Welcome and Review of Minutes (Capt. Bloom)
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June 6, 2018 minutes adopted.

June 21, 2018 minutes adopted.

Task Force Debrief

At the request of Sean Waters, the full task force directed this subcommittee to reconsider the requirement for marking of automated testing vehicles to ensure it is compatible with commercial motor vehicles.

Lt. Tannenbaum suggested that rather than requiring a decal on either the cab or the trailers of commercial AV testing vehicles, the subcommittee could recommend that the manufacturer notify ODOT, similar to the current voluntary notification process.

Daniel Fernández suggested an addendum to the original recommendation to recommend that ODOT create minimum standards for a decal for passenger AV testing vehicles but leaving details open ended. He wanted to ensure that manufacturers could use a decal that would be applicable across multiple states, if necessary.

The subcommittee agreed to Daniel Fernández’s suggestion and agreed to require a notification of testing instead of a decal for automated commercial motor vehicles.
**Crash and Incident Reporting**

The subcommittee discussed concerns about automated vehicles’ ability to fulfill exchange of information requirements in the event of minor collisions.

The subcommittee decided that since insurance information will be available as part of the testing permit process and law enforcement officers would likely be called to the scene of an incident involving an automated vehicle without a human backup driver, an open-ended requirement to make sure insurance information is exchanged would be adequate.

The subcommittee recommended that automated vehicles follow existing crash reporting criteria and exchange of information laws. They recommended that the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) create some procedure to capture AV-specific information from incidents involving AVs, including the level of automation of the automated vehicle and whether the automated driving system was engaged at the time of the incident.

The subcommittee addressed possible issues with crash reporting due to the lack of a driver. The subcommittee decided that a clear definition of the driver would be helpful, but consented to wait to hear what the Subcommittee on Licensing and Registration recommends in this area.

**EDRs and Crash Data**

The subcommittee discussed possible requirements for the presence of and data collected by event data recorders (EDRs) in automated vehicles.

Lt. Tannenbaum suggested the subcommittee did not need to be descriptive in any recommendation in this area, so that future changes in technology and data could be accommodated. He noted that law enforcement has the means to obtain data from EDRs currently.

Capt. Bloom said that standards for EDRs will likely be address by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA).

The subcommittee decided to refrain from any making recommendations about EDRs in anticipation of future NHTSA guidelines.

**Adherence to Traffic Laws**

The subcommittee decided to reaffirm the requirement that automated vehicles will need to be able to comply with all applicable laws.

They noted that in the future, Oregon law may have to be examined and changed to accommodate the continuing development of this technology.

**Distracted Driving**

The subcommittee decided that existing distracted driving would will be adequate for the initial phase of AV applications.
Public Comment

Robin Ness of ODOT’s Transportation Development Division told the subcommittee that more than 50 percent of crash reports do not involve the police and 20 percent are single-vehicle incidents. She identified meeting crash reporting requirements in these cases as potential areas of difficulty for automated vehicles.

Recap and Next Steps

The subcommittee does not plan to meet again, but it is possible they could if any of their recommendations are referred back to them in the August 15, 2018 meeting.
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Recommendations

AV manufacturers seeking to test automated passenger vehicles must display a small decal on the rear window of the testing vehicle to indicate to law enforcement that it is an automated testing vehicle. Consideration should be given to ensure that the decals are discreet. ODOT should create minimum standards for a decal but give discretion to manufacturers to design decals that can be applicable across different states and jurisdictions.

Manufacturers seeking to test automated commercial motor vehicles do not need to display an identifying decal, but will need to provide ODOT and state police with images of the testing vehicles, information about routes, and notification of testing dates and times, similar to ODOT’s current voluntary notification process for AV testing.

In the event of a crash or incident involving an automated vehicle, insurance and registration information must be provided.

Current laws regarding the reporting of crashes are sufficient and should apply to automated vehicles and test drivers.

Oregon’s crash report forms should be updated to cover additional information on automated vehicles, including the vehicle’s SAE level of automation and whether the autonomous technology was engaged at the time of the crash or incident.

After discussion and consideration, the Subcommittee on Law Enforcement and Crash Reporting recommends waiting for guidance from the federal government regarding event data recorders, in recognition of state and federal roles in regulating motor vehicle operation.

Current distracted driving laws are sufficient for testing of automated vehicles and should apply to test drivers of automated vehicles.
The subcommittee recognizes that Oregon law is currently sufficient to cover most possible law enforcement interactions with automated vehicles, but in the future the law may need to adapt as the technology continues to develop.