State of Maine
Commission on Autonomous Vehicles
Meeting Minutes
March 6, 2019 – Department of Transportation - Augusta


Minutes
There were no changes to the minutes of the November 7, 2018 meeting.

Draft Rules
- Kara and Parker took Herb’s draft rules and updated them based on the most recent Massachusetts and Pennsylvania rules.

Discussion
Cathie stated that the rules as written may not address general testing (e.g. software testing, “does the software work”) vs. pilot testing (does the software work in this jurisdiction, etc.)
AAMVA guidelines (Jurisdictional Guidelines for the Safe Testing and Deployment of Highly Automated Vehicles) support a lot of the material currently in our rules, but should be revisited for consistency.

- Per AAMVA guidance, consideration should be given to the inclusion of the following:
  - Vehicles should comply with federal motor vehicle safety standards
  - The safety driver or operator is responsible for following all rules of the road and to ensure that the vehicle is following the rules of the road. If there is a violation, then it can be added to the driving record.
    If the vehicle is operated remotely, the “owner” of the vehicle would be responsible.
  - Section 3, B.2. – AAMVA recommends that the company that does the testing also be responsible to do a background check, driving history check, and criminal record check of operators/drivers.
  - Driver should be prohibited from distracted driving.
  - Section 4 – Description of prospective pilot project – consider adding language to have manufacturer map their vehicle to the SAE levels of automation.
  - May want to include definition of “remote driver” – SAE has a good definition.
  - Section 4 – require description of vehicles ability to achieve minimal risk condition (see SAE definition)
  - Some type of certification that in prior testing, the technology and test vehicle were used in a controlled environment before being put on the public roadway.

Other items be added or considered:
- Description of permit termination and/or description of what constitutes annual renewal.
- A safety driver requirement regarding information on prior experience of and involvement with these technologies.
- Description of data required, if any.
- Speed clarifications – will the testing be high or low speed?
- Under the crash reporting section – analysis of crashes including what caused the crash (software/vehicle malfunction or outside factors such another vehicle)
  Requirement on near misses? California might have language regarding “unexpected events”
• It is important to make sure we maintain the ability to revoke or suspend testing as needed.

• Should we consider who the vehicle is serving (e.g. the underserved population)?
  Keep in mind that the ADA covers both physical and mental disabilities.
  This will be important in deployment, but maybe not so much in testing.
  Adding ADA compliance in the application for testing may be restrictive to the applicant. Safety
  should be of utmost importance.
• Do we want to draft a MOA or MOU?
  - Do we need one?
  - Massachusetts only provides a template. Should our rule become overly restrictive, we may
disourage the use of the technologies in our state.
  - Do we allow the jurisdiction and the pilot tester to develop their own MOU/MOA?
    We should maintain flexibility for general testing. It would be unreasonable for a general
tester to stop and get permission and sign a MOU/MOA for each jurisdiction.
• Have we run these by a potential tester yet?
  - Not yet, the members at this meeting are the first to see these.
  Glossary needs work. Some terms were added from Pennsylvania. We may want to add some
  language regarding platooning.

Around the Table
• Bill (L.D. 844) is proposed to prohibit driverless commercial vehicles.
  Lt. Scott stated that there have been discussions to consider reaching out to the sponsor and
making a recommendation to amend the language that would require authorization by the
Commission for driverless testing.
• There is limited awareness of the Commission among state officials and others.

Action Items
• Updated draft with comments/discussion from today and redistribute.
  Please review and send any additional comments.
• MaineDOT staff will begin drafting the application.
• Joyce will send Massachusetts draft(s) to the group.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Public Comment
There were no comments from the public.

Adjourn
Next meeting scheduled for April 3, 2019 at MaineDOT.