Task Force on Autonomous Vehicles Meeting
July 25, 2019
Salem, OR, 355 Capitol St. NE, Basement Rooms A/B

Members in attendance: Lt. Timothy Tannenbaum (Chair), Rep. Susan McLain, Mike Benzer (alternate for Commissioner Paul Savas) Rick Blackwell, Waylon Buchan, Marie Dodds, Steve Entler, Daniel Fernández, Eric Hesse, Cheryl Hiemstra, Neil Jackson, Gail Krumenauer, Mark MacPherson, Evan Manvel, Galen McGill, David McMorries, Todd Nell, Jeff Owen, Eliot Rose, Jeremiah Ross, Commissioner Paul Savas, Jacob Sherman (alternate for Eric Hesse), Becky Steckler, Graham Trainor, Sara Wright (alternate for Chris Hagerbaumer)

ODOT staff in attendance: Adam Argo, Paul Duncan, Chris Erickson, Michelle Godfrey, Sarah Hackett, Amy Joyce, Ali Lohman

Public attendance: Chloe Becker (Oregon House Majority Office), Paul Cosgrove (representing the Auto Alliance), Phil Donovan (representing Google), Jenny Dressler (Public Affairs Counsel), Justin Freeman (representing Tesla), Nicole Palmateer (representing Uber), Nathanial Price (Federal Highway Administration), Claire Prihoda (staff for Rep. Susan McLain), Hannah Proffitt-Allee (representing General Motors), Madeline Unger (Dalton Advocacy)

Welcome and Opening Remarks, Review of Minutes (Chair Tannenbaum)

Chair Tannenbaum welcome the group and led introductions. He noted a few articles that provide tempered predictions about automated vehicle deployment and observed that the state has time to get automated vehicle policy right. He said that there is uncertainty about what the future will look like and urged task force members to focus on what we do know. He also thanked staff for their work.

The task force approved the draft minutes from the May 2 meeting.

Legislative Update (Representative McLain)

Representative McLain thanked the task force members for their work. She provided an update on HB 2770, which passed in the Joint Transportation Committee and passed in the House, but was referred to the Senate Rules Committee and did not receive a vote in the Senate before the legislative session ended. She shared some of the sticking points in the bill, including a question about the ratio of remote operators to testing vehicles.
She emphasized the importance of the work of the task force and urged members to focus on the report due Sept. 15. She also raised the question of whether the task force will continue to meet after turning in the September report and noted that they would need a specific mission for further meetings.

**Schedule (Chair Tannenbaum)**

Chair Tannenbaum outlined the schedule leading up to the Sept. 15 deadline. He emphasized the large quantity of work to do in August.

The schedule of meetings is available on the [Task Force website](#).


The draft outline of the report is included on slide 8 of the meeting presentation, which is available [here](#).

**Bike and Pedestrian Safety Meeting Summary (Ali Lohman, ODOT)**

Loman summarized the Bike and Pedestrian Safety meeting, which featured presentations from Becky Gilliam, Michael Clamann, Ken McLeod, and A.J. Zelada.

Lohman explained that the overarching message from that meeting was that AV deployment could create both opportunities and challenges for bicyclist and pedestrians.

Slides 9-12 of the [meeting presentation](#) summarize the Bike and Pedestrian Safety and include links to the presentation.

**Review and Vote**

**Subcommittee on Road and Infrastructure Design**

Subcommittee Lead Galen McGill introduced the work of the Subcommittee on Road and Infrastructure Design. The Subcommittee plans to produce twelve impact assessments that address different ways automated vehicles could change road and infrastructure design. Five impact assessments were ready for a vote by the full the task force. McGill also noted that the Manual on Uniform Control Devices (MUTCD) sets the standards for many of these areas, and that the MUTCD will likely be updated in 2019.

McGill summarized the road markings impact assessment, which is available [here](#).

Becky Steckler asked about the discussion regarding unmarked crosswalks. Rep. McLain highlighted the importance of pedestrian safety. McGill noted the uncertainty about whether marked crosswalks would provide a safety benefit or not. He also observed that connected vehicle technology could potentially improve pedestrian safety.

McGill and Mark MacPherson discussed maintenance requirements for road markings. McGill noted the contrast may be more important for machine vision than retroreflectivity.
He also observed that different materials and weather conditions require different levels of maintenance. McGill also explained that there are metrics for determining when maintenance is required, but those metrics may need to change in the future.

Jeremiah Ross said it was important to consider motorcycle safety and the impact of changing road markings on motorcyclists.

Sara Wright asked about setting requirements for AV performance. Chair Tannenbaum explained that the federal government has not yet set standards for AV performance. McGill added that the impact assessments are only looking at road and infrastructure design topics.

McGill summarized the road signs impact assessment, which is available here. He noted that a suggestion under “Next Steps” about investments in arrow boards had been included in error and should instead be moved to the work zone impact assessment.

MacPherson and McGill discussed that signs need to be readable for AVs upon deployment, and become more critical as more AVs are deployed.

Richard Blackwell and McGill discussed some of the challenges of establishing and maintaining a digital database of road signs.

McGill summarized the work zones impact assessment, which is available here.

Steckler and McGill agreed that some of the research around work zones could be applicable to other events that disrupt normal traffic.

Marie Dodds said that work zones are tough for human drivers to navigate as well and AVs could have safety benefits.

Lohman summarized the school zones impact assessment, which is available here.

Lohman also summarized the traffic signals impact assessment, which is available here.

Cheryl Hiemstra asked whether ODOT keeps detailed track of road miles, stripes, and traffic signals. McGill and Amy Joyce explained that ODOT has detailed data on the state highways but not on other roads.

The task force members voted unanimously to include all five impact assessments in the report.

**Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Data and Privacy**

Subcommittee Lead David McMorries introduced the work of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Privacy and Data. He noted that the state has limited authority over cybersecurity standards, but that privacy and data have become dominant concerns. He explained that in addition to the two privacy statements prepared for a vote today (on geolocation data and the right to be forgotten), the subcommittee was also working on a statement to address privacy considerations more generally.
McMorries summarized the statement on cybersecurity policy, which is available [here](#).

McMorries also summarized the statement on privacy and geolocation data, which is available [here](#).

Eric Hesse asked if the recommendations in the geolocation statement should be strengthened and whether the task force should vote on the geolocation statement before the joint meeting on data between the Land Use Subcommittee and the Cybersecurity, Privacy and Data Subcommittee. Lohman explained that there are two complementary statements in development: a broader statement on privacy being prepared by the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Privacy and Data and a statement on data prepared by the Land Use Subcommittee. She suggested voting on the geolocation statement today and continuing the conversation regarding the other two documents.

Steckler asked if the subcommittee had considered geolocation data for deliveries. McMorries said that the subcommittee intended to address any location data that could be used to single out an individual.

McMorries summarized the statement on the “right to be forgotten,” which is available [here](#).

MacPherson asked whether the subcommittee had considered how to protect private data collected by rental vehicles. McMorries said that this is a problem with conventional rental vehicles, not just AVs.

Steckler observed that many data brokers use smartphone data or scrape data from the internet to collect information on vehicle location. She asked whether this statement was meant to be applied broadly, not just to AVs.

Lohman reminded everyone that the task force is only making recommendations related to automated vehicles and that other groups are considering privacy and location data more broadly.

Daniel Fernández raised a concern on behalf of the Auto Alliance. Transfer of ownership is an edge case, but some personally identifiable information is needed for AVs to operate, so not all personal data can be deleted immediately, for example geolocation data enabling an automated driving system to navigate and essential for safety. Other edge cases could include contact information so a company can pursue outstanding bills. Hiemstra suggested amending the statement on the right to be forgotten to include system operability. The final sentence of the statement was edited to read: “The right to be forgotten will need to be balanced with competing concerns for the retention of data: public records law compliance (if shared with a government agency), subpoenas, other legal compliance concerns, and system operability.”

The task force voted unanimously to include the three statements in the report, with the agreed upon edit to the statement on the right to be forgotten.
**Subcommittee Updates**

Chair Tannenbaum provided an update on the Subcommittee on Vehicle Code Amendments and Public Safety. The subcommittee is considering how to incorporate new definitions related to automated vehicles into Oregon’s existing vehicle code.

McGill reiterated that his subcommittee will produce seven more impact assessments. The complete list of impact assessments is available on slide 14 of the [meeting presentation](#).

McMorries said the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Privacy and Data has two more meetings, one to finalize the broad statement on privacy and a joint meeting with the Land Use Subcommittee.

Evan reiterated that the Land Use Subcommittee will be meeting with the Cybersecurity, Privacy and Data Subcommittee to discuss data. The Land Use Subcommittee will meet separately to discuss how AV policy can align with existing land use and greenhouse gas reduction goals. The subcommittee will also discuss pricing.

Jeff Owen said that the Subcommittee on Public Transit will finalize a memo on best practices and a matrix of public transit components.

Todd Nell shared that the Subcommittee on Workforce Changes will review a workforce report prepared by Gail Krumenauer. The subcommittee is also identifying elements for a more comprehensive independent study of how AVs will impact the workforce in Oregon.

**Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**Next Steps (Chair Tannenbaum)**

The materials voted on by the task force will be incorporated into the report.

The subcommittees will continue to meet according to the schedule.