

Washington State AV Work group - Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee
February 8th, 2019
Lacey Community Center – 9am-12pm
6729 Pacific Ave SE - Lacey, WA 98503

Minutes for Distribution (03-27-2019)

Welcome, Introductions, Opening Remarks

Roger Millar

- Introductions from all attendees – name and represented organization (*see separate attachment for sign-in sheet*)
 - Second Infrastructure & Systems subcommittee meeting, first held on October 2, 2018.
 - Some joining by phone for note taking purposes. Future call-in capabilities will be evaluated.
-

Highlights from the Oct 24th AV Executive Committee Working Group Meeting

Roger Millar

- Executive Committee (EC) to refill any open legislative appointments – 4 House and 4 Senate seats
- Work product and budget requests of various subcommittees:
 - Infrastructure & Systems – [See Report](#) ; No recommendations.
 - Liability – [See Report](#) ; No recommendations.
 - Licensing – [See Report](#) ; No recommendations.
 - Safety – [See Report](#) ; 2 recommendations:
 - **Health Impact Assessment** – Conduct a modified Health Impact Assessment with an emphasis on identifying disproportionate impacts on disadvantaged populations.
 - **Educate the Public** – Develop a multi-phased communications plan to gauge public awareness of and attitude towards AVs; and educate public on AV testing in WA.
 - System Technology & Data Security – [See Report](#) ; No recommendations.
- Review of agencies’ use of assigned budgets for AV efforts
- Discussed EC’s role:
 - Sounding board / Information exchange
 - EC budget requests to go through participating agencies (State Patrol, Traffic Safety Commission, Insurance Commission, etc.)
 - Budget requests to support subcommittees go through WSTC
- Discussed whether to extend membership of EC
 - Not represented – Business, cities, counties, environmental, and labor
 - WSTC has authority to augment membership
 - Subcommittees do or can provide representation of currently unrepresented groups
- EC reconvening meetings in June 2019
- No comments, questions, or additions from subcommittee meeting attendees.

Topic Closed.

Public Comment

Roger Millar

- No public came forward with comment.

Topic Closed.

Review comments received prior to meeting: 2019 Draft Action Plan

(See attached Infrastructure & Systems Subcommittee 2019 Draft Action Plan)

ACTIVITY 1

Ted Bailey / Daniela Bremmer

- Overview: Develop draft state AV policy goals and potential strategies with illustrative actions, based on state, regional and national policy examples. The intended result of the goals, strategies and actions should be measurable and support Washington State's existing transportation policy goals..
- Comments/recommendation actions received during review period were generally supportive of approach
 - Before developing a draft state AV policy, define the boundaries for this subcommittee when preparing for future and infrastructure? The Federal Highway Administration Joint Programs Office has prepared a report, [FHWA-JPO-18-629](#), Guidelines for Applying Capability Maturity Model Analysis to Connected and Automated Vehicle Deployment, November 2017. This tool may be helpful as activity subgroups look at other states.
 - Include assessment for features unique to our region that could accelerate and/or challenge our ability to adopt AV
 - Work Plan activities will inform these questions/comments and examples and move forward with something this group can use to develop recommendations for EC
 - The AV Safety Subcommittee's recommended action to perform a Health Impact Study (HIA) – What does that mean for AV? How is this different from a social justice screen?
- Infrastructure funding discussion:
 - Should policy discussion in this subcommittee include the funding and management of the infrastructure we are evaluating for AVs?
 - Funding the infrastructure expectations/needs that this group evaluates is key.
 - Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC) is conducting a road usage charge (RUC) – pilot underway.
 - Evaluating per-mile fee replacement of gas tax.
 - Providing policy papers on how future technologies impact revenues.
 - Don't duplicate efforts in this subcommittee.

- Try to keep a reasonable scope. Suggest this subcommittee specifically focus on what the *impact* of AVs is on infrastructure
 - Impacts of AVs on funding is a larger conversation than just infrastructure – curb access, parking, bonds, etc.: There are several implications for funding when it comes to AVs.
ACTION ITEM: (Roger Millar) Ask the Executive Committee how they would like to handle the infrastructure funding question – as part of the Infrastructure & Systems subcommittee or separately (e.g. should the subcommittee engage discussions surrounding alternative transportation funding sources to the traditional fuel tax)?
- Group discussion on adopting Activity 1 based on the intended amendments (*tracked changes in the Draft Action Plan document*):
 - Agree to adopt this activity, with needed clarity on what falls under subcommittee’s purview.
 - Funding as part of policy discussion (Pending Executive Committee input)
 - Focus on current, near-term changes or future infrastructure needs
 - Focus on current testing/deployment or potential future applications
 - Research regional/national examples and best practices only, or extend to international applications
 - Other work being done at national and international level: [Policy, Legislative & Regulatory Working Group](#) (NOCoE – AASHTO, ITE, ITSA, etc.); SAE, NCSL, MaaS Alliance, AAMVA also looking at this.

DECISION: Activity 1 (as amended) adopted.

Topic Closed.

ACTIVITY 2

Ted Bailey and Daniela Bremmer

- Overview: Develop selection criteria for identifying potential pilots/projects.
 - Original work plan proposal was to develop a prioritized list of suggested deployment projects that were referenced in the membership survey. This approach was revised following the group’s feedback during the draft work plan review. Proposed funding sources: Intent for project proposers to include how they plan to fund work as part of proposal. Potential grant funding as an option
- Group discussion on Activity 2:
 - Activity subgroup will draft recommendation for EC then Legislature.
 - Previous survey lists potential pilots/projects, can be used as starting point to determine criteria.
 - One reason for changing vision of activity is that this is a self-selected group. Need to make sure actual pilot/project selection is done through an open, competitive process.

- What is the scope of the selection criteria? Yes/No only? Only for projects seeking state funding?
 - Activity subgroup to research further and provide recommendations.
 - What are near-term things that can be done to prepare (private and public entities)?
 - Example: Could a city geo-fence a part of their space, setting up traffic signals to communicate with AVs for a pilot? Does this criteria allow for that?
 - Near-term is important, but don't want to be limiting. Criteria should look at potential future applications as well.
- ACTION ITEM:*** (Group) “near-term” is to be kept in the language of Activity 2, but provide definition/clarification on what “near-term” means in this context, in writing in the Draft Action Plan.
- Eastern WA has different perspectives than Western WA. Rural/eastern often has limited staff (e.g. 1 Engineer). Need to consider what is equitable and doable for non-metropolitan areas.
 - Focusing on solving current problems, may not have capacity to add pilots/projects based on future needs.
 - Suggest identifying pilots/projects that solve existing problems while also testing AVs (e.g. DSRC in traffic controllers allow for AV testing, also provide cheap solution to current controllers).
 - Project selection criteria should include that near term projects to be selected should address existing problems/needs.
 - Don't see representation from technology providers here. Are technology providers represented at national groups?
 - Yes – example: CAT coalition (AASHTO, ITSA, ITE) invited Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) and technology companies to bring that perspective to the conversation.
 - Criteria may be different if wholly state funded vs. partially private sector funded as a partnership

DECISION: Activity 2 (as amended) adopted.

Topic Closed.

ACTIVITY 3

Jeff DeVere (Peloton Technologies)

- Peleton Technologies:
 - Truck platooning technology, driver assisted.
 - Enhances safety and fuel savings.
 - Following truck connects to lead truck, following truck goes into “cruise control” mode.
 - Current laws and Governor's Executive Order allow truck platooning now
 - Peloton testing facility in Mt. Vernon, limited testing planned with PACCAR along a rural section of the I-5 corridor north of Mt. Vernon.

- Peloton to provide 2019 year-end testing data for Activity 3 – weather, truck types, OEMs, other meaningful data
- Work Plan Activity 3 changed from “what to do to make it happen?” to “what has Peloton found out/learned as they are making it happen?” since subcommittee first met, technology and testing is moving quickly
- Group discussion on Activity 3:
 - Should subcommittee define what data is needed to measure safety, other metrics, and evaluate expectations/needs of infrastructure?
 - Some attendees agreed that subcommittee should define desired dataset.
 - Other attendees agreed that for this initial data gathering phase, should not restrict potential collaboration with private AV testing entities by defining exactly what data we want.
 - Group suggested expanding Activity 3 to reach out to all currently self-certified entities testing/deploying in WA state
 - Learn what type of testing/deployment is being done, how it is going, what lessons are being learned
 - Foster entrepreneurship and innovation
 - Be generally consistent in what questions we ask of each entity, and what data we ask for from each entity
 - Try to collect data from private entities without exposing proprietary data
 - AVs present less reliance on infrastructure, can communicate directly with infrastructure and other vehicles – may not need signage, illumination, etc.
 - Need to balance with existing vehicles that require drivers and may not be connected

Discussed Mobility-on-Demand (MoD) smartphone app deployments, provides user choice in evolving transportation world.

ACTION ITEM: (All Subcommittee Members) If a member has a suggestion for an additional activity to include in the Infrastructure & Systems Subcommittee 2019 Action Plan, email Ted Bailey with the following information to be reviewed by subcommittee members for consideration:

- Activity Description
 - Target Outcome
 - Roles and Responsibilities of Activity Volunteers (self-identified subcommittee members)
 - Deliverables and Timelines for Completion
 - Note: as of March 27th, 2019 no emails with additional suggestions have been received.
- Integration of AV/CAV activities in existing transportation plans. Subcommittee’s Work Plan should inform existing local and regional Transportation Plans, not create a new one. Multiple attendees brought up potential Activity 4 options, including aligning transportation plans, developing

KPIs/metrics and investment priorities, and define the private vs. public role in future infrastructure investments.

***DECISION:** Activity 3 adopted (as amended) with the addition of the following action: “Reach out to all entities that are currently self-certified by the WA DOL to test and/or deploy AVs in the state to gather information about AV testing and deployment and discuss data sharing, partnership and future needs from the transportation infrastructure and services. All self-certified entities will be asked a similar set of questions, including what data points and results they may be able and willing to share with the state.”*

Topic Closed.

Additional Discussion / Approve the 2019 Action Plan

Activity #1 – Policy Framework: Overview and Identify sub-committee member lead(s); –

Example Policy Framework:

Overview of [WSDOT CAT Draft Policy Framework](#) to set stage for what Activity 1 research might entail – informational (Daniela Bremmer, WSDOT)

Request for Activity 1 “Policy Framework” Volunteers: [Identify sub-committee member and lead\(s\)](#) (Roger Millar and Ted Bailey)

- Activity 1 Volunteers
 1. Francesca Maier, Fair Cape Consulting LLC
 2. Dan McReynolds, Parametrix, APWA Transportation Committee Chair
 3. Mariya Frost – Washington Policy Center, Director, Coles Center for Transportation
 4. Mark Daily - Thurston Regional Planning Council, Executive Director
 5. Sam Yaghmaie, Harris & Associates, Senior Director
 6. Cecile Malik – City of Auburn
- Subgroup to identify lead(s), structure, timelines
- See work plan for additional details

Activity #2 – Project Selection Criteria: Overview and Identify sub-committee member lead(s);

Sample Project Selection Criteria:

Share Seattle DOT Pilot Evaluation Scorecard – Informational

- Seattle DOT Pilot Evaluation Scorecard:
 - Seattle DOT, Sound Transit, King County, Metro all using
 - Planning and evaluation tool for pilot projects

- Using on existing pilots and to plan new ones, helpful to identify key metrics, equity impacts, etc.
- Plan to use widely across agencies, planning and evaluation of the next iteration of EV charging and right-way permit pilots.
- Not every category is filled out for every pilot. Suggest picking one to three key performance metrics from the scorecard.

Request for Activity 2 Volunteers: Identify sub-committee member and lead(s)
(Roger Millar and Ted Bailey)

ACTION ITEM: (Activity 2 Volunteers) Get results from Activity 1, then come up with something starting with the Seattle’s scorecard example.

- Activity 2 Volunteers:
 1. Brian Brooke – Sound Transit, Deputy Director of Innovation and Performance
 2. Robert Acevedo, HDR, Traffic Design Lead
 3. Jakeh Roberts – City of Monroe, Public Works O&M Manager
 4. Jim Peters – DKS Associates, Principle and National Director of Transportation Technology
 5. Chris Johnson – Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, Director of Government Relations
 6. Francesca Maier, Fair Cape Consulting LLC Request for Activity 3 Volunteers
- Subgroup to identify lead(s), structure, timelines
- See work plan for additional details

Request for Activity 3 Volunteers: -Identify sub-committee member and lead(s)
(Roger Millar and Ted Bailey)

Activity 3 Volunteers:

1. Scott Kuzinski, Consultant
 2. John Milbrath – AAA Washington, Vice President Member Services
 3. Robert Acevedo – HDR, Traffic Design Lead
 4. Brian Brooke – Sound Transit, Deputy Director of Innovation and Performance
- Subgroup to identify lead(s), structure, timelines
 - See work plan for additional details

ACTION ITEM: (All Subcommittee Members) If a member would like to volunteer for one of the activities (1-3) that did not already do so during the 2/8 meeting, email Ted Bailey and Daniela Bremmer.

ACTION ITEM: (Ted Bailey) Follow up with volunteers for each activity with more information on the activity, target outcomes, deliverables and timelines.

Topic Closed.

Discuss interest in adding an April 2019 Meeting

Roger Millar

- Need to meet before Roger Millar presents to Executive Committee. Everyone OK with an April meeting?
 - *Group:* YES.

ACTION ITEM: (Ted Bailey) Identify April meeting date and location, one of two dates presented in agenda – April 12th or 26th, (**April 26th was selected for the next meeting**).

Topic Closed.

Next Meetings

April 12th or 26th, 2019 (*see above agenda item*)

June 25th or 27th, 2019 (*TBD – Will be determined at April meeting*)

Topic Closed.

Other Business

ACTION ITEM: (Ted Bailey) Follow up with subcommittee members on actions / decisions taken at 2/8/19 meeting.

No other business.

Meeting Adjourned.