



MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting: Safety Subcommittee
Location: State Farm, 1000 Wilmington Drive, DuPont
Date: March 12, 2019

Attendees:

First Name	Last Name	Organization	Executive Committee Member? (Y/N)
Debi	Besser	Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC)	N
Kenton	Brine	NW Insurance Council	N
Brian	Chandler	DKS Associates	N
Jennifer	Cook	AAA Washington	N
Ty	Cordova	State Farm Insurance	N
Doug	Dahl	WTSC	N
Andrew	Dannenberg	University of Washington	N
Aimee	D'Avignon	Washington Department of Health	N
Mandie	Dell	WTSC	N
Dan	Hall	Washington State Patrol (WSP)	N
Mari	Hembeck	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA)	N
Mi Ae	Lipe	Driving in the Real World	N
Steve	Marshall	City of Bellevue	N
Mark	Medalen	WTSC	N
John	Milton	Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)	N
Markell	Moffett	WSP USA	N
Pam	Pannkuk	WTSC	N
Paul	Parker	WA State Transportation Commission (WSTC)	N
Paula	Reeves	Washington Department of Health	N
Carla	Sawyer	Sawyer and Associates	N
Yes	Segura	Smash the Box	N
Mike	Southards	Washington Trucking Association	N
Warren	Stanley	WSDOT	N
Shannon	Walker	Seattle DOT	N
Angie	Ward	WTSC	N
Alan	Werner	Washington Society of Professional Engineers (WSPE)	N

MEETING SUMMARY

Welcome and Introductions

Dan Hall, Debi Besser, and Kenton Brine

- Introductions and meeting attendees captured

Review 2018 Activities

Dan Hall

- 3 subcommittee meetings have been held up to this point
 - #1 – Brainstorming exercise, priority topics to focus on
 - #2 and #3 – Defining priority topics into recommendations for the Executive Committee
 - At the last meeting, two recommendations were put forward for the Executive Committee, and questions the Licensing subcommittee should review were submitted
- Late 2018, Dan Hall (WSP) met with the Executive Committee to give overview of Safety subcommittee recommendations (only subcommittee to put forth recommendations at this point)
 - Recommendation: Educate the Public
 - Hesitant about the cost (\$1 million over 3 years)
 - Executive Committee requested the subcommittee look further into the cost and how it could be supplemented or revised prior to recommending to the Legislature
 - Look into grant funding opportunities
 - University of Washington may have grant / research funding options
 - Look into what other states are doing to relieve cost burdens
 - Work on ways to provide more specific information on what costs are for and potential funding sources
 - Recommendation: Modified Health Impact Assessment (HIA)
 - Status of the HIA recommendation as of 3/12/19:
 - Transportation Commission included in AV Workgroup Formal Report to Legislature as a recommendation
 - Legislature is now in session, recommendation will be reviewed in Report
 - Talking points (“one-pager”) was developed for recommendation
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Talking Points will be provided to subcommittee members/interested parties list
 - For future subcommittee meetings, co-chairs will make sure any information/status on the HIA recommendation is provided

MEETING SUMMARY

- If funding is not approved for the modified HIA, some work may still be able to be done if other resources can be found.
 - Subcommittee could discuss how the modified HIA should be structured and implemented
 - Could use other potential sources of funding, such as University research/grant funding
 - Groundwork can be done to make a stronger case for resubmittal of recommendation
- Reminder to subcommittee of the other 5 subcommittees and brief status on their progress

Review and Discuss Draft Charter

Dan Hall, Debi Besser, and Kenton Brine

- Executive Committee direction for subcommittee charter is to detail membership list and member voting requirements
- Up to this point, subcommittee has been using consensus-based decision making. Moving forward, more formal voting structure will be implemented.
- Subcommittee charter details ground rules, quorum, how member gets removed, etc.
- Vision for the charter is to ensure the subcommittee operates fairly, consistently, and in alignment with the mission of the subcommittee
- Subcommittee needs structure and procedures (e.g. Roberts Rules of Order for Legislature)
- Subcommittee reviewed Charter:
 - Section 1 – Background: No comments.
 - Section 2 – Purpose: No comments.
 - Section 3 – Scope and High-Level Requirements:
 - Bullet that refers to “equitable access” – What does equitable access mean in this context?
 - This language was selected to express – evaluating the benefits and burdens of this new technology on disadvantaged populations, and whether it is disproportionate.
 - We want to take a proactive role to make sure we do not go down a path that disproportionately burdens disadvantaged populations.
 - In this context, it is not specific to access. Suggest pulling “access” out of the language to present broader evaluation of equity
 - *Subcommittee charter updated live to revise language related to equity*
 - Bullet that refers to hazards and vulnerable road users – Suggest more expansive language to address response to infrastructure, systems, and vehicles

MEETING SUMMARY

- Could change to a more inclusive word, such as “environment”
 - Change to an inclusive word – environment
 - Do not want to overlap too much with Infrastructure and Systems subcommittee, focus on safety objectives
 - *Subcommittee charter updated live to revise language related to Vehicles’ safe recognition of and response to environment, such as infrastructure, vehicles and vulnerable road users*
- Section 4 – Subcommittee Leadership:
 - How the private co-chair was to be selected/appointed was left blank for open discussion. Should private co-chair be selected by public co-chair? Nominated and elected? Volunteer directly?
 - Attendees agreed that private co-chair should be nominated and elected (voting by subcommittee members only)
 - Subcommittee charter updated live
 - Public co-chair will be selected by WSP and WTSC. If a public co-chair steps down (end of term, left position, etc.), WSP and WTSC will select replacement directly.
 - Added “including but not limited to” language to co-chair responsibilities list
 - Section 5 – Subcommittee Membership:
 - Want to make sure membership is inclusive
 - Important Item of Note: Voting membership limited to 1 person per org/division (e.g. WSDOT separate divisions with separate visions can each vote 1 person)
 - May create an imbalance if some organizations have many divisions while others do not (and therefore would only get 1 vote)
 - Currently, WSP voting members include Dan Hall and Linda Powell – Very separate areas of WSP
 - Suggest a maximum number of voting members per organization. No more than 3?
 - WA Dept. of Health currently has two members, but will consult with each other and be have a unified WA Dept. of Health vote
 - All attendees can share opinions, but suggest only one formal vote per organization
 - WSDOT is a good example of an organization that should have more than one vote
 - WSDOT is a very large organization
 - Representatives from different divisions will have differing opinions on many topics

MEETING SUMMARY

- Should private organizations get the same weight of a vote as public agencies?
 - How does organization/division split break down for cities?
 - City of Seattle is not one organization. Police, public works, transportation, etc.
 - Suggest evaluation of number of votes per organization on a case-by-case basis
 - Not uncommon to assign different number of allowed voting members per organization (e.g. WSDOT may have 3, WSP has 2)
 - What are we bringing to the table vs. how many votes are coming from a department?
 - Bringing different expertise...road users, data, DOH, etc.
 - Consider that in many cases DOT and DOH have roles that expand beyond state level, going to local level....multiple ways we are looking at this work.
 - Note that we record the consensus position and all dissenting opinions. The voices of dissent will still be heard and communicated to the Executive Committee.
 - Suggest adding statement to charter “we strive for consensus and include dissenting opinions”.
 - Are we creating a silo by saying 3-4 organization members attend meetings, then they must huddle together to get only one vote?
 - Suggest a compromise – Allow more than 1 vote per organization, but not unlimited. Suggest 2 or 3.
 - Informal Vote of Attendees – 2 or 3 voting members allowed per organization:
 - 3 voting members – 5 votes
 - 2 voting members – 3 votes
 - Either 2 or 3 Works – 5 votes
 - What if the standard is 1 voting member per organization, and at the discretion of subcommittee co-chairs, an organization can have up to 3?
 - **DECISION:** Standard voting membership per organization is 1, and at discretion of co-chairs an organization can have up to 3.
 - *Charter updated live – “However, exceptions may be made by the co-chairs on a case-by-case basis and communicated to the sub-committee, if there are*
-

significantly different functions within an organization, to a maximum of 3 members.”

- Note: Charter can be amended at a later date if this voting member structure needs to change.
 - Subcommittee wants to make sure everyone that wants to participate is able to, however voting is limited.
 - Maximum of 40 voting members. If voting membership is too large, getting a quorum at each meeting may be difficult.
 - Question on minimum voting member requirements (noted as 15) – Are there ramifications if the subcommittee does not have *enough* members?
 - *Charter revised for minimum voting membership “should be a minimum of 15”*
 - The membership list included in the charter includes all previous subcommittee meeting attendees.
 - **ACTION ITEM – Revisions to Membership List:**
 - If someone currently listed no longer wants to be a voting member, contact one of the co-chairs to be removed
 - If someone not currently listed would like to become a voting member, must attend at least one subcommittee meeting and then request to be added by one of the co-chairs.
 - If a member misses two consecutive meetings, a co-chair will contact them to discuss removal of membership.
 - Once a member has been removed, can follow same rules as new members – attend at least one meeting, then request to be added as a member.
 - If a member can only attend electronically/over the phone, it is still counted as attendance. A representative can also be sent on the member’s behalf (includes proxy voting rights).
 - Anyone can be on the interested party list to receive emails/information about the subcommittee without being a voting member.
 - Section 6 – Meetings and Schedules: No comments.
 - Section 7 – Member Responsibilities: No comments.
 - Section 8 – Ground Rules:
 - Clarification of “no sidebars” requested – A quick ‘sidebar’ conversation during a meeting is permitted, just request that sidebars do not become distracting and disruptive to the meeting.
 - Section 9 – Voting:
 - Noted that interested parties can attend meetings and contribute to conversation, just do not have voting rights.
-

MEETING SUMMARY

- Section 10 – Current Assumptions of Automated Vehicle Deployment:
 - Level 3 vehicles are not being released for consumer purchase yet, suggest changing language to “imminent for release”
 - *Charter language revised*
 - Question – What is the highest level of AVs?
 - Level 5 – Vehicle can travel anywhere, anytime without a driver
 - Scoping question –So far, passenger/ground transportation AVs have been the subcommittee’s on passenger/ground transportation. There are other types, such as personal delivery devices (PDD) on sidewalks. What falls within the scope of this subcommittee? Any guidance from WSTC or the Executive Committee?
 - No guidance provided at this time. Suggest keeping a broad scope, as other subcommittees are doing.
 - Comment that current assumptions seems out of place in this document. Suggest removing from the charter, and placing in another type of document.
 - Infrastructure & Systems subcommittee has a Work/Action Plan. That may be a better fit for the current assumptions.
 - Section 11 – Guiding Principles:
 - Rather than addressing disadvantaged populations specifically, suggest addressing impact on people as a whole.
 - Important to call out disadvantaged populations, if we don’t then they often get overlooked. Creating a system that serves broader people risks not addressing disadvantaged populations. Further widens the gap of equity. Maintain focus and awareness of disadvantaged populations.
 - Older and younger are important populations to call out as well.
 - Suggest inclusion language that covers religion, sexuality, gender, etc.
 - Guiding Principles should be broader – Accelerate the adoption of AVs in WA to increase overall road safety.
 - Easier to get where you want to go.
 - Less expensive.
 - More accessible.
 - Celebrate adoption of these technologies to increase overall road safety.
 - Other state policies should include AZ and NV.
 - Suggestion: Take the guiding principles and assumptions out of the charter and put into a Work/Action Plan. Can be discussed in more depth at the next subcommittee meeting.
 - **DECISION:** A Work/Action Plan will be drafted to incorporate guiding principles and assumptions that are being removed from charter.
-

MEETING SUMMARY

- **ACTION ITEM:** A Work/Action Plan will be drafted and sent out to subcommittee members/interested parties prior to the next meeting to review, think about, and provide written feedback.
- How does the subcommittee want to address those listed on the charter membership list that are not in attendance today?
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Co-chairs will reach out and find out if they would like to be a member moving forward.

Topic closed.

Finalize Charter

Dan Hall, Debi Besser, and Kenton Brine

- **ACTION ITEM:** Co-chairs will finalize changes made in this meeting and send revised charter out for review and comment.
- Start of next subcommittee meeting will include approval of finalized subcommittee charter
- Can electronic (email or online survey) voting mechanisms be used to approve subcommittee charter prior to next meeting?
 - WSTC AV Workgroup and Executive Committee guidance is that formal voting must be conducted during subcommittee meetings, either in-person or by virtual attendance.

Topic closed.

Future Meetings

Dan Hall, Debi Besser, and Kenton Brine

- What topics do we want to work on/delve into?
 - If the subcommittee recommends moving ahead on something, does the subcommittee have input on steering that recommendation?
 - Case-by-case basis. Depends on how we want to recommend, what to include in what is submitted to the Executive Committee and Legislature. It can include recommendations for a steering committee with subcommittee membership.
 - How AVS and related technology specifically relates to counties, cities, state DOTs. How it affects localities, MPOs, smaller cities.
 - How will we measure and evaluate impact to safety? Should metrics be developed by this subcommittee?
 - Efforts to get law enforcement and first responders educated, up-to-speed on AVs.
-

MEETING SUMMARY

- Potential role for this subcommittee is to recommend framework for what type of information we would like to receive from AV testing and deployment companies. Can we ask currently self-certified companies to provide information related to safety?
 - UW If the modified HIA moves forward, UW Professor Andrew Dannenberg could give a presentation on HIAs to the subcommittee (teaches an HIA course)
 - Are there organizations not currently represented on the subcommittee that should be (e.g. Institute of Traffic Engineers)
 - Should we recruit/target specific types of organizations that could bring different perspectives?
 - Yes, if there are organizations missing that someone feels should be represented, please invite them.
 - The initial invitation to join the subcommittee was very broad. May be good to redistribute original invite to see who got it.
 - The subcommittee recommended public education – we also need to educate ourselves. What are we doing to educate the public?
 - Whether we emphasize demonstrations and pilots, it is one thing to tell folks what the issues are, another thing to kick the tires.
 - There is a grant proposal into FHWA for a flexible, EV, and ultimately AV commute/van pool program.
 - If public education includes testing/pilots, should include those as a discussion at next meeting.
 - Question re: implementation of the Public Education communications plan – It notes that implementation will begin as early as July 1, 2020. That means the subcommittee would not start implementing *until* then, correct?
 - The plan was to send the next year developing/writing it, then implement.
 - The Public Education recommendation was not pushed forward by the Executive Committee, so no action is expected to be taken on the recommendation at this time.
 - Public education on AVs should have started a long time ago. People are asking questions now. It can be a real safety hazard. Know there is a need to spend time developing a communications plan, but potentially some type of head-start initiative to address driver assistive technology would be good now.
 - What message should be taken to the Executive Committee to press the urgency of this topic?
 - Subcommittee needs to prioritize that discussion. Out in the real world, people are asking questions now.
 - Importance of sharing with people who are already buying vehicles that have AV technology embedded – what is included, how it works, etc.
-

MEETING SUMMARY

- Should encourage OEMs and dealerships to have internal education processes, informing vehicle purchasers what features come with their car, how the features work and how the features interact with the driver, the vehicle, and the roadway.
 - Suggest reaching out to the OEM and dealer community, push for standardized communications and messaging
 - Driving instructors as well, teaching next generation of drivers.
 - What is communications materials are already out there?
 - There is a website called “mycardoeswhat.com” – Need to research how informative and helpful it actually is, may be a useful tool.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** Any subcommittee member/meeting attendee that has a newer vehicle with driver assistive technology, please check the website to see if the information provided may be useful for further exploration by the subcommittee.
 - A topic of discussion for this subcommittee should be what we can talk about, research, and get out to the public without the additional funding requested for the recommendation.
 - PAVE is an organization that formed this year – Big manufacturers/OEMs working together to develop communications materials on AV technology
 - How do you constructively warn drivers about specific driving scenarios when the technology does not work the way they expected?
 - Suggest a new subcommittee recommendation: Reaching out to drivers through specific channels about driver assistive technology currently available in vehicles. Suggest discussing at next meeting, prioritizing against other work plan topics, and developing a recommendation.
 - Are translation services, in-language materials, inviting representatives from other language groups to get information back to communities included as part of the Educate the Public Recommendation?
 - Yes. The recommendation included leveraging a consulting group that specifically works with disadvantaged populations to make sure those types of things happen.
 - Subcommittee Meeting Frequency:
 - Suggest meeting in May, June, July, September, Nov/Dec.
 - **DECISION:** Attendees agree to this meeting schedule.
-



MEETING SUMMARY

- Suggest having a standard time to set meetings – available options include:
 - 2nd Tuesday afternoon
 - 4th Monday afternoon
 - 2nd Wednesday morning – 9:30am to noon works for folks
 - **DECISION:** 2nd Wednesday of each meeting month, 9:30am-12pm.
- Next meeting will be May 8th 9:30am-12pm
- **ACTION ITEM:** All subcommittee members/meeting attendees can suggest alternate meeting locations for future meetings. Suggest at least one of the 2019 meetings should be in Seattle.

Topic closed.

Next Steps

Dan Hall, Debi Besser, and Kenton Brine

- Previous subcommittee meetings gathered suggested topics, which were narrowed down based on attendee selection and prioritization
- Next meeting (May 8, 2019) to start with approving charter, then identification, selection and prioritization of topic areas for Work Plan

NEXT MEETING: May 8, 2019
