



MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting: Health & Equity Subcommittee
Location: Teleconference
Date: July 21, 2020

Attendees:

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Dave	Andersen	Washington State Department of Commerce
Debi	Besser	Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC)
Daniela	Bremmer	Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Barb	Chamberlain	WSDOT
Brian	Chandler	DKS Associates
Kit	Chiu	WSP USA
Holly	Cocci	Gordon Thomas Honeywell
Christopher J.	Comeau	City of Bellingham
Rad	Cunningham	Washington Department of Health (DOH)
Andrew	Dannenberg	University of Washington, Subcommittee Chair
Tom	Foster	Washington State Patrol
Paul	Inghram	Puget Sound Regional Council
Francois	Larrivee	Hopelink
Scott	Le Vine	Transpo Group
Vanessa	Link	Disability Rights Washington
Patrick	Lynch	Transpo Group
Erika	Mascorro	WTSC
Clark	Matthews	Disability Rights Washington
Paula	Reeves	DOH, Subcommittee Staff
Yes	Segura	Smash the Box
Bryce	Yadon	Futurewise
Anna	Zivarts	Disability Rights Washington

WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND QUICK OVERVIEW OF WORK TO DATE

Dr. Andrew Dannenberg, UW School of Public Health

- The meeting began with a brief welcome from Dr. Andrew Dannenberg, and a round of introductions from meeting attendees.

Topic Closed.



WASHINGTON STATE

AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE
WORK GROUP

MEETING SUMMARY

Presentation on Safety Subcommittee work and 2020 proposals

Debi Besser, Washington State Transportation Commission

- Debi Besser, representing the Safety Subcommittee, provided an overview of key areas where their subcommittee has focused recent efforts, including:
 - Recommendation on the revision of the RCW 46.37.480 section on television viewers;
 - Feedback on language in HB2470, the uniform automated operation of vehicles act;
 - Consideration for the use of terms and definitions such as “Autonomous”; and
 - Development of Safety Goals.
- Recommendation on the revision of the RCW 46.37.480 section on television viewers.
 - The Safety Subcommittee has put forward a recommendation to repeal the first section of RCW 46.37.480, which relates to the use of television viewers, screens, or other means of visually receiving a television broadcast when the moving images are visible to the driver.
 - This section is considered to be outdated, as it is not used by law enforcement to address distracted driving (a separate distracted driving law achieves this) and has been seen as a barrier to potential safety technologies that could be used within vehicles.
 - The Safety Subcommittee is looking for the Health and Equity Subcommittee to review and sign-off on this recommendation.
 - Questions:
 - Barb Chamberlain posed a question related to the process for signing off on the recommendation, and whether the Health and Equity Subcommittee will thoroughly examine the recommendation from the perspective of health and equity, or if it will simply be a matter of approval and sign-off.
 - Dr. Dannenberg clarified that it would not be a simple sign-off, but an actual review of the recommendation.
 - **ACTION:** Debi Besser to send the recommended revision to the Health and Equity Subcommittee for review, along with the rationale describing the distracted driving law.
- Feedback on language in HB2470, the uniform automated operation of vehicles act.
 - The Safety Subcommittee has pulled together their feedback on HB2470, and will be reviewing it together in their upcoming meeting this coming Thursday. They will continue to develop their feedback from a safety perspective.
- Consideration for the use of terms and definitions such as “Autonomous”.
 - The use of the term “Autonomous” in HB 2676, a bill that is adding insurance and reporting requirements to self-certifying testing entities, has opened a discussion around what it means for a vehicle to be autonomous.
 - While there are definitions on what it means for vehicles to be automated, it is unclear at what level of automation vehicles can be considered as “autonomous”. There is a need to clarify this as it will define what types of vehicles are addressed under the new laws, and covered under various types of insurance.

MEETING SUMMARY

- This is a discussion that all the subcommittees may need to eventually think about, but the Safety Subcommittee has taken up the task to start the discussion, and will eventually need input from the other subcommittees.
- There are standards through SAE (formerly the Society of Automotive Engineers) and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA), but there is a sense that something more is needed at a national level.
 - Scott Le Vine commented that they may consider checking the AV Start and SELF-DRIVE federal bills. While neither were passed into law, they may have definitions for autonomous that would be helpful here.
- Development of Safety Goals.
 - Building on work done by the Infrastructure & Systems Subcommittee, the Safety Subcommittee is looking to expand on a set of subcommittee specific goals. The Infrastructure & Systems Subcommittee has developed a set of goals for each area.

Topic Closed.

Discussion of Health & Equity Proposal(s) for 2020 State Legislative Report

Dr. Andrew Dannenberg, UW School of Public Health

- Dr. Dannenberg presented on two potential proposals for the 2020 State Legislative Report:
 - A proposal to conduct structured public engagement to improve understanding of equity needs and expectations related to autonomous vehicles (AVs); and
 - A proposal to include AV Testing Location Assessments as a requirement to ensure public health and safety.
- The first proposal is focused on engagement and outreach to expand understanding of equity needs and expectations related to AVs.
 - Paula Reeves commented that they had approached the Environmental Justice Task Force to ask if they might be interested in conducting joint engagement, but was told they have been given a targeted task that they would like to keep succinct.
 - Anna Zivarts commented that it is a good idea to engage more, but wanted to make sure that those engaged would be given the agency to provide open input on what they think, rather than be asked to sign-off on something that is presented to them.
 - Barb Chamberlain added that the current wording of the proposal, which says that “AV technology may be met with opposition” makes it sound as if engagement is being done specifically for sign-off. There is a need remove assumptions about specific outcomes, and maintain an avenue for open conversation, regardless of whether it includes AVs or not.
 - Daniela Bremmer commented that the stated goal of the proposal needs greater clarity, as the title speaks specifically to equity. It was suggested that references to health be removed so that the proposal could be refocused on the topic of equity.
 - Dr. Dannenberg requested that Daniela provide language substitution for what has been written. Paula indicated that she would try to also help capture the revisions based on Daniela’s comment.

MEETING SUMMARY

- **ACTION:** Daniela to provide language to Paula for clarifying the equity objective of the engagement proposal.
- Kit Chiu commented that in addition to deployment, there is a need to ensure that testing is also included under this proposal, as there are also impacts of testing on historically disadvantaged communities.
- Anna Zivarts further commented that there is a need to make sure that the proposal does not replace the previously identified action on compensate people who may face more barriers to attending the subcommittee meetings.
 - Paula indicated that there had been a second piece of this proposal around increasing participation in the decision-making process that could be considered. However, this would impact the budget estimated for this proposed task. The current proposal has been pared back in light of current financial limitations. However, a phased approach could be put forward to reflect a suite of potential options that decision-makers could fund.
- Francois Larrivee commented that review of the final product is needed before the subcommittee can determine whether or not to progress with the proposal. There were questions from Francois and other subcommittee members on whether \$30,000 would be sufficient for meaningful engagement, and concern that this would turn into a token effort where the bulk of the budget allocated will go to a consulting firm rather than to bolster actual engagement.
 - Paula commented that the subcommittee has two more meetings to discuss this proposal prior to the deadline for submitting recommendations. The subcommittee is encouraged to consider a multi-staged approach so that funding can be proposed accordingly.
 - Dave Anderson further added that there is a need to understand the underlying objectives of the \$30,000 budget, which might not be sufficient to vet all of the equity issues. However, it may be helpful in providing potential users and people who are disproportionately impacted by AVs an opportunity define ways to get involved. There is a need to ensure open avenues for input, and considerations should not just be on equal access, but also on disproportionate impacts. In considering the last major transportation technology (the automobile), many of the knock-on effects originally considered as secondary have had tremendous impact on the way people live, and there is opportunity to learn from that process to inform the research agenda needed.
- The second proposal relates to AV testing location assessments to ensure public health and safety. The proposal is to amend RCW 46.30 to require testing location assessments to be provided to the state prior to permitting pilot testing on Washington streets and roadways
 - Kit Chiu posed a question regarding whether this testing location assessment would be conducted by the self-certifying entities.
 - Dr. Dannenberg confirmed that the intent of the proposal, as currently written, expects that the self-certifying entities would be responsible for conducting their own assessments.
 - Kit followed up by pointing out the potential conflict of interest that would arise from self-certifying entities being made responsible for the assessment. There is a dichotomy between the desire to attract testing to Washington and the need to

MEETING SUMMARY

uphold objectives around health, equity, and safety. In either case, there is a need for access to data on testing from the self-certifying entities either to provide a mechanism for auditing of assessments, or for the State and its partners to conduct the assessment of testing locations.

- Paula requested that Kit provide some language relating to this the proposal.
- **ACTION:** Kit Chiu to provide language to Paula on the issue relating to the AV testing location assessment.
- Daniela posed a question on whether this type of self-assessment is being done in other places. At the moment, there are only 5 companies that have expressed interest to test in Washington. Given this limited testing, there is concern that this may be a barrier to attracting more testing to the region.

Topic Closed.

Questions, discussion and next steps

All

- Chris Comeau reported that he will be stepping away from the subcommittee.
 - In his place, Michael Harpool from the Whatcom Transportation Authority will be joining the subcommittee.
 - **ACTION:** Chris to provide contact information for Michael Harpool to Paula.

NEXT TELECONFERENCE MEETING: August 18, 2020 12pm – 1pm

MEETING ADJOURNED.