Chair Jerry Litt opened the meeting at 9:00 am with introductions by Commissioners.

**Commission Business**

**ACTION**: All meeting summaries approved unanimously.

**ACTION**: Add Directors of Employment Security Department, Department of Labor & Industries, and Department of Health to serve on AV Work Group Executive Committee with addition of Labor and Health & Equity subcommittees. Brings Executive Committee total to 32. Appointments approved unanimously.

Staff recommended 2020 Meeting Dates & Locations, as well as suggested locations for 2021. Commissioner Tortorelli suggested the Commission not convene in towns smaller than a population of 5,000 due to minimal transportation issues, relative to larger locations. The discussion favored keeping small towns on the list of options. Commissioner Tortorelli also stated that the Columbia River Gorge is not an Eastern Washington location. He suggested locations we have not met before, such as Othello and Ephrata in the Columbia Basin area, Liberty Lake out by Spokane, Colville or Chewelah. Paul Parker noted that we did visit Othello when meeting in Moses Lake in 2016.

Commissioner Young recommended shifting the Gorge meeting to 2021 to have Eastern Washington meeting in 2020. Commissioner Batra likes Bellingham and Bellevue. He also noted that Mount Vernon and Burlington are growth areas; he also suggested we consider Yakima. Recommends the Gorge visit to follow-up on tour topics from September 2019, but open to 2021. Overall, consider areas where action is taking place, including I-5 Bridge over Columbia River. Commissioner Jennings recommends the Commission hold off on 2021 in consideration of schedule changes for rate setting that may result if I-976 passes this fall.

The consensus agreed on the 2020 dates and locations as follows:

- Wenatchee – April
- Bellingham – June
- Pullman – September
- Bellevue - November

Oregon has proposed 2020 Tri-State Meeting Dates of August 10-11 or between August 17-21, or a September meeting in addition to a local meeting. The consensus preferred August off and a September Tri-State meeting.
Commission Reports:
- Commissioner Batra attended the ferries conference and participated in tolling meetings.
- Commissioner Tortorelli attended the Regina Clark bridge dedication along with Commissioner Jennings. He delivered the resolution and flag to her son in Spokane.
- Commissioner Jennings noted that everyone signed the back of the sign. He also attended ferry and tolling calls/meetings.
- Commissioner Young attended a San Juan ferries meeting, the PACCAR tour, the JTC tour to Olympic Peninsula and Victoria, and the WSF quarterly meeting.
- Commissioner Litt participated in the tolling subcommittee call.

Staff presented an outline and cover options for the Annual Report. In addition to the cover options presented, Commissioners asked for an additional cover option with scrabble board and tiles thrown up in the air.

**Joint Transportation Committee Presentation - City Needs Assessment**

In June 2019, the Joint Transportation Committee accepted an Assessment of City Funding Needs. The report, led by BERK Consulting, concluded that city transportation investments fall short by about half. The study looked at micro, small, medium, and large cities, with a hard delineation noted for the Transportation Improvement Board funding criteria between small and medium-sized cities.

City transportation costs are increasing faster than revenue (or as revenue shrinks), which leads to deferred maintenance and preservation. In turn, that leads to higher costs for replacement. Although city investments have increased, state and federal funding has been static, or declining. Cities have enacted new taxes and fees in response, but there is pressure to minimize these new taxes / fees.

Overall, cities receive about 8% of state transportation funding. State support is particularly important for operations and maintenance for micro and small cities, and for major projects for medium and large cities.

Cities statewide need $1.9 billion per year just for preservation vs. spending of about $1 billion. The gap is about $190 per person a year, or $0.28 cents in the gas tax. For system expansion, deferred maintenance, spending close to $1.5 billion, but need closer to $3.0 billion. System expansion is not always a choice – the Growth Management Act requires transportation investments to meet system capacity needs.

Two Priority Recommendations:
- Increase funding for preservation
- Increase funding for large-scale investments

Approach
  A. Strengthen local funding options (enhance TBDs, increase gas tax flexibility & clarity, rental car local option). Counties can currently go out for local gas tax of 10%
B. Increased collaboration on efficiency for use of federal funds and for funding of local jurisdictions for use of streets through city as state highways
C. Increase program support and collaboration – better facilitate investments that maximize infrastructure lifecycle

Josh Diekman, Traffic Engineer, Tacoma Public Works, participated on the staff work group, which included Tacoma as a case study for the Needs Assessment. Tacoma struggles to meet funding needs for its aging infrastructure. He emphasized the efforts to utilize the existing local funding options.

Commissioner Young asked what funding sources would be impacted with passage of I-976. Mr. Diekman said that local funding sources would be impacted (TBD car tab), but there also would be a multiplier effect from lack of investment from Sound Transit, etc.

Commissioner Tortorelli asked how many Transportation Benefit Districts rely on a license fee and how many on sales tax. Sherri Hsu of Berk Consulting, said that as of 2017, 49 cities have adopted license fees, 27 adopted a sales tax, and some have both (total: 105).

Commissioner Young asked if cities lose the local funding mechanisms from the initiative, how much larger would the $1 billion funding gap become? Logan Bahr, Government Relations Advocate, Association of Washington Cities, reported that TBD repeal would cost cities $60 million per year. Over 6 years, OFM has estimated a $1.4 billion hit to the multi-modal account; $1.9 billion to Sound Transit; $1.4 billion to the state; and $350 million to cities.

The City of Ritzville, another case study city in the Needs Assessment, relies on real estate property tax, motor vehicle fuel tax, and utility tax revenues for maintenance and operations. It was able to fund some crack seal preservation funding in last year to address five-year backlog. It also needs to improve the ability of certain streets to handle heavy trucks from over-height loads diverted from I-90 because of a BNSF railroad bridge, as well as seasonal agricultural traffic.

Ritzville is not using all funding options because the revenues would be minimal, and it has already gone to voters for sewer and water taxes. Ritzville does not have a TBD and has not estimated the impact of I-976.

Commissioner Batra asked why cities receive 8% of the $9.8 billion transportation budget. With the need to maintain 20% of state’s centerline miles and 25% of traffic, doesn’t it make sense that more money go to cities for preservation and maintenance. The solutions in the report will not be sufficient, we need additional money in the system.

Brian Murphy, Berk Consulting, agreed. The primary recommendation is to increase support for preservation (which includes increased investment).
Ashley Probart, Executive Director, Transportation Improvement Board, added that cities need more dedicated state funding; not just more state grant funding.

Mr. Probart also suggested additional investment in city streets that serve as necessary diversion from state highways, or are otherwise relied on as de facto part of state highway system (such as Ritzville example). He encouraged action to strategically mix and match when and where to use federal funds (or not.)

Commissioner Tortorelli asked if it is time to look again at re-categorizing state routes. Mr. Probart said that state route designation was last done in 1990-91 (route jurisdiction transfer study), so yes it does deserve another look to address the noted gaps being funded by cities.

Reema Griffith, Executive Director, Washington State Transportation Commission, said that Steve Gorcester would agree with the need to re-designate state routes. She said the Commission may want to recommend a new route study in its Annual Report. Mr. Probart added that three decades of the Growth Management Act have changed characteristics of state highways within growth areas; many act more like city streets now.

**JTC Assessment of City Transportation Funding**

**TIB Strategically Federalizing Projects**

**Action:** None.

**Follow-Up:** None at this time.

**Oregon House Bill 2881, expanding the OreGO program**

Oregon enacted legislation this year revising its Road Usage Charge program. Maureen Bock explained how House Bill 2881 implements a suite of policy changes recommended by Oregon’s Road User Fee Task Force to stabilize and expand the OreGO program. Oregon’s rate is 1.7 cents/mile and it is indexed to the gas tax rate.

Policy Goals of HB 2881:
- Collect revenue equitably
- Increase public understanding of the transportation funding problem
- Build appreciation for the road charge solution
- Expand OReGO to learn how to manage a larger program

Executive Order 17-21 promotes Electric Vehicle adoption, its directives include:
- Promoting EV enrollment in OReGO in lieu of the registration surcharge (2017)
- Exploring point of sale enrollment in OReGO (2019)

If you enroll in OreGO, you pay base registration, but not the $110 surcharge. We assume that in 2021, 5% of new vehicles would enroll each year, and 3% of previously enrolled vehicles would leave. Three percent of revenue not accounted for. With HB 2881, no vehicle under 20 mpg can newly enroll.
What’s next?

- Interoperability demonstration
- Test clearinghouse requirements, possibly with a block chain clearinghouse model
- Evaluate RUC for local governments
- Connected vehicle ecosystem
- Share the Mobility Marketplace Vision: a mobility marketplace where the user experience is paramount. This envisions having private sector service providers providing services like RUC, tolling, parking and other such services

**OreGo Program**

**Action:** None.
**Follow-Up:** None at this time.

**Road Usage Charge Assessment Report - ACTION**

In 2012, the Legislature directed the WSTC to identify a sustainable, long-term funding source for transportation, and assess a road usage charging as a possible replacement for the gas tax. The WSTC has been conducting this assessment since 2012 with the strong support of a 28 member steering committee from the start. Our work and recommendations to the Legislature on RUC is based upon the findings and work of the Steering Committee.

The results of the research and findings will be submitted to the Legislature, Governor, and USDOT in early January for their consideration. It will be up to the Legislature to decide if it wants to proceed with RUC and if so, how to proceed.

Throughout the assessment, the Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC) has taken public comment in a variety of ways. Public comment will continue to be collected as this work moves forward.

In this session, Commissioners will review findings and recommendations of the Road Usage Charge Steering Committee, identify preliminary findings and recommendations for the Legislature, and provide direction regarding the RUC Assessment Final Report.

**Finding:** Test drivers became more in favor of RUC over the gas tax throughout the year, with 68% of respondents preferring RUC over the gas tax (or preferred it equally to the gas tax) by the end of the pilot, while 19% preferred the gas tax.

**Result:** RUC shows promise to earn drivers’ acceptance over the gas tax. Actual experience with a RUC system improves user acceptance.

**Possible WSTC Actions:**

- Recommend implementation options that allow RUC to gradually scale up, offering drivers an opportunity to try the system and recommend further improvements while RUC is still in an early-implementation stage.
Finding: Despite the pilot evaluation’s focus on the user-pay dimension, the RUC Steering Committee recognizes that the concept of equity encompasses many other important dimensions, ranging from potential disparate impacts to lower-income populations, to whether all state drivers should be responsible for contributing to high-cost transportation facilities that primarily serve a single transportation corridor.

Result: Additional research may be warranted to explore some of these other dimensions of equity.

Possible WSTC Actions:
• A1 Per legislative direction, WSTC will develop a plan for assessing potential equity impacts of RUC on communities of color, low-income households, vulnerable populations, and displaced communities
• FD1 Forward Drive federal STSFA grant proposal would measure these equity impacts, develop potential mitigation measures, and if warranted, test mitigation measures in a limited-scale RUC test

Finding: During Focus Group sessions and in other direct communications with the Project Team, some participants questioned why vehicle weight, emissions, and other factors they viewed as related to “fairness” of RUC weren’t factored into the pilot test rate. RUC can reflect transportation tax policy at a higher resolution than the gas tax and can be customized to apply different rates based on the characteristics of the owner, or the vehicle, or how (or where) the vehicle is used.

Result: RUC per-mile rates could be set to reflect other transportation, energy or environmental policy preferences.

Possible WSTC Actions:
• R2 Conduct additional research (alone or in collaboration with other states) on differential RUC rates based on driver, vehicle, or infrastructure characteristics
• A2 Develop an illustrative scenario to show how RUC rates could vary based on vehicle weights and/or emissions ratings

Finding: Several ways of avoiding paying RUC were identified during a tabletop exercise. Measures were developed to minimize the occurrence or impact of RUC tax avoidance. However, more work is required in the area of compliance and enforcement before RUC can be widely-deployed as a replacement for the state’s gas tax.

Result: Additional research and testing of RUC compliance and enforcement methods are required before RUC can be widely deployed as a replacement for the state’s gas tax.

Potential WSTC Actions:
• R3 Conduct research in collaboration with other states implementing RUC to understand compliance gaps and potential enforcement measures
• R4 Recommend additional time and appropriate testing grounds to improve RUC before pursuing a wider implementation
• **R5** In an Initial start-up stage of RUC, test compliance and enforcement mechanisms

**Finding:** Open-ended responses to survey questions as well as focus group discussions revealed that many drivers are concerned about the potential complexity and cost of a RUC system that would apply to all registered vehicles in Washington. People are familiar with gas tax collection, which has relatively low administrative overhead. Moving to a per-mile charge will require new reporting and payment systems, and participants had concerns about how this could be done most efficiently.

**Result:** Improvements and testing of methods for most effectively and efficiently collecting RUC revenue must be undertaken before RUC can be widely deployed as a replacement for the state’s gas tax.

**Possible WSTC Actions:**
- **FD2** The *Forward Drive* federal grant proposal will undertake a series of intense work sessions (“scrum”) with other RUC-implementing states to identify ways to reduce the cost of collections for RUC
- **R6** Consider existing mechanisms (e.g., public-private partnerships) to most efficiently develop a RUC system that reduces the cost of collection
- **R7** An Initial start-up stage of RUC can test cost reduction strategies on a limited set of vehicles

**Finding:** Vulnerabilities with certain RUC mileage reporting methods: Technical, operational and legal measures must be in place to deter fraudulent mileage reporting before RUC can be widely deployed as a replacement for the state’s gas tax.

**Result:** More development and testing is needed for smartphone-based mileage reporting methods to reduce the possibility of fraudulent out-of-state mileage deductions.

**Possible WSTC Actions:**
Pursue improvements to MRMs and processes:
- **FD3** Continue development of smartphone-based mileage reporting (via 2019 *Forward Drive* federal grant)

**Finding:** The frequency, timing and wording of odometer image reporting reminders must be optimized to improve the participant experience while maximizing compliance. WA RUC invoice is a vital communications tool. Invoice design should be further improved.

**Result:** Additional research and testing of methods for properly collecting and allocating per-mile fee revenue is required before RUC can be widely deployed as a replacement for the state’s gas tax.
Possible WSTC Actions:
- Explore new, simpler methods of mileage reporting, such as in-person mileage verification services (via 2019 *Forward Drive* federal grant) (same as FD4)
- Recommend additional time and appropriate testing grounds to improve RUC before pursuing a wider implementation (same as R4)

Finding: The interconnection between Washington and other states (especially in the greater Portland-Vancouver metropolitan area) presents unique challenges to implementing a RUC system where road payments are paid in fair amounts and remitted to the proper jurisdiction.

Result: Additional research and testing of methods for properly collecting and allocating per-mile fee revenue is required before RUC can be widely deployed to replace the state’s gas tax.

Possible WSTC Actions:
Increase testing of Mileage Reporting Methods (MRMs) with special focus on cross-border and interoperability issues:
- R8 Include border-area testing in an Initial start-up stage of RUC
- FD5 *Forward Drive* federal grant proposal: test new-and-improved MRMs that are more effective for reporting RUC mileage for frequent cross-border travelers
- R9 Engage with ODOT’s OReGO program to explore bi-state RUC solutions for frequent WA-OR travelers

Finding: The Steering Committee identified gaps in the legal protections for personal privacy in a RUC system. For example, current state law does not specifically exempt RUC mileage data from public disclosure laws. The Steering Committee considered a model privacy policy that could be used to craft appropriate privacy protections in any RUC enabling legislation. At minimum, RUC mileage data should be granted similar privacy protections that currently exist for the state’s tolling program, where information related to roadway use and payments are exempt from public disclosure.

Result: extend privacy protections that already exist in state law for tolling to RUC.

Possible WSTC Actions:
- R10 Recommend specific changes in Washington statutes that protect personal privacy in a RUC program
- R11 Test new personal privacy protections during an Early-Adoption stage of RUC
- R12 Leverage public agency vehicles as test subjects for privacy protection testing

Finding: A RUC Interoperability HUB is a simple, effective way to achieve interstate and international interoperability for distance-based road usage charge systems.

Result: Continue to develop the WA RUC HUB (or a similar multi-jurisdictional system) in collaboration with other states that are implementing RUC.
Possible WSTC Actions:

- **FD6** As part of the *Forward Drive* federal project, specifically consider the WA RUC Interoperability HUB (or similar) in collaboration with other states as part of the Reducing RUC Cost-of-Collections workshops

Finding: A RUC system in Washington can be delivered and operated without creating a new agency. The Washington State Department of Licensing (DOL) would likely take lead role in implementation, while the Legislature may opt to direct the Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC) to maintain policy oversight of the new system during a transitional period.

**Result:** Roles in implementing a RUC system would remain comparable to how RUC has been investigated and tested since 2012, with the Legislature providing overall policy direction and parameters; WSTC providing policy oversight and reporting back to the Legislature; and DOL and private vendors implementing RUC.

Possible WSTC Actions:

- **R13** During a transitional period while the gas tax remains in place, retain the same policy-setting and oversight roles between the Legislature, WSTC, and other agencies and the private sector

Finding: Compatibility with other public policies. RUC can be customized to apply different rates based on the characteristics of the owner, or the vehicle, or how the vehicle is used. This level of customization is not feasible under the state gas tax.

**Result:** RUC is more flexible in its ability to harmonize with (or reflect) other public policy goals.

Possible WSTC Actions:

- **A3** Develop example scenario(s) to illustrate how RUC could be tailored to reflect additional public policy goals, such as heavy vehicle impacts to pavement, emissions by vehicle type, rate differentials for low-income or other populations, etc

Finding: The Steering Committee examined RUC as a potential replacement for the gas tax. The Committee took no position on other potential uses of RUC revenue. To most closely replicate the features of the gas tax it would eventually replace, RUC should be designed, implemented and the proceeds expended subject to Amendment 18 of the Washington State Constitution (i.e., limited to highway purposes).

Jason Richter, Deputy State Treasurer, Washington State Treasurer, added that the full faith and credit of the state secure the Nickel, TPA and Connecting Washington bonds. If the pledged MVFT or MVFT and Vehicle Related Fees are insufficient, bonds unable to be supported by the pledged revenues become subject to the state’s debt limit.

**Result:** If intended to replace the current gas tax, RUC would most closely replicate the gas tax’s advantages as a funding mechanism if RUC is made subject to Amendment 18.
Bond counsel notes it will be important for the State to be clear how those road usage charges will be treated under the Bond Act so that, among other things, the types and amounts of fees pledged to pay the Bonds can be reliably determined and disclosed to investors who purchase the Bonds.

To ensure that a charge is subject to the Bond Act pledge, bond counsel suggests that the Legislature consider the following in creating or modifying a transportation charge:

1. Confirm that charge is properly characterized as a fee (rather than a tax)
2. Codify the charge under Title 46
3. Characterize the charge as a “license fee” and confirm that the fee will be collected for the right to use a vehicle on public highways (including registration and license plate fees), and is not an administrative processing fee, inspection fee, vehicle operator’s license fee, excise tax imposed in lieu of property taxes, or fee for certificate of ownership
4. Confirm that the charge relates to a self-propelled motor vehicle
5. Require that the fee be used for “highway purposes” by directing that receipts be deposited in the Motor Vehicle Fund (in particular, in the Connecting Washington Account)

Possible WSTC Actions:
- **A4** Provide analysis to the Legislature on the fiscal, legal and policy implications of reducing or repealing the state’s gas tax and replacing it with RUC
- **A5** Provide the Legislature with various options for how RUC could be designed and implemented in a manner that places the revenue under Amendment 18 provisions of the Washington State Constitution

**Recommendation 15:** Commission indicated that to be a replacement for MVFT, RUC should be 18th Amendment restricted.

Finding: Of participants in the Pilot, 61% said move forward with RUC implementation, either immediately or to be phased in over a 5 to 10 year period; 28% said move forward but apply RUC more narrowly, such as requiring high-mileage vehicles like hybrids and/or plug-in electric vehicles to pay; 10% said take no further action on RUC.

**Result:** A large majority of participants favored some form of RUC implementation, although opinions varied on how quickly a transition should happen.

Possible WSTC Actions:
- **A6** Develop specific RUC transition options for legislative consideration that reflect the three scenarios favored by drivers
- **A7** Of the scenarios developed, identify the most promising option(s) and the parameters for transitioning to RUC for legislative consideration
Findings: Transition issues.

- RUC cannot fully replace the state’s gas tax until all outstanding bonds that pledged the gas tax have been paid off or restructured. The soonest this could happen would be 10 years, while the longer time horizon is 25 years.
- One advantage to keeping the state’s gas tax in place during a transitionary period is that the gas tax provides a simple way to collect money from out-of-state drivers who use Washington’s roadways.
- For practical and legal reasons related to already-issued motor vehicle fuel tax bonds, the state should continue to collect the gas tax for at least 10 to 25 years, regardless of the transition approach to introducing RUC. Meanwhile, the Legislature can introduce RUC on a portion of vehicles, using the gas tax as a prepayment mechanism to reduce RUC collection costs and evasion risks.
- The policies currently in place that provide exemptions from gas taxes or refunds (either directly or indirectly) should remain in place for as long as the gas tax system is in place (i.e., at least 10 to 25 years).

Result: An immediate transition from the gas tax to RUC is not financially feasible or legally possible. Any transition to RUC will likely take at least 10 years, and likely longer.

Possible WSTC Actions:

- **R14** Alternative RUC transition scenarios for legislative consideration in 2020 should be developed that specifically consider:
  - Participants’ preferences for implementation time frame and vehicles subject to RUC;
  - Advent of electric vehicles, their effects on revenue, and current programs to incentivize adoption;
  - The need for continued development and testing of a RUC system before wide-scale implementation;
  - *Forward Drive* project timing, which is aimed at reducing the cost of collections for RUC;
  - Availability of public fleet vehicles as part of an Initial start-up stage for RUC;
- **FD7** The *Forward Drive* federal grant proposal will (among other things) develop a RUC implementation plan for Washington

Follow-up: The Commissioners directed staff to move all 15 recommendations forward in the draft Final Report.

Ara Swanson, Enviroissues, reported that the October e-newsletter will be issued next week with the comment opportunity. Feedback will be collected between Oct 24 and Nov. 14, 2019. It will summarize research, participant engagement and public involvement work done so far. Share draft recommendations from WSTC and WA RUC Steering Committee and provide opportunity for feedback before WSTC formalizes recommendations in December.
**Action:** None.
**Follow-Up:** None at this time.

**AV Work Group: 2019 Update and Recommendations**

Darrin Grondel, Chair, AV Work Group, provided an update on the accomplishments of the Work Group in 2019. He was joined by representatives from each of the subcommittees.

Dan McGrady, PEMCO, presented the recommendation of the Liability Subcommittee:

The Liability Subcommittee recommends

The legislature consider enacting legislation that requires that persons or entities testing autonomous vehicles or autonomous vehicle technology equipment under the Department of Licensing’s Self-Certification Pilot Project shall maintain with the Department of Licensing proof of an umbrella liability insurance policy in an amount not less than five million dollars per occurrence for damages by reason of bodily injury, death, or property damage in addition to the financial responsibility requirements in accordance with RCW 46.30.020.

Charles Knutson expressed his opinion that the recommendation was not yet ready to act upon, with questions about cost still unknown.

**ACTION:** Commissioner Restucci moved adoption of the recommendation for a $5 million umbrella policy. Commissioner Jennings seconded the recommendation. The recommendation was adopted unanimously.

Captain Dan Hall, Washington State Patrol, and Debi Besser, Traffic Safety Commission, reported on the Safety Subcommittee. It has no recommendations at this time.

Nick Streuli, Employment Security, reported that the Labor and Workforce Subcommittee will hold its first subcommittee meeting on October 21, 2019.

Beau Perschbacher, Department of Licensing, reported that future topics to be addressed by the Licensing Subcommittee may involve registration requirements, changes to driver testing.

Will Saunders, Office of Chief Information Officer, reported on the System Technology and Data Security Subcommittee.

The recommendations it made in June, 2019 were tabled for more research and discussion. The Subcommittee will be studying privacy and data security frameworks in other jurisdictions. Other topics under consideration include:

- Data needs for understanding AV (joint meeting with Licensing)
- Other states’ regulations
- Data systems for mobility as a service
- Transparency framework for testing programs
- Auto-ISAC best practices for vehicle cybersecurity
- Event recorders and data access (with Safety)
Takeaways from the joint meeting with the Licensing Subcommittee:

- First responders need good information in the event of a crash
- Cities have an interest in what may pose challenges and problems for AVs

Professor Andy Dannenberg, University of Washington and Rad Cunningham, Department of Health, said that the first meeting of the Health and Equity Subcommittee will take place on November 19, 2019 in Seattle. Its goal is to ensure that the benefits of automated mobility are equitably distributed and that negative impacts are not disproportionately borne by traditionally marginalized communities.

Some Key Topics the Subcommittee will address:

- Access to transportation for all income levels
- Costs of AV transportation
- Distribution of AV services
- Accessibility and mobility for vulnerable populations communities of color, people with disabilities, the young and the aging, rural populations, and other historically marginalized populations
- Job losses from automation
- Exposure to traffic and related impacts

The Subcommittee recommends an Assessment of Health Impacts, similar to the Recommendation in WSTC 2018 Report to the Legislature.

Some questions to be addressed:

- Would AVs be more willing to go into some areas at night than the current taxi system
- What health & equity issues are communities experiencing now and how might AVs improve that situation, or make it worse
- How might testing AV technology on public roads disproportionately impact disadvantaged or vulnerable populations

Action: Commissioner Jennings moved that the Commission recommend that the Legislature fund a Health Impact Assessment, pending further work by the Health and Equity Subcommittee. Commissioner Batra seconded the motion, which was adopted unanimously.

Mike Ennis, Association of Washington Business, and John Nisbet, WSDOT, presented the work of the Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee:

Action Plan Activity #1: Develop policy goals, strategies and illustrative actions based on local, regional and national “best practice” policy examples.

Action Plan Activity #2: Develop project selection criteria and discuss potential funding approaches to enable the selection of near-term pilot deployment proposals and projects.
Action Plan Activity #3: Partnership and Collaboration discussions with the private sector companies who are self-certified to test autonomous vehicles in WA State via the Department of Licensing process as of June 1, 2019.

The CAT Policy Goals emerged from Activity #1:

1. Organize for Innovation: Enable organizational change that empowers officials to be flexible, accelerate decision-making, and adapt to changing technology
2. Shared Mobility: Encourage and incentivize shared mobility, including an emphasis on high occupancy and shared modes for moving people and goods
3. Economic Vitality and Livability: Create resilient and efficient regional networks and empower local agencies to create resilient, multimodal local networks
4. Infrastructure and Context Sensitive Street Design: Promote durable, physical and digital networks that accommodate the movement of people and goods in ways that are appropriate for the context
5. Land Use: Encourage land use development patterns that support multimodal connectivity to efficient local and regional networks
6. Equity: Work with marginalized communities to increase access to desirable mobility options
7. Safety: Increase the safety of transportation systems and infrastructure to support the safe movement of people and goods
8. Environment: Reduce the local and cumulative environmental impacts of mobility to improve air and water quality, energy conservation and mitigate climate change

Commission Business

Action: Commissioner Young moved adoption of these policy goals to enable the Infrastructure and Systems Subcommittee to continue the work on the CAT policy framework and, as a next step, develop specific strategies. The motion also recommends encouraging the development of a state CAT/AV policy framework that would integrate these policy goals along with policy goals developed by other subcommittees. Commissioner Tortorelli seconded the motion.

The motion was adopted with Commissioner Jennings opposed.

Commissioner Jennings moved that the Chair and Commissioner Restucci finalize the Report to the Legislature. Commissioner Tortorelli seconded the motion and it was adopted unanimously.

AV Work Group Update
AV Work Group Website Update
AV Liability Subcommittee
AV Safety Subcommittee
AV Labor & Workforce Subcommittee
AV System Technology & Data Security Subcommittee
AV Health & Equity Subcommittee
AV Infrastructure & Systems Subcommittee
**Secretary’s Report**
Keith Metcalf, Deputy Secretary, Washington State Department Transportation reported that he went on the Joint Transportation Committee (JTC), tour with a focus on the fish passage program. He appreciated the tour’s emphasis on showing that there are not cookie cutter solutions. WSDOT is ramping up resources for design and implementation for delivery on the fish passage projects, up to the authorized funding levels.

WSDOT presented to JTC last month on preservation funding; he bluntly said we are – “on a glide path to failure”. And, he noted the significant gap in meeting the needs, with a list exemplifying the deferred maintenance needs. Projects become due for preservation work at its lowest cost point – delay from then increases costs. WSDOT is working to reduce the rate of decline within existing resources – for example, one-touch road repair. *We can fund the system we want, or get the system we fund* – the message to the Legislature. WSDOT is participating with the JTC needs assessment study to support prioritizing preservation funds.

Commissioner Jennings asked what passage of I-976 would mean for Washington State Department Transportation (WSDOT). Office Financial Management (OFM), has identified a $1.9 billion impact to WSDOT and $2.3 billion loss for local governments.

**Tolling Update**
Ed Barry, Director, Tolling Division, Washington State Department of Transportation, reported that tolling will begin on SR 99 tunnel on November 9, 2019. An educational marketing campaign emphasizes the savings from using a transponder.

WSDOT is working closely with the City of Seattle, King County and Port of Seattle. It is gathering and analyzing data about traffic patterns at three time periods:
- Before tunnel opens
- After tunnel opens
- After tolling starts

The new toll exemptions went into effect on August 1, 2019, to standardize exemptions across all toll facilities. Vanpools with state-issued rideshare license plates, on-duty emergency vehicles, authorized tow trucks, in-service incident response vehicles and buses (transit, school, and qualifying private buses) are eligible for exemptions.

WSDOT reached out to nearly 300 organizations with vehicles that meet the new exemption requirements, in an effort to provide the information necessary to obtain an exemption, updated 119 accounts, and created 17 new accounts.

**WSDOT Tolling Update**

**Action:** None.
**Follow-Up:** None at this time.
**I-405 Toll Lanes: Usage, Benefits, and Equity**

Mark Hallenbeck, Director, TRAC, University of Washington, reported on the I-405 study the Washington State Transportation Center recently completed. Using data on each trip made on the I-405 express toll lanes during operational hours in 2018, demographic data on census block groups, and lane speed, volume, and travel time data, it shows how the express toll lanes are used, the benefits they provide to the region, and how these benefits are distributed among different groups of noncommercial users.

Findings:

➔ Higher income households use the lanes more, but households of all incomes use them
➔ Most households that use the system are not high income
➔ Most users use it infrequently. 21% use it monthly; 20% use it weekly; 23% use it daily.
➔ High-income drivers travel more often during low-toll periods
➔ Benefits
  ◆ $31M in revenue generated
  ◆ 800K SOV hours saved
  ◆ $50M in benefits to users
➔ Higher income households benefit more overall, but lower income households benefit more per trip

We first thought about all the potential benefits that exist from HOT lane usage.

➔ Time savings
➔ Increased reliability
➔ Safety
➔ Environmental benefits
➔ Societal benefits

Factors considered:

➔ Income
➔ Geography
➔ User frequency
➔ Peak/off-peak use
➔ Routes
➔ Modes of transport (SOV vs. HOV)

**I-405 High Occupancy Toll Lanes**

**Action:** None.
**Follow-Up:** None at this time.

**Reflections and Recommendations**
Commissioner Batra noted the complexity of the RUC issues.