State of Maine
Commission on Autonomous Vehicles
Meeting Minutes
June 5, 2019 – Department of Transportation - Augusta


Minutes
There were no changes to the minutes of the April 3rd, 2019 meeting.

Draft Rules
Discussion

Rulemaking Process –
Joyce introduced Toni and her experience with rulemaking.

Routine technical rulemaking (Title 5) is relatively easy for the agencies, but open to the public for involvement.

Rules have the full enforcement of law.

Make sure that the rule isn’t duplicative of other rules/laws.

Prepare a form called the MAPA-3, with proposed rule attached. Decide on having public hearing or not. There’s a 30-day public comment period. We typically have public hearings. Public notice 17-24? days before hearing.

Trade, industry, etc. would be designated as impacted parties.

Publish in major newspapers, etc. that will best reach the impacted parties.

Major policy decision maker is required to attend the hearing.

Typical 10-day period for comment after hearing, but can be extended as needed.

Need to enact the rule within 120 days of the end of the comment period.

Need to respond to all comments made in this period (Ferry service hearing received around 400 comments, but comments can be grouped together based on theme.

Basis statement and any tweaks made to rulemaking as a result of public comment.

Prepare a MAPA-4 – Goes to the Commissioner, then AG office, then file with Secretary of State. Once approved and posted on the website, it takes effect 5 days after that.

Joyce stated that would like this enacted by the end of the year, with public hearing.

Toni suggested that we should share it with AG ahead of time to assure that we have rulemaking authority.

Patty stated that the DOT is the lead, so it will indeed go through DOT commissioner.
Joyce mentioned that a self-driving trucking company has contacted the DOT and was inquiring about what they need to do to drive here legally.

Draft Rules –
The draft rules have been updated to address the comments made by the Commission.

Lena wanted to discuss the insurance section – what type of insurance do we want to require for the drivers of the vehicle? Frank explained that it is typically the vehicle itself is insured.

Lena pointed out that perhaps “Inspection” should be “Motor Vehicle Inspection” to differentiate from just a company’s internal inspection. Lt. Bruce Scott explained that there isn’t a special inspection process for HAVs. Also, we have reciprocity with all other states, so out-of-state registration and inspections would be valid.

Lena mentioned that we may want to capture the goal of the specific pilot project (braking, platooning, etc.) in the description of the Prospective Pilot Project.

Melissa pointed out that perhaps 6a should be somewhere else. Financial capacity doesn’t have much bearing on insurance.

Lena mentioned that perhaps we should have a standardized MOU template to include. Joyce mentioned that we will work on the template and the actual application.

Lena mentioned that “elected officials” in 8b should be changed to deal with different municipalities.

Melissa mentioned that we should clarify who should be the one that carries the insurance.

Kara mentioned that in 8b, “application” should be “applicant”. General formatting (capitalization, indentations, etc.).

Data collection concerns.

Lena mentioned that we should outline the actual process of completing and submitting an application.

Discussion about the 30-day period for acceptance or denial of application. Settled on 30-day period being sufficient.

Update instances of “certified letter” to include an electronic option.

Doreen mentioned that we should clear up the reapplication process – spell out how a denied applicant makes changes and applies again, including timeline.

Doreen mentioned that perhaps substantial changes to the pilot may not be made without prior approval from the Commission.

Kara mentioned that wording should be changed to “Approved pilot projects are valid for one year from issuance of permit.”

Tom Lynch mentioned that we have more of a discussion of what we should ask for in terms of data. Members will put together their thoughts.

Kara mentions that we should send our draft to some other states to get their feedback.

Joyce, Parker, and Kara will put together the draft application. MOU will come later.

We should clarify the crash reporting section. Remove “general”, “approximate”, and “to the extent known.” Lt. Bruce Scott mentioned that incidents under $1000 property damage don’t typically receive crash reports, but we would still want to know about these incidents.

Need to change date of next meeting due to long weekend to June 26th.
Action Items
- Send in comments on draft within one week.
- Tom (and others) will put together thoughts on data needs.
- Joyce, Parker, and Kara will update the draft.

Agenda Items for Next Meeting

Public Comment
There were no comments from the public.

Adjourn
Next meeting scheduled for June 26th at MaineDOT.