



MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting: Health & Equity Subcommittee
Location: Teleconference
Date: August 18, 2020

Attendees:

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Debi	Besser	Washington Traffic Safety Commission
Kit	Chiu	WSP USA
Holly	Cocci	Gordon Thomas Honeywell
Andrew	Dannenberg	University of Washington (Chair)
Margo	Dawes	Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
Michael	Harpool	Whatcom Transportation Authority
Paul	Ingrham	Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)
Tamara	Jones	Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC)
Francois	Larrivee	Hopelink
Scott	LeVine	Transpo Group
Kyle	Miller	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Paula	Reeves	Washington Department of Health, Subcommittee Staff
Suzanne	Schrek	Sound Transit
Shannon	Walker	SDOT
Bryce	Yadon	Futurewise

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.
- Dr. Dannenberg highlighted the work to date, including that Yes Segura is working with Paula Reeves on getting the Teams site set up to enable further collaboration.
- As a committee, we have also begun the process of reaching out to the other subcommittees to get a sense of what they are doing.
- Dr. Dannenberg is set to brief the Executive Committee on September 23rd on the subcommittee's proposals.

Topic closed.

MEETING SUMMARY

Presentation on Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee Work and 2020 Proposals

Kyle Miller, WSDOT AV Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee Staff

- Representing the Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee, Kyle Miller provided an overview of key activities that are currently being undertaken by their subcommittee.
- The Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee does not have plans to submit any proposals to the Executive Committee this year, but will continue to make progress across three activity areas.
- Activity 1 – Best Practices Scan
 - The Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee has been engaged in a best practices scan since 2019.
 - In April 2020, they conducted a large work group meeting to develop illustrative strategies and associated actions.
 - The work group meeting was 6 hours long and had a balance of both public and private sector attendees.
 - In the spirit of transparency and inclusivity, the subcommittee used this work group meeting as a way to leverage existing resources and capture thoughts from different attendees.
 - The subcommittee received recommendations on a number of strategies, as well as changes to language and terminology used.
 - The outcomes of the work group meeting contributed to the development of the Cooperative Automated Transportation (CAT) Policy Framework, which is currently being finalized.
 - However, even with finalization, this document is intended to remain as a living document, and will continue to be revised with changing technologies.
 - The latest version of the CAT Policy Framework is posted on the subcommittee's page.
 - Any further questions can be directed to Kyle Miller and Daniela Bremmer.
- Activity 2 – Project Selection Criteria
 - The Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee is looking to develop a set of project selection criteria to enable the selection of near-term pilots to achieve the objectives of the CAT Policy Framework.
 - They have also been investigating funding sources to fund identified pilots.
 - The subcommittee currently has a compiled list of grant opportunities and are working to investigate eligibility across these different programs.
 - A spreadsheet with active links to grant opportunities is posted on the subcommittee's page.
- Activity 3 – Understanding of Testing Motivations
 - The Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee has also been working to understand the testing motivations of companies that have self-certified for testing in Washington.
 - Leads for this activity have interviewed companies with self-certification on the type of testing they are doing and why they are testing.



WASHINGTON STATE

AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE WORK GROUP

MEETING SUMMARY

- Out of a total of 17 self-certified companies, 12 companies responded.
 - Since the original tally of 17 companies, some companies no longer exist, some have changed their business models, and some have been bought up by other companies. The interviews found that 6 remain active.
 - The results of the interviews are shared on the subcommittee's resources page.
- Questions:
 - Dr. Dannenberg asked a question regarding the types of recommendations and proposals that will come out of the CAT Policy Framework
 - Kyle responded that they have a meeting on September 11th to discuss this. As the subcommittee has yet to finalize the CAT Policy Framework, they do not currently have a specific recommendation. Once that plan is finalized, they will work towards a proposal for the Executive Committee.
 - The grant information that the subcommittee has collected is not specific to a recommendation or proposal, but rather a resource intended for all the subcommittees.
 - Dr. Dannenberg followed with a question regarding the application of the CAT Policy Framework, and whether it will be put forward to legislators, or for use internally within WSDOT.
 - Kyle responded that the CAT Policy Framework is intended more as a resource for localities. However, if something arises as an obvious opportunity for legislation, they will consider it then.
 - Dr. Dannenberg asked for clarification on the 6 active companies.
 - Kyle clarified that the 6 companies identified as active are self-certified, but it is unclear if they are actually undergoing testing.
 - Debi Besser added that after the second part of the self-certification legislation comes into effect next year, they will have a better understanding of whether testing is actually being done.

Topic closed.

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

Dr. Andrew Dannenberg, UW School of Public Health

- Dr. Dannenberg re-introduced the Health and Equity Subcommittee's two proposals for the 2020 State Legislative Report.
- Proposal 1 – Testing location assessment
 - The first proposal, relating to a requirement for testing location assessments, is intended to amend the rules so that when companies are ready to do a test, they conduct a testing

MEETING SUMMARY

assessment to consider the impacts of where the testing is being done. In effect, this would enable better understanding of the equity impacts of testing activities.

- Discussion on Proposal 1:
 - Shannon Walker noted that the current wording of the proposal indicates that this information will need to be provided prior to permitting. However, this would be contrary to the order of events outlined in existing legislation. Shannon suggests that this language be revised to be reflective of the language in RCW 46.30. For example, a change could be made along the lines of requiring this information to be provided as part of minimum requirements for self-certification.
 - Paula responded that this is a good suggestion and that the language can be adjusted to reflect this.
 - Debi Besser asked a question regarding who the collected information would be provided to, and what information will actually be needed.
 - Dr. Dannenberg responded that the intent of the current proposal is to leave room for ambiguity so that more detail about what needs to be known can be written in as there is greater understanding.
 - It was agreed that some flexibility could be written into the proposal so that one of the agencies, likely the Department of Licensing, would be able to develop it in greater detail.
 - Michael Harpool asked for clarification on whether the assessment is intended to be an equity check, and whether testing would be paused if companies do not pass the check.
 - Paula clarified that the assessment is not intended to be a regulatory mechanism. Rather, it is intended more for information gathering. At this point, it is difficult to know what can be considered equitable or not when it comes to automated vehicles, so this is a way to begin informing our collective understanding.
- Proposal 2 – Structured engagement process
 - The second proposal is focused on seeking funding for an engagement process, and is intended to enable active outreach across the different subcommittee areas.
- Discussion on Proposal 2:
 - Margo Dawes asked a question on why the proposal asks for funding of an engagement process rather than funds for direct engagement within this working group. Margo notes that direct funds for stakeholder participation from underrepresented groups on this subcommittee has been a longstanding idea.
 - Paula responded that the budget for the subcommittees come from transportation funding that goes to the Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC). While there is funding for staff to support the Executive Committee, there are no funds flowing through to the subcommittees. This proposal was put together in an attempt to support augmentation of these funds.
 - Tamara Jones, who works for the WSTC, indicated that she will look into this further to see if there is additional information on funding for stakeholder participation.



WASHINGTON STATE

AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE WORK GROUP

MEETING SUMMARY

- Margo responded that the proposal is a fine idea, but skips over the critical need that this subcommittee has talked about, and that is the barrier that some stakeholders have in participating. Margo suggested that an inclusive planning process might serve as a middle ground, and provided a link to a toolkit that provides a relevant framework: <http://www.acltoolkit.com/p/toolkit.html>
- Paula responded that this approach may be more suitable for projects that the Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee may come up with.
- Francois Larrivee commented that the wording of the proposal still includes a statement about opposition to AV technology. However, the point of this process is to illuminate potential issues, not to avoid opposition.
 - Dr. Dannenberg responded that the wording will be reworked to address that issue.

Topic closed.

Overview of Work Group Progress on General Transportation Equity and its Potential Impacts on AV

Francois Larrivee, Health and Equity Subcommittee Member

- Francois provided an overview of the work that has been done to date on understanding the potential equity impacts of AVs.
- The group assigned to this task undertook a literature review to develop a baseline understanding. This included a review of the Federal Transit Administration's transportation equity framework.
- The group also came across research by Todd Litman who runs the Victoria Transport Policy Institute (VPTI), in which he suggests a transportation equity framework.
<https://www.vtpi.org/equity.pdf>
 - The equity framework divides equity across horizontal and vertical equity lines.
 - Francois noted that the group would like to see whether the broader subcommittee would be interested in using this framework as a way to help develop and review policies.
- Discussion:
 - Margo pointed out that this is fine, but it is just one of many frameworks available for our reference.

Topic Closed.

Questions, Discussion, Next Steps

All



WASHINGTON STATE
AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE
WORK GROUP

MEETING SUMMARY

- A reminder was made that the next meeting of the Executive Committee will be September 23rd.

Topic closed.

NEXT TELECONFERENCE MEETING: September 15th, 2020 12pm – 1pm

MEETING ADJOURNED.