dave, as you start and 15 let it rip. 16 MR. KERR: Chairman Taylor, Chairman 17 Keller, members of the committee: Good afternoon. 18 My name is David Kerr, Regional Vice President for 19 AT&T here in Pennsylvania. I'd also like to extend our condolences 20 2.1 to Mrs. Miller and her family and her guest from 22 Texas as well, who's enjoined her on this journey. 23 We met Mrs. Miller ourselves on this journey. It's very unfortunate. I've heard her story before, but 24

to hear it even again in this setting is -- is

tragic story to hear even a second time.

2.1

On behalf of our employees here in the Commonwealth and around the world, I appreciate the invitation to join you to discuss our nearly decade-long campaign to remind drivers about the dangers of distracted driving and that that is not okay. So I'm going to talk a little bit today about what AT&T is doing.

But I will share that our competitors, the other wireless providers share, in the goal to increase the education around the dangers of distracted driving. I also will share, CTIA, our national association, has a pretty expansive scholarship program to award scholarships to students to put digital videos in place. I haven't seen any of these myself personally, but they're to encourage other students about the dangers of texting and driving, so the industry really is committed to this education.

In 2009, our chairman at AT&T, Randall Stevenson, announced efforts to raise awareness of the dangers of texting while driving. Our texting and driving IT CAN WAIT program launched in 2010 to deliver a simple yet vital message to all wireless users. When it comes to texting and driving, no

text is worth a life.

2.1

The campaign evolved over the years as driving distractions grew beyond texting, as we heard today, to social media, web surfing, selfies and video chatting, and those types of activities, which unfortunately are going on behind the wheel. Our effort is sustained and multifaceted. It includes several elements. Some of the highlights include encouraging all of our employees to take the pledge not to text and drive; and, in turn, urge others to do so.

Since the campaign's launch, when you go to the it can wait dot com website, you will see that over 23 million people have pledged to not drive distracted. Many celebrities have joined the cause to deliver the message by television ads, concerts, public appearances, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube videos, really targeting millennials on that effort.

Our aggressive social media campaign encourages people to share the hash tag IT CAN WAIT message with friends.

We've challenged device makers. This has come up today, too, and app developer to work with us. All Android devices presently include the

AT&T DriveMode app, which is one of the texting while driving apps that was discussed today. It's preloaded on Android devices, and the app is also available to iPhone users in the app store as well.

I was just checking today in preparation. There's been 20 million downloads of the AT&T DriveMode app, and there are other apps out there as well.

In 2013, we provided a kit of no-texting-while-driving information to every high school in the United States.

In June of 2014, we launched a new IT CAN WAIT handle on Twitter, and it now has over 130,000 followers.

Towards the end of 2014, AT&T was one of 10 global companies to join Together For Safer Roads, a coalition, an innovative cross-sector coalition, focusing on improving road safety and reducing deaths and injuries by road traffic collisions.

In May of 2015, AT&T expanded the IT CAN WAIT campaign from a focus on texting while driving to include other smart phone distractions.

Last month we launched a new version of our virtual reality experience to bring the public

2.1

face to face with the dangers of distracted driving using the new VR technologies, as they call it. So we participated in hundreds, if not thousands, of events across the country to show the impacts of distracted driving.

Here in Pennsylvania we posted scores of events throughout the Commonwealth, from Love Park in Philadelphia to the Erie County Courthouse, from Bedford to Bensalem and many other communities in between. I know some of you have participated in some of our events, and we appreciate that.

Our employees have made presentations to high schools and college students statewide; at hospital-sponsored events, and even at companies and some of our customers in the state who called us and asked us what this campaign is about. They wanted to provide training to their employees.

In 2016 and '17, we made several stops, including here in the Main Capitol last spring.

Last month we joined -- this is the third year we've done this with the Pennsylvania News Media Association to announce the winners of IT CAN WAIT essay contest. We team up with newspapers across the Commonwealth to help spread the word about the dangers of smart phone distractions while driving,

and we're excited that the school press association here in Pennsylvania joined us this year.

Last year, we officially kicked off the 2018 nationwide tour with an enhanced VR virtual reality experience I mentioned. There will be around 200 stops nationwide. We're currently scheduled to be at the Farm Show for the Fire Expo in May, and we expect some other stops as well.

We've also done extensive research on the impact of the IT CAN WAIT campaign across many categories. I won't go into great details because we already heard some of the research today, but I will focus on research that we've done over the last couple of years that shows just how powerful teen voices can be on this issue.

Ninety percent of teens say they will stop texting while driving if a friend in the car asked them to. 93 percent would stop if a parent in the car asked them to, although I find that a little hard to believe as a parent of four.

Seventy-eight percent of teen drivers say they're likely not to text and drive if friends tell them it's wrong or stupid, or probably some other word there. 44 percent say they would be thankful if a passenger complained about their

texting while driving.

These findings are among many of the reasons why we remain inspired to continue this campaign moving forward, and I would encourage all of you and those in the audience and those watching on TV to learn more about the campaign. Go to it can wait dot com and take the pledge, and encourage your friends, family and constituents to do the same.

I'll just speak personally myself. When I took the pledge -- I think we all know the pledge is nonbinding. There's no way to enforce a pledge. Take it in front of your kids. It means a little bit more if you take that pledge, to your point, Representative, take it in front of your kids, because kids are always watching what adults do.

Thank you for the opportunity to join

today. I'll be happy to answer questions later.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Thanks, Dave.

Sam.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you. Sam Marshall with the Insurance Federation. You have my remarks, and I won't read them into the record.

I'll just be brief.

You know what the problem is. It's use

of cell phones. We're all guilty. We all have done it ourselves. We've all been there. Question is: What are you going to do about it?

We're not debating. We can quibble about which type of distracted driving is the most distracting, and what comes in second, third or fourth. But we know what the problem is. It's using your cell phone while you're driving. That's what it is. Question is: What are you going to do?

I'm an insurance guy. I'm going to err on the side of safety. I'm going to recommend that you do whatever you feel you can cobble together the votes to do that's most strong.

We represent policyholders who drive on the roads of Pennsylvania. We care about their lives. We care about their safety. We're always going to sit here and tell you, be as safe as you possibly can. I will tell you, whatever you pass in terms of making it have an impact, I'll share with you some of our hard-learned observations.

First, make the violations primary; not secondary. This isn't like seat belt usage or even motorcycle helmets where, if you don't do it, the main -- the main danger is to yourself. With

2.1

distracted driving, the main danger is to other people as well. So, I think that merits a primary enforcement.

Second, let the violations go on the person's driving record. Let it be considered by insurance companies for purposes of auto rating.

We tend to say, we'll fine the person, but it won't go on his record; and, insurance companies, you can't consider it when you're assessing his rates.

That doesn't make any sense to me. You want us rating on the basis of how safe and how non-distracted a consumer is.

These aren't no-harm no-foul violations. These aren't just sort of courtesy warnings. These are real dangers for people. You heard from -- You have all the numbers and you heard the personal testimony from Mr. and Mrs. Miller. I mean, it needs no further amplification. You just need to take it seriously.

Third, let insurance companies use technology to determine when an insured is using a phone while driving. Let us rate accordingly.

There are methods out there, there's technology out there that can monitor whether people are using their cell phones in a distracted way when they're

driving. They can monitor whether you're texting while the car is in operation.

Let the insurance company say, here, you know what consumer, you know what policyholder? If you agree to plug in so that we can monitor that, if you're not doing it, we're gonna give you a discount. It's a great incentive. Financial incentives tend to work.

Fourth, focus on the phones. I'll agree that there are a lot of other distractions, grooming, eating, things of that nature. Let's target what's really at stake here, and that's the use of hand-held phones while driving.

I'm not saying there are other things that aren't also dangerous, but that's what it is. Sometimes when you clutter up the law with too many other issues, it tends either not to pass or not to be followed once it does pass.

Fifth, I'd say publicize whatever it is you do. I know that sounds obvious. We talked about some of the laws that you passed already. Our surveys, and surveys companies do of their own policyholders shows time and time again people aren't really aware of what the laws in a given state are. Certainly not the laws here in

Pennsylvania.

In fact, getting ready for the hearing today, my colleagues and I at the Federation said I had to review, they know exactly what is it. Is it texting? Is it cell phone? Is it hands free and all of that.

One of the people testifying earlier said, when you go into Maryland or Virginia they have the billboards right when you come in on the highways. You have that in some parts of Pennsylvania, too, Click It Or Ticket it with seat belts because we have a very clear law. You need to publicize what that law is, because one of the things that we discovered is, people's habits aren't dictated necessarily what the laws are. They're dictated by what people perceive the laws to be.

really hard, tough, anti-cell phone law, you'll see safety improve. I understand the technology in these phones makes that difficult. There are a lot of, is it texting? Is it holding the phone? Is it reading a text or e-mail? How can you tell if the person is just looking up a number to punch it in and call, and that's okay, or is he texting? Those

are hard things.

But I would say, whatever it is you do, having one clear law is going to help. Don't have one entitled 75, one entitled 18, the hodgepodge of laws sometimes we end up doing. Have one clear law. Frankly, I'd say, have a law that you can put on a billboard. That's actually what works.

The other related to that on the publicizing end, our survey show no need to publicize the danger. The danger is well-known.

It's beyond us. Everybody knows it's dangerous and you still do it. You think it's a random danger.

It's not like smoking where you say, eventually it's going to get everybody who does it. You know what, I can get away with it in this one situation.

It's open road ahead of me, no problem, or anything like that.

What we do find is, people actually care a great deal what the penalty is when they're -- when they're deciding their own course of conduct on the driving. You have a harsh penalty. Even if it's not enforced all that often, I appreciate Representative Keller's question about how often are these things enforced. If that law is known and the penalty is clear, and people -- that, in

and of itself, gets people to change their conduct.

There are a lot of other organizations out there that will -- well-publicize the danger; have things like the pledge and do all that.

That's all well and good. In terms of what can the state do to provide something unique to this problem, the state can say, we have a very clear law and here's what the penalty is, and you know what, it's going to mean something. It's going to mean something in your insurance rates. It's going to mean something on the enforcement end.

If I sound a little frustrated, it's probably because I am. I've been to no shortage of these types of hearings and press conferences over the years. We've been banging the drums on safe driving for a very long time as an insurance industry.

I would love to be at a few more bill signings. And even more than that, I would love to be at a press event or a hearing where we're able to come up with you and show you statistics of improved -- lower fatalities, lower accidents because we've seen a reduction in the world of distracted driving. We're not there yet. So I'd ask for action, and I'd ask for it to be

2.1

1 meaningful. 2 Thank you. 3 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Thank you, Wayne. 4 Sam. MR. CAMPBELL: Let Vince. 5 6 MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Vince. 7 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, good afternoon, everybody. Thank you very much for convening the 8 9 hearing. 10 I want to commend the two chairs, first 11 of all, for your service to the citizens of 12 Commonwealth since you're both retiring and it's a 13 darn shame that you are. But, with your tenure 14 comes wisdom, and I think that's may be one of the 15 things that led you to schedule this hearing today. 16 So I just want to tell you that I appreciate it 17 very much. 18 For the record, I'm Vince Phillips. I'm 19 the lobbyist for the Pennsylvania State Grange. 20 With me is Wayne Campbell, the President of the 21 Pennsylvania State Grange. 22 I have to tell you, I had a lot to think 23 about even though I used to be the lobbyist for the Driver's Ed teachers, so I'm not exactly a stranger 24

to this issue. But just giving thought to the

testimony from Mr. and Mrs. Miller and others, it kind of got me to thinking. Rather than go through my testimony per se, because you've got it in front of you--I'll reference it certainly--but I want to share a couple things with you.

First of all, why should the Grange care about distracted driving? Now, this is a supposition. I don't have any fine-tuned studies to back it up. But, you know, if you're driving in the city, you're probably going to be mindful because there are other drivers in close proximity. There are pedestrians, even those who are on their cell phone. There's stop lights, there's traffic, there's construction. Everything conspires in a positive way to make you maybe a little more aware.

But, if you're out in the country, there's the perception that it's okay or more okay to engage in some distraction behavior. Now, what is this anyway? Sure it's a cell phone, but it's a tool. It's a tool just like a car is a tool. And the use of the tool determines the consequence. A misuse of this tool, just like a misuse of the car, is going to lead to terrible consequences.

And so, the bottom line here is that, if you're driving in the countryside, you know, the

rules appear to be a little bit different. Now give you a case in point.

On Easter Sunday I spent some time with my youngest daughter who lives in Arlington.

Driving back, I'm in Maryland and Virginia, and verboten, right? No cell phone use. And, I have religion, no cell phone use.

Cross the Pennsylvania state line now, I will tell you no cell phone use for me, even though my wife did call me to see where I was, I didn't answer the call. Now, shame on me. Except, no, not really.

The thing I want to leave with you, though, is the behavior of the other drivers who are keeping pace with me through the State of Maryland. When they got to the Pennsylvania border, a good number of them drove what I would characterize as somewhat erratically. It was almost as if they felt that they could do something in Pennsylvania that they could not do elsewhere.

And so, I think this underscores the support of the Pennsylvania State Grange for Representative Brown's legislation that there's got to be something done to enhance the penalties and the recognition by drivers and others that

something has got to be done.

Now, the other thing I would point out to you, again, a personal antidote. My middle girl, she was a high school student at Trinity High School in Camp Hill. She always used to text my wife on the way to school. I discovered, to my amazement, when I asked her about that, that she was always stopped at the same railroad crossing for about two minutes on her way to school. Can you believe that? What an unlikely set of coincidences.

In other words, regardless of what you do with distracted driving, you know it does get in the way of human nature. I don't want anybody up there to get mad at me. Please do not get mad at me for what I'm about to say, but there were four legislators on their cell phones or checking their e-mails or something during the course of this hearing this afternoon. Now, there's no consequence from it. I don't pretend I have sterling words of wisdom, so if you have to take a text I forgive you. Please don't be angry, but that's what I saw this afternoon.

Oh, look. Someone just texted me. What do you think? Should I answer the text now?

Perhaps not. And that leads us to the other issue.

We've talked about statistics. I've repeated statistics that I've heard and, frankly, the statistics get worse the more I look into it.

But, there's another issue that also needs to be addressed, and that is, cell phone use is a symptom. It's a symptom of human nature that says, distracted activities in the car are either necessary or desirable.

Now, I'm kind of reaching far here, but bear with me, because we've all been there. We've all seen people put their makeup on while they're driving. We've seen people play with their pets in the front seat while they're driving. We've seen people reading the newspaper while they're driving. That gets a little scarier if I'm on the Schuylkill Expressway, and I see that. It may well be that they're reading about the Villanova game and it's too riveting for them to put the paper down. I don't know.

But, in reality, there's a lot of distracted driving. So, I would ask the committee, in addition to focusing on these particular pieces of legislation, perhaps the conversation from today, is look at the larger issue of what can be

2.1

done to stop other forms of distracted driving.

2.1

Now, President Wayne Campbell, in addition to his many years of service for the Pennsylvania State Grange and to his local community in Perry County, he also has 30 years of experience working for automobile dealerships, and much of the time he was a service manager. As such, he's very attuned to what goes on inside a car and also the devices used to drive the car.

Wayne, I'd like to ask you to share your observation.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you, Vince.

On behalf of the Pennsylvania State

Grange, I'd like to extend our condolences to the

Miller family for your loss. Words can't express

anyone's feelings or remorse in a time like this.

But, we're there with you.

As Vince said, I did spend almost

30 years in GM dealerships. And many times during
that, I could have amazed people with what I could
tell them about their vehicle, about their life and
their driving habits that they didn't know.

Vehicles don't lie.

Someone would come in -- The cars that I got involved with were what many of you would refer

-Key Reporters-

to as lemon cases. Several times a year, GM would call us and ask us if we would work on a vehicle because two or three other dealerships couldn't fix it. I can remember of at least two cases where it took us over a year to repair the vehicle, but we eventually repaired it. Many times it was a very simple repair. Problem was finding it.

I would like to express to you my concern, and you're going to say this is something that the Pennsylvania state legislature can't address. You're right, you can't. But you can be a leader and you can address your fellow coworkers down in Washington that it is a problem, and that's standardization of the controls in a vehicle.

You heard a couple people address today voice or hands-free driving with their vehicles.

Yes, they're hands free. But, I myself, even with the amount of years I have in working on vehicles get very frustrated with my hands-free vehicle.

If you look at your controls, and if you have more than one vehicle in your family, the controls are not at the same location on each vehicle. My wife drives a 2017 and I'm driving a 2018. The voice button is at two different locations.

An ironic situation that happened on our way in here today. About a month ago I had to trade vehicles. My old vehicle broke down. The cost of repairs was, in my years in the business, I knew not to put two or \$3,000 into repairing something; put it toward a new vehicle. My wife has not had a chance to drive my new truck until today.

This morning right before we came over here, we had a phone call that my grandson had to come down for an emergency orthodontist appointment. My daughter is a special needs teacher. She had taken off this morning to bring him down, and one of the bands broke so he had to come back down this afternoon. So, of course, who gets the phone call? Grandma.

I'm here with Vince so, I throw my truck keys to my wife. Of course, a guy with a truck, my next words were, be careful. Vince and I are coming across the Forster Street Bridge and my phone rings. It's my wife. Oh, you can imagine the first thing went through my head was, oh, no, she hit something. Thank goodness it wasn't that. It was, how do I turn the windshield wipers on?

Think about it. She's driving a 2017.

The windshield wipers are on the right-hand side on the lever. With my 2018, they're on the left-hand side on a twisty knob. No two vehicles are the same.

When I was working in the dealership, one of the first things I would do when a customer come in with a vehicle that everybody else said couldn't be repair was, take me for a ride. Show me. What's it doing? You show me what I have to do to duplicate it, because if I can't duplicate it, our people can't fix it. And you would be surprised how many times driving down the highway the person would say, well, I push this and I do this, and the next thing the tires are going down the rumble stripes along the side of the road. And my reply was, you drive. You just tell me what you do. Let me work the controls, or let me look at the scanner that I'm holding in my hand.

If we could get the car manufacturers to standardize settings, and they're not going to want to do it because, when you buy a new vehicle, everybody wants the new fancy frills. That's fine, but let the frills all be the same. Let it be the windshield wipers are at one spot. The voice control button is at one spot.

2.1

As I said, I get very frustrated in my own vehicle because it has a maps program on it.

But push the voice button while you're driving and try to get it to accept an address. The lady's voice comes on and says, no address found. It's like, I've been there a hundred times. It exists.

What's the next thing you do? Your eyes look down at that TV screen in the center of the dash, and you've now just traveled four or 500 yards down the road.

So, that's the message I would leave you with today. We can either lead, follow or get out of the way. I think the best thing that everyone has said here today is, hands-free devices are great. But, give the Pennsylvania State Police the ability to enforce that. Just plain, no devices; no hand-held devices, period.

We managed that way in the '60s and '70s, and then along came cell phones. We didn't have the accidents back then. When you wanted to adjust the heat on your old '67 truck, did you have to look over to slide that bar across? You knew where it was at.

So, again, thank you for allowing us to address you here today.

MR. PHILLIPS: I do have one more thought I'd like to share with you.

2.1

nature, a lot of things go on that can distract people. For example, following up on what Wayne said, my wife has a car. I have a car. Her controls are different, which means, when I drive her car I have to remind myself how to use the cruise control. Maybe I just can't be taught well, I don't know. But, nonetheless, that's the usual thing that happens. I've gotta in a sense re-learn that behavior because I'm in a different vehicle that's simply structured differently.

Now -- (Mr. Phillips open a box of Ritz crackers). Kind of late in the day, right? A little hungry, anybody? I'm willing to share. But you're driving, you get hungry, what do you do? You reach down for, well, food. And does that become a course of distraction?

In other words, there's lots of things out there, which is why I would ask you to think a little larger than just hand-held electronic device, perhaps, in the context of another hearing.

What are some ideas that could be brought to the table? Let me just throw a couple

of things that could be talked about infinita later on. One I already mentioned is driver's ed. You know when I started using seat belts? It's when my kids got after me because I was not. Think about it.

Now, of course, driver's ed and my kids, different ages at that time, but kids are taught the correct way to drive in a formal teaching environment. I know all the workability things, budget for schools, mandated issues from the state, I got all that. But still, if you teach them the right way to drive, they may deviate from that but at least they have a grounding.

One of the problems with graduated driver's license in Pennsylvania, unfortunately, is that it does rely on other adults to be the ones who teach the kids all their bad driving habits.

So, that could be one thing to be revisited.

What's another thing? How about giving law enforcement officers the ability to give warning tickets if they see someone using a hand-held device. We already talked about difficulties with evidence. I understand that. But if an officer sees someone on a phone, why not be able to pull them over and at least give them a warning

2.1

ticket.

2.1

Sometimes a warning ticket is enough to scare them into model behavior. I know that I always get religion whenever I see a state police officer on the side of the road. You would be amazed at how righteous I can be for at least the next few miles. Oh, excuse me. Are they still here? Did I say that?

But, if there's a deterrent, and this echoes what others have said, that might be the thing that makes all the difference.

The last antidote I'll give you. My middle daughter, Adrian, Adrian was a student at Towson University. And I get a ticket from Maryland's Motor Vehicle Bureau in the mail, it's a 40-dollar ticket for driving too fast on the Baltimore Beltway. So I called her up, and I said, Adrian, I got this ticket; shame on you, right, a good fatherly talk. And she said, well, dad, you know, I didn't drive at all that day. You know, I looked at the picture and it was me smiling back.

So, first of all, I'm not a fan of big brother is watching you. That's something I abhor, but, you know, PennDOT could put up, as they have in Maryland, the congratulations, you're on candid

camera. You go through it. You get a notice. You will be photographed. Sometimes you even have a flashing light that tells you you have been taken, like I was.

I have to tell you, when I drive on the Maryland Baltimore Beltway, I am the model decorum because I know that someone is watching me. And no, I don't like big brother. But, you know, just the threat of being nailed in that way. So, if there's a picture taken of someone on a cell phone and you can get their license number, et cetera, well, why shouldn't they be given a ticket for that? Of course, that would be the topic of conversation for another day.

Bottom line is, I very much appreciate you spending the time with us all today, and I thank you very much.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: Vince, big brother will be tomorrow. I'm sure we're going to hear that phrase a little bit tomorrow.

Representative Kortz.

REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you, Mr.

Chairman.

2.1

Gentlemen, thank you for your testimony today. I just have a comment.

And, Sam, I appreciate it. I think you hit the nail right on the head. A few basic truths, people are addicted to their phones, and they do it in all conditions, and we've got to do something about it.

I think we definitely have to put this law into effect. We've got to tweak the language, but it's getting worse. I know myself, when I drive down the road and folks coming the other way, everybody's on a phone. They're on the phone. So thank you. I appreciate your candor. Thank you.

 $\label{eq:majority} \mbox{MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR:} \quad \mbox{I'm assuming}$ there are no other questions.

But I agree with Representative Kortz's and Sam's comments. I think we do have to get to the point where we have a very clear sound bitetype law that we could easily put on a billboard. I think that -- it is baffling, I think, to me that we haven't done this more clearly already.

As I mentioned in our opening, we really can't have a perfect law. We just need to do -- I think banning the entire device as a hand-held is probably the answer. I'm not being fresh here, Vince, but we don't know what those members -- Sometimes their notes are on their phone for --

2.1

their entire testimony is on their phone. They could be --

2.1

So, I mean, you don't know what someone is doing when they're looking down, but it really doesn't matter if you're driving because -- I mean, it's a problem all the way around.

I made reference to tomorrow. Tomorrow we'll have as many critics as we have supporters of radar in our testimony. You can see today, we have pretty able staff but there isn't a lot of folks lined up to say this concept is wrong. And even if law enforcement said that -- I mean, the state police didn't testify that they have a problem with the enforcement or worrying about the enforcement. The FOP didn't say that. PennDOT didn't say it.

so, I think you'll see this committee report out a bill, maybe a combined concept, but something that's clear and definable. I think that the educational part of that is going to work. We think of very controversial stuff that we've done already in terms of speed cameras and red-light cameras. No matter what else you say about that, it works. When people know that that's a consequence, they stop doing it. Whether that causes other people inconvenience, that's the way

it goes, and we'll deal with the repercussions of that as elected officials.

So, to everyone who is here, particularly the Miller family, we appreciate you being here. We'll certainly make sure you're back when we actually do conduct business, which I can assure you will be very soon.

You're all welcome tomorrow. I think the room will be a little more crowded tomorrow. For our members, we're starting out early. But before I get to that, Chairman Keller.

MINORITY CHAIRMAN KELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I think this was an excellent hearing with a lot of testimony and a lot of facts we'll have to take into consideration. I'm glad to hear that you think this is an important enough issue that we will work on this bill and get it out this session. I know we've had similar bills passed, and they haven't gone anywhere. With these testifiers and with this hearing, I'm sure -- and with your commitment to do it, I'm sure we'll be able to get something done.

Thank you.

MAJORITY CHAIRMAN TAYLOR: With that, we

2.1

will be in this room tomorrow at 10:30 a.m. with the subject of local use of radar. And again, thanks to everybody that participated, and this hearing is adjourned.

-Key Reporters-

1 CERTIFICATE 2 I, Karen J. Meister, Reporter, Notary 3 Public, duly commissioned and qualified in and for 4 5 the County of York, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and 6 7 accurate transcript, to the best of my ability, of 8 a public hearing taken from a videotape recording 9 and reduced to computer printout under my 10 supervision. 11 This certification does not apply to any 12 reproduction of the same by any means unless under 13 my direct control and/or supervision. 14 15 16 17 Karen J. Meister Reporter, Notary Public 18 19 20 21 22 23 2.4