Welcome and Introduction
Subcommittee chair Tom McClellan welcomed the members and invited all present to introduce themselves.

Review of Agenda and Scoping Documents
Tom McClellan went over the agenda and introduced the scoping document and the “Considerations for Licensing and Registration” document.

MacPherson noted the wide range of potential types and use cases for Highly Automated Vehicles (HAVs) and cautioned against legislation limiting innovation. MacPherson distributed “Potential Methods of Distribution” document.

The subcommittee discussed the possible need to define terms related to commercial vehicles and the relative lack of American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators (AAMVA) guidance in that area.

Testing
Subcommittee agreed in principle that there should be a permitting process for AV testing.

Subcommittee asked staff for examples of the typical turnaround time and process for AV test permitting in other states.

Huang suggested that any permitting process be statewide and keep in mind the policy of other states.
Subcommittee discussed conditions in which OEMs (Original Equipment Manufacturers) would be allowed to test (weather, urban/rural, etc.) and reached a general consensus around allowing testing in most/all conditions.

Subcommittee considered the safety assurance and data sharing requirements for testing permits and discussed the possibility of allowing HAV deployment if sufficient testing has been done out of state.

**Licensing**

MacPherson suggested that the subcommittee needs to consider policy specific to commercial use and users.

Subcommittee agreed that considering Commercial Driver’s License (CDL) recommendations relating to highly automated commercial vehicles was probably not needed within the timeline of the September report.

Subcommittee considered at what point HAVs no longer need licensed drivers.

Dodds stressed the need for education that emphasizes new technology benefits and challenges, especially related to level 2 and 3 vehicles.

**Registration**

Lt. Tannenbaum suggested that there should be information specific to automation and AVs in Law Enforcement Data Systems (LEDS) so that law enforcement can be aware of the nature of vehicles they encounter. Recommends that exterior labelling may not be necessary and, in fact, may be disadvantageous.

Dodds countered that there may be occasions when exterior labeling could be useful, but agreed generally with that sentiment.

What are the grounds for suspending or revoking registration? McClellan explained that move to HAV will require shift away from suspending drivers to suspending or revoking registration.

Hurley introduced the concept of an early warning system to identify problem vehicles/operators prior to something that would rise to the level of registration revocation.

Lt. Tannenbaum expressed a desire for registration fees to be revenue neutral. Advised that careful cost analysis will need to be conducted to ensure registration fees and HAV policies aren’t barriers to OEMs or burdens to citizens.

**Public Comment**

Molly McGrew, representing 3M, informed the subcommittee that 3M will be bringing a roadshow to Oregon to showcase AV/CV infrastructure technology (working with Michigan and Minnesota).
Areas of Consensus and Areas for Further Discussion

Testing:

The Subcommittee agreed in principle that the Task Force should recommend the creation of a permitting process for testing of highly automated vehicles. The Subcommittee generally agreed that automated vehicle manufacturers will need to test in all conditions and the permit process should not prohibit testing in certain types of conditions.

Areas for further discussion:

- Elements of permit application (ODOT Staff will prepare materials comparing AAMVA, California, Nevada, Pennsylvania, and other comparable processes)
- Term of permit application
- Process and grounds for suspending or revoking a permit
- Relationship of state permitting process with local jurisdictions
- Whether testing permits should rely on safety assertions or data-driven thresholds as testing moves from lower- to higher-complexity and risk environments

Licensing:

The Subcommittee agreed that considering CDL recommendations relating to highly automated commercial vehicles is likely not needed within the timeline of the September report. Additionally, CDL requirements are heavily regulated at the federal level and may be a federal responsibility.

Areas for further discussion:

- The Subcommittee recognized that, eventually, commercial vehicles may assume numerous autonomous or semi-autonomous configurations, including different types of platoons that may require different driver training or skillsets. As commercial AV technology continues to develop, this topic may need to be revisited.

The Subcommittee did not reach consensus on the point at which a license requirement is no longer necessary, or whether a license should be required for an occupant of a vehicle with manual controls if they perform no aspect of the driving task, or are not seated in the driver's seat (e.g., a passenger).

Areas for further discussion:

- Licensing requirements for different users of automated vehicles
- Whether to establish an endorsement for automated vehicles or certain levels of automated vehicles
- Driver training requirements
Registration:

The Subcommittee did not reach consensus on registration requirements for HAVs, but discussed several aspects of HAV registration that warrant further exploration.

Areas for further discussion:

- Labeling/marking requirements for HAVs, whether externally visible or accessible to law enforcement through a system like LEDS that allows law enforcement officers (LEOs) to look up license plates
- Process and grounds for suspending or revoking registration
- Chair Tannenbaum proposed a principle that registration fees should be revenue-neutral and based on cost of administering program