Members in attendance – Tom McClellan (subcommittee chair), Jon Isaacs, Eric Hesse, Mark MacPherson, Steve Entler, Marie Dodds, Jana Jarvis, Riche Huang (proxy for Sean Waters, by phone), Rep. Susan McLain (non-voting), Sen. Fred Girod (non-voting), Lt. Tim Tannenbaum (Chair of Task Force, non-voting for this subcommittee)

ODOT staff in attendance – Andrew Dick, Ali Lohman, Amy Joyce, Jenna Adams-Kalloch, Russ Casler, Sarah Kelber, Eryca Dinsdale, Lindsay Baker, Paul Duncan

Public attendance count – Lori Anne-Sills, Patrick Brennan, Jocelyn Blake, John Powell, Rose Feliciano

Welcome and Review/Approval of Minutes

Meeting start 10:04 a.m.

Minutes were approved. Lt. Tannenbaum reported back on what issues had been discussed in other subcommittee meetings.

Andrew Dick summarized ODOT staff memos and research based on questions or topics raised at the May 30 meeting.

Testing Framework

McClellan reintroduced the licensing and registration considerations document from the last meeting, as well as the AAMVA recommendations report.

MacPherson and Huang discussed the merits of specifying the conditions OEMs would be allowed to test in. MacPherson expressed an interest in requiring OEMs test in all conditions.

Huang explained that there are specific use cases that the OEM develops for each region. He further expressed that OEM is not averse to declaring the locations/conditions in which it intends to test, but he does not believe that an OEM should be required to test in conditions it does not identify as useful or prohibited from testing in conditions it needs data on.

Lt. Tannenbaum suggested language requiring OEMs to certify they will only test within the capabilities of their vehicles.

Subcommittee generally agreed that the AAMVA report is a good blueprint for the foundation of a testing program.
Isaacs explained that TNCs generally approved the recommendations of the report, but also shared a concern that vehicles should not be required to completely reinitiate permit process if a software update raises a vehicle to a new SAE Level.

Lt. Tannenbaum emphasized that law enforcement would want to access some data specific to HAVs in the event of a crash.

The group discussed the definition and role of a remote operator.

Jarvis asked whether the testing parameters in AAMVA’s report would be sufficient to cover platooning of CMVs. Huang explained that right now platooning vehicles are Level 2 and are not highly automated. He shared that there is certainly the possibility that future technology Daimler develops would fall into that category.

Jarvis wanted to make sure that the subcommittee considered other OEMs who may be testing highly automated CMVs. Huang and Tannenbaum discussed the fine line between including CMV/CDL issues in subcommittee recommendations and excluding CMVs from testing/deployment in the long term.

Hesse asked why CA had not included testing of CMVs in its driverless vehicle regulations. Huang explained that CA regulations are limited to vehicles 10,000 lbs and lighter.

McClellan asked the group whether the subcommittee should make recommendations to the group regarding platooning. Huang observed that platooning is a Level 2 technology and asked whether the group wanted to expand the scope of its recommendations to include non-HAV technology.

MacPherson shared that Teamsters did not take issue with Level 2 technology like platooning. They did, however, want to know more about remote operation. Teamsters have concerns about this technology and its impact on safety.

Hesse questioned if that was adequate, since differently levels of automation might need different standards.

**Jurisdictional Comparisons**

Dick referred the group to the jurisdictional comparison memo. The subcommittee reviewed the memo as a group.

Dick clarified differences among the different levels of automation. The group considered if there would be different infrastructure needs for different levels of automation. The group agreed infrastructure is something that would be better addressed by the cybersecurity and long-term policy subcommittee.

The group discussed merits of a per-OEM vehicle cap for testing.

Isaacs recommended that the group look at Nevada’s streamlined approach to a testing program and application process.
Lt. Tannenbaum countered that accountability and safety were paramount. He highlighted the good driving record requirement in other states, as well as the 21-year-old age limit.

The group discussed ways to ensure the reliability of drivers other than age.

Huang raised the issue of privacy concerns related to driver information. The group further debated the merits of driver requirements.

Rep. McClain and Hesse highlighted some of the CA program requirements.

**Public Comment**

None

**Recap and Next Steps**

The subcommittee decided to hold another meeting at ODOT headquarters on June 28 at 10 a.m. to continue preparing recommendations for the entire task force.

End 11:30 a.m.

**Areas of Consensus and Areas for Further Discussion**

The subcommittee generally agreed that platooning technology with drivers in both vehicles are outside the scope of this task force.

The subcommittee agreed to a permitting process for automated vehicle testing. Details on specific recommendations are included in the AV Testing Permit Requirements document for the 6-28 meeting.