```
Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.
1
2
    RPTS BRENNAN
    HIF207170
3
4
5
    SELF-DRIVING VEHICLE LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK: ENHANCING
6
7
    SAFETY, IMPROVING LIVES AND MOBILITY, AND BEATING CHINA
    WEDNESDAY, JULY 26, 2023
8
9
    House of Representatives,
    Subcommittee on Innovation, Data, and Commerce,
10
    Committee on Energy and Commerce,
11
    Washington, D.C.
12
13
          The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:32 a.m. in
14
    2322 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Gus Bilirakis,
15
     [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.
16
17
          Present: Representatives Bilirakis, Bucshon, Walberg,
18
19
    Duncan, Dunn, Lesko, Pence, Armstrong, Allen, Harshbarger,
    Cammack, Rodgers (ex officio); Schakowsky, Dingell, Soto,
20
    Trahan, Clarke, and Pallone (ex officio).
21
2.2
```

Also present: Representatives Latta, Obernolte; and 23 24 Veasey. 25 26 Staff Present: Michael Cameron, Professional Staff Member; Sydney Greene, Director of Operations; Jessica 27 Herron, Clerk; Tara Hupman, Chief Counsel; Sean Kelly, Press 28 Secretary; Tim Kurth, Chief Counsel; Carla Rafael, Senior 29 Staff Assistant; Brannon Rains, Professional Staff Member; 30 31 Teddy Tanzer, Policy Director; Zane Mandle, Intern; Hannah Anton, Minority Policy Analyst; Ian Barlow, Minority FTC 32 Detailee; Waverly Gordon, Minority Deputy Staff Director and 33 General Counsel; Daniel Greene, Minority Professional Staff 34 Member; Tiffany Guarascio, Minority Staff Director; Lisa 35 Hone, Minority Chief Counsel, Innovation, Data, and Commerce; 36 Joe Orlando, Minority Junior Professional Staff Member; and 37 Anthony Choi, Minority Intern. 38

39

*Mr. Bilirakis. The committee will come to order.
I ask unanimous consent that the members of the full
committee waiving on to this subcommittee today be able to
participate.

44 Without objection, so ordered.

Good morning, everyone. The chair recognizes himself for five minutes for an opening statement.

Again, good morning, everyone, and welcome to today's legislative hearing on self-driving vehicles, also known as autonomous vehicles, or AVs. The work we do in this subcommittee is foundational to America's economic future and national security. It is essential we secure our country's leadership in emerging technologies to transform Americans' lives.

When the subcommittee began working on AVs under Republican leadership over six years ago, I don't believe anyone thought it would be back to square one today in 2023. But here we are, re-examining similar legislation that had previously passed the House unanimously, and that many members of this committee on both sides cosponsored -- and we have the prime cosponsor here, Mr. Latta, today.

It is sad and unfortunate that we haven't been able to

do anything in this space, given all we can benefit from this technology. And we know our adversaries aren't waiting. This hearing serves as an opportunity to level, set, and discuss why it is dire for us to move legislation forward, and not give in to ancillary demands from those who wish to keep the U.S. in the 20th century.

By NHTSA 2022 estimates 42,795 Americans lost their lives in crashes, unfortunately. And for the first 3 months of this year, approximately 9,330 lives were lost. It is clear the status quo is unacceptable. This technology can help roll back these sad fatality statistics, solving the issues of human limitation, impairments, and inattentiveness.

We are also in a race against the clock with China. 74 While the United States has failed to advance a national 75 framework that expands testing and deployment, China has 76 unveiled a national strategy to boost testing and deployment 77 throughout their country. Any more inaction from Congress 78 will result in the Chinese defining and owning the technology 79 80 and its supply chain. We cannot let that happen, folks. Enacting a national regulatory framework without top-down 81 taxpayer subsidies is the true path to securing the future of 82 our AV economy. 83

I am pleased that the first hearing of this year focused our competitiveness with China, with -- Jeff Farrah from the newly formed Autonomous Vehicle Industry Association testified on the need to get this done this year. As he laid the case out clearly, America must not lose our edge and see this lifesaving and transformational technology to those who don't hold our values.

It is also important to think about who this technology 91 will benefit. Many of us take for granted our ability to 92 drive a car either to our jobs, to visit friends or family, 93 or run errands. But millions of Americans don't have that 94 luxury. In fact, today marks the 33rd anniversary of the 95 Americans with Disabilities Act, and that was passed in a 96 bipartisan -- Senator Dole led that. So just as that law 97 made sure to protect people living with disabilities from 98 discrimination, we can draw parallels to the bills we are 99 discussing today. 100

I want to thank Mr. Latta again for including language I championed in this discussion draft to ensure people living with disabilities cannot be discriminated against from receiving a license to access this technology, and for ensuring the manufacturers keep in mind how to design their

106 vehicles so that all people can use them, regardless of their 107 disability.

108 Of course, these vehicles must be affordable.

109 Studies have shown how impactful AVs will be for 110 transportation and mobility, especially for people living 111 with disabilities, and we should certainly not be dictating 112 who can and cannot access them.

113 So we have Mr. Riccobono. I want to thank you for 114 testifying today and sharing how much this will transform the 115 lives of people living with disabilities.

AVs hold so much promise for everyone in this country, in my opinion. So let's make sure this promise ends up a reality for everyone, and not just a proportion of the U.S. population.

I want to thank Mr. Latta again for his tireless work, his persistence to work to make America the home of manufacturing the vehicles of this future -- of the future, and for Mr. Walberg's efforts to ensure that Chinese auto companies don't take advantage of our openness, just as their tech companies have. So I want to thank you, I want to thank the panel for testifying today.

127 [The prepared statement of Mr. Bilirakis follows:]

*Mr. Bilirakis. And I yield back. The Chair recognizes
the ranking member, Ms. Schakowsky, my friend, for five
minutes for her opening statement.

134 *Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you
135 for the witnesses that are here today, and thank you for the
136 good turnout at this hearing.

I know there is a lot of interest in autonomous 137 vehicles, and they do hold a great deal of promise, 138 particularly when it comes to issues of safety. As you heard 139 from the chairman, we are looking at over 40,000 people who 140 are losing their lives on the highways, and we are hoping 141 that it will reduce. And he also talked at length, which I 142 totally agree on, the issue of accessibility, to make sure 143 that all Americans are able to move around in the ways that 144 they want and need to do, and ways that they have not been 145 able to do before. 146

But at the same time we know that there are a number of unanswered questions that we are going to have to answer before we are able to totally move forward. I am not saying that we should slow down, but we certainly want to answer the questions.

152

For example, we have heard reports of AVs that are

disrupting emergency services, that are snarling traffic, and obstructing public transit.

We have certainly heard -- have concerns about the -about workforce issues. I continue to hear from worker owners in -- that are making their living driving right now. We are looking at about four million Americans who do make a living driving professionally. We have to make sure that we consider the -- that huge change, and Americans should have their [sic].

And finally, the third thing that I wanted to raise as an issue is that Americans should have the same right to seek justice in the courts when they are dealing with autonomous vehicles, if they are harmed, as they are with current vehicles right now.

And all of these are open questions right now that they are -- that we are absolutely going to have to deal with. I know that a lot of work has been done for many years on this, and a lot of conversation has been done. But I think these important issues of safety, of workforce, of access of consumers to justice are still not entirely, entirely resolved.

174

I want to say a special thank-you to leaders, including

175	on our side of the aisle: Debbie Dingell, who really has
176	been working for so many years to come up with legislation.
177	But I want to make it clear that I look forward to
178	working in a bipartisan way to getting this done. I know
179	there is a lot of urgency about getting it done, but let's do
180	it right. Let's work together. We can make our roads safer,
181	our consumers more flexible in their travel options, make
182	sure that consumers are protected. I know that we can get
183	this done in this wonderful subcommittee and beyond.
184	[The prepared statement of Ms. Schakowsky follows:]
185	
186	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
187	

*Ms. Schakowsky. And with that I yield back my time. 188 *Mr. Bilirakis. I thank the ranking member and now I 189 yield to the chairman of the full committee, my good friend, 190 191 Mrs. Rodgers, for her five minutes of opening statement. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, I *The Chair. 192 too want to say thank you to all the members who have been a 193 part of bringing us to this place: Mr. Pallone, Mrs. 194 Dingell, and certainly Mr. Latta. 195

196 I too am very optimistic. I am excited about what autonomous vehicles, self-driving cars are going to mean to 197 so many Americans, truly transformational. You know, I think 198 about our oldest son, Cole. He was born with Down syndrome. 199 He recently turned 16. And like most 16-year-olds in 200 America, he is really excited about getting a driver's 201 license. Now, Mom and Dad aren't quite as confident here 202 yet. But, you know, I think about Cole. I think about 203 others living with a disability and what self-driving cars 204 will mean to providing amazing mobility options, transforming 205 206 their lives.

But is beyond that. It has the potential -self-driving vehicles have the potential to break down

209 transport barriers, unleash more opportunities, more freedom,

210 more independence. It will mean safe, reliable ways to get 211 to work, go to the doctor, get education, and so much more. 212 Self-driving cars have the potential to reduce death and 213 injuries on our roads, tens of thousands of Americans that 214 are killed every year on our roads, many due to human error 215 and impaired driving.

It will help ensure our transportation future isn't 216 reliant upon supply chains from our adversaries, and prevent 217 218 China from controlling the AI and machine learning technologies and insights gained from this technology. The 219 U.S. is currently at risk of ceding leadership to China. 220 China is currently moving forward with ambitious plans to 221 lead development and deployment of this technology. We all 222 know that we cannot trust the Chinese Communist Party to set 223 standards for this industry, and we certainly cannot trust 224 them to protect our data and our individual rights. 225

These standards and a regulatory framework must be led by the United States of America. So last Congress the committee Republicans wrote to Secretary Buttigieg raising concerns about U.S. approval for Huawei to buy our semiconductor technology for its growing auto business. And sadly, two years later, we have not received a response. And

the National Highway Safety -- Traffic Safety Administration declined our request today to testify, despite weeks of notice.

235 China's ambitions in this industry prevent -- present a critical economic and national security threat to our 236 country, especially when you consider seven Chinese car 237 manufacturing -- car companies testing on our roads today, at 238 least seven testing their self-drive technology, technology 239 240 that includes video cameras on every car it produces. So I would also like to thank Mr. Walberg for the language that he 241 has contributed as a part of this discussion draft today that 242 reins in Chinese company testing on our roads. 243 This important technology cannot be overstated. 244

The journey alone to deploying self-driving vehicles is going to deliver many benefits, some we haven't even thought of. America must lead, not China. The goal today is to make sure that America continues to lead in the auto sector for the next 100 years and beyond, and self-driving cars are a part of that.

251 [The prepared statement of The Chair follows:]

252

253 *********COMMITTEE INSERT********

254

*The Chair. I am pleased to yield the remainder of my 255 256 time to the leadership of Mr. Latta on this issue. *Mr. Latta. Well, I thank the gentlelady for yielding. 257 258 I also thank the chairman for allowing me to waive on today. American automotive leadership is vital for the future 259 of our national security, and autonomous vehicles aren't just 260 the future, they are the present. And the harsh reality is 261 the United States is already falling behind the global stage. 262 263 Communist China poses an immediate threat to our national security through the use of the driverless cars 264 within our very borders. As the chair of the Communications 265 and Technology Subcommittee, I am all too familiar with our 266 ongoing efforts to rip and replace Communist Chinese 267 technology from our communications infrastructure. If we do 268 not ensure our laws support innovation, the United States 269 will be forced to consider how to secure our roadways after 270 communist China has already collected massive amounts of data 271 on our transportation systems. 272

273 We have the privilege on the Energy and Commerce 274 Committee to look over the horizon and enact laws and 275 regulations that pave the way for American innovation and 276 global leadership. In the 115th Congress I felt strongly

277 that AV technology and an AV Federal framework were the next 278 frontier for legislative action within this committee. 279 Although I have remained focused on meaningful legislation 280 action over the last six years, I have been disappointed in 281 the lack of bipartisan action by some on AVs.

Finding a solution is essential. Over the last several 282 months I have been working closely with my friend across the 283 aisle, the gentlelady from Michigan's 6th district, to craft 284 285 a solution through a Federal legislative framework. I am committed to continuing those conversations, drafting a bill 286 that supports the safe development and deployment of fully 287 autonomous technology. The time to act is now. With a 288 Federal roadmap for autonomous vehicle deployment, we as 289 Americans all win. We simply cannot sit back and watch other 290 countries, especially our adversaries, lead because we cannot 291 work together to come to an agreement. 292

I am pleased we are furthering this discussion at today's hearing, and I look forward to the hearing and hearing from our witnesses.

296 [The prepared statement of Mr. Latta follows:] 297

298 ********COMMITTEE INSERT********

299

300 *Mr. Latta. And I yield back to the gentlelady. And 301 again, thank you to the chairman.

302 *Mr. Bilirakis. The gentlelady yields back.

I want to personalize this, as well. I have a severe disability, a visual disability, and I waited until -- it was probably my parents who wanted me to wait until I was 18 years old before I got a valid driver's license. And I did get the license, and had to go to the ophthalmologist to make sure that that was okay to drive.

But I have been very limited in my driving, and I have 309 restricted myself, even though the license doesn't restrict 310 me in any way. I don't -- no night driving, and just around 311 the local area. But you know, if we had these self-driving 312 cars I would not be restricted. And who knows in the future 313 if I can qualify to get a license because of the 314 disabilities. So I think it is very important that we work 315 on this. Time is of the essence, and I appreciate the 316 bipartisan work that we have done in the past, and I want to 317 318 get this done for the American people.

319 So in any case, now I am going to yield to my good 320 friend, the ranking member, Mr. Pallone, for his five minutes 321 of opening statement.

*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Chairman Bilirakis. 322 Autonomous vehicles hold the promise of improving 323 safety, expanding mobility, and growing our economy for the 324 325 future. Fortunately, our nation holds a competitive edge in developing and deploying these technologies. According to 326 KPMG, the United States is among the top five most prepared 327 countries for AVs. By contrast, Japan ranks eleventh, 328 Germany ranks fourteenth and China ranks twentieth. 329

330 But we must preserve and expand this advantage by charting a course that is also in line with the fundamental 331 American values of safety, equity, and workforce protections. 332 AVs will not save lives if they do not operate safely and 333 adhere to state and local traffic laws. They will not bridge 334 the mobility divide if we weaken enforcement of the Americans 335 with Disabilities Act and preempt state and local 336 accessibility laws. AVs will not benefit society if crash 337 victims and their families do not have a right to seek 338 justice in the courts. And AVs will not create jobs and grow 339 wages if we don't address how AVs may displace workers. 340

We also cannot simply dust off six-year-old legislation and ignore the substantial issues that have emerged in recent years. We can now see these vehicles in action: troubling

344	safety incidents are mounting, liability loopholes are
345	emerging, workforce impacts are becoming more apparent.
346	So I appreciate the Republican majority's willingness to
347	discuss drafts offered by Representatives Dingell and Latta
348	at this hearing today. I have committed to both of them to
349	work together to find a bipartisan path that promotes the
350	safe, responsible deployment of AVs, and I hope the
351	Republican majority will allow their bipartisan process to
352	move forward and to bear fruit, because a partisan approach
353	stands no chance at ever becoming law.
354	[The prepared statement of Mr. Pallone follows:]
355	

356 ********COMMITTEE INSERT********

357

358	*Mr. Bilirakis. But I would now like to yield the
359	remainder of my time to Representative Dingell, the author of
360	one of the discussion drafts, who continues to push us that
361	we must address this and pass some legislation. I yield to
362	Representative Dingell.
363	*Mrs. Dingell. I thank the ranking member, and I am
364	thanking for him listening to my pushing.
365	[Laughter.]
366	*Mrs. Dingell. But Michigan put the world on wheels,
367	and is the global center of automotive manufacturing and
368	innovation, and we must keep it this way. We must keep
369	American leadership. And today Michigan is the tip of the
370	spear for the autonomous vehicle, AV, revolution. I will
371	give Ohio is right there with me.
372	[Laughter.]
373	*Mrs. Dingell. We always have a little of Michigan-
374	Ohio. But Michigan-Ohio together is a team you can't beat.
375	From Go Reds.
376	[Laughter.]
377	*Mrs. Dingell. See, I wore red for you today to show
378	the bipartisanship in more than one way. Hopefully, nobody
379	got that on camera.
	10

Anyway, I firmly believe in the promise of AV 380 381 technology: improved safety, expanded mobility, and greater economic prosperity. But if the United States is going to 382 383 stay at the forefront, Congress must pass a comprehensive, bipartisan Federal AV framework that supports safe, 384 responsible deployment of AVs, and addresses the issues that 385 my colleague, Ranking Member Pallone, addressed. And that is 386 why I am locked arms with my good friend, Representative Bob 387 388 Latta, and co-led the SELF DRIVE Act, which passed the House in the 115th Congress, and it is why we have continued to 389 work on bipartisan, bicameral efforts to revive AV 390 legislation ever since. 391

Despite our best efforts, comprehensive AV legislation has not been enacted. Concerns persist. And additionally, as others have expressed, I am concerned that China and other countries are taking advantage of our inaction.

At today's hearings we will hear from witnesses about draft legislation that we have been working on for more than a year, legislation that I believe can break the logjam. It represents a vision that can address the issues that have emerged over the last six years since we passed the SELF DRIVE Act. And over the course of the last year, we have

402 been in meaningful and productive conversations with

403 Representative Latta on that legislation.

I want to make it clear. Between Mr. Latta and I, we have met with every stakeholder. We talk to each other about what every stakeholder is saying. We know the issues, we know what keeps killing this bill, and we are going to get a compromise if it kills us to get this bill done.

409 [Laughter.]

*Mrs. Dingell. Listen, I know that -- and I also -- I really want to thank Chairman Cathy Rodgers, who came to me right after she became chairman and said, "I want this to get done. I want this bipartisan bill." And my dear friend, my sometimes chairman, now today ranking member, who does get tired of my nagging, but he knows how important it is.

Between these two draft bills we are considering today I 416 see a real path forward on achieving bipartisan legislation. 417 My bill is not perfect. John Dingell used to say no bill is 418 perfect. In today's world the Ten Commandments that Moses 419 brought down wouldn't be. But it is a base to work with, and 420 I do -- I want to work with all the members, all the 421 stakeholders. We want your honest feedback. We want to know 422 what you like, what you don't like, what is missing, and what 423

424 should be struck.

425 Look, these are going to be tough, difficult conversations. They have been for the last four years. But 426 427 I am tired of people trying to pit us against each other, divide us against each other, then send a bill over to the 428 Senate that everybody knows is going to go nowhere. 429 The House got a bill done, and got it through unanimously. 430 We want you to work with us. We want to get this done. 431 432 Compromise is not a dirty word. And I am going to be locked arm in arm with my colleague, Mr. Latta. Messaging bills 433 don't cut it. They don't get the job done. We need to come 434 together. And that is one of this committee's greatest 435 strengths. 436

437 Let me be clear: I am committed to coming together.
438 [The prepared statement of Mrs. Dingell follows:]

439

441

*Mrs. Dingell. And I look forward to today's hearing, 442 443 and I yield back. Thank you. Mr. --444 445 *Mr. Bilirakis. The ranking member yields back, and I want to thank the gentlelady for her passion on this 446 particular bill. 447 And yes, you are right. Chairman Dingell worked in a 448 bipartisan fashion and got a lot of things done because -- I 449 450 know, I was there. My dad was there, anyway, and I was a spectator. And he is a legend, and we have got to do this in 451 his memory. 452 So our witnesses today are John Bozzella, the president 453 CEO of the Alliance for Automotive Innovation. We have 454 Philip Koopman, associate professor at Carnegie Mellon 455 456 University. Welcome. 457 Mr. Gary Shapiro, president and CEO of the Consumer 458 Technology Association. 459 460 Welcome. And Mark Riccobono, who is the president of the National 461 Federation of the Blind. 462 Welcome, sir. We will have Mr. Bozzella begin. 463 23

464 So you are recognized, sir, for five minutes.
465 *Mr. Bozzella. Chair Bilirakis -466 *Mr. Bilirakis. We appreciate you being here, again.
467 Thanks.
468

469	STATEMENT OF JOHN BOZZELLA, PRESIDENT AND CEO, ALLIANCE FOR
470	AUTOMOTIVE INNOVATION; PHILIP KOOPMAN, PH.D., ASSOCIATE
471	PROFESSOR, CARNEGIE MELLON UNIVERSITY; GARY SHAPIRO,
472	PRESIDENT AND CEO, CONSUMER TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION; AND MARK
473	RICCOBONO, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND
474	
475	STATEMENT OF JOHN BOZZELLA
476	
477	*Mr. Bozzella. Ranking Member Schakowsky, Chair
478	McMorris Rodgers, Ranking Member Pallone, members of the
479	subcommittee, my name is John Bozzella. I am the president
480	and CEO of Alliance for Automotive Innovation. Thank you for
481	the invitation to share my perspective on the future of
482	autonomous vehicles in the United States.
483	In my view, there is no safety or mobility solution with
484	as much promise for the traveling public as autonomous
485	vehicle technology. My written testimony outlines the urgent
486	need for a Federal AV regulatory framework to get more AVs on
487	the road and protect American leadership in autonomy.
488	I would like to use this time to describe my most recent
489	experience in an AV just a few days ago in San Francisco.

Here is my report from the front.

490

I summoned the AV on my phone. It arrived quickly, and for 90 minutes shuttled me to several destinations I chose. The driving was careful, careful and competent. My AV seamlessly navigated double-parked cars, swerving cyclists, pedestrians crossing the street late at night, flashing red lights at intersections, and other vehicle traffic.

This wasn't a closed track with foam dummies and fake 497 buildings. This wasn't a DARPA challenge or science 498 499 experiment. This wasn't a tech show ride-and-drive with an engineer in the driver's seat, hands hovering over the 500 steering wheel. This was full self-driving in real-world 501 conditions. And the technology worked. It worked perfectly, 502 in fact. It got me where I needed to be calmly, 503 methodically, carefully, safely. That is what made my 504 experience so powerful. Even for someone like me, who has 505 seen virtually every innovation in this industry over the 506 last 25 years. 507

And the good news, it will only get better. The software will learn from my ride and every ride in the future. Why? Because the more an AV operates, the more it learns and the better the technology gets.

512 So if the technology works now and will continue to

improve exponentially over time, there is only one remaining question: Do we want this safety technology to exist and the vehicles to be built and to operate here in the U.S., instead of China? This is a question that can only be answered by Federal policymakers.

The truth is government has been bogged down on AVs, even with bipartisan support. For almost a decade there has been virtually no forward movement on Federal AV rules. In spite of this lag in the legal constraints, AV innovators have still managed to notch some growth.

But there is a ceiling to that growth. Barring a regulatory framework that delivers some certainty in the near future, I predict two things will happen: some AV companies will not succeed, and the technology and supply chains for this innovation will migrate to China and other countries establishing the right operating conditions. That is as plain as I can say it.

A similar dynamic happened with electric vehicle batteries. China locked up the global supply of critical minerals and raw materials for EV batteries because, candidly, it was impossible to process, mine, and build here. That is starting to change, but we are still playing catch-

up. It would be a shame if history repeated itself with AVs 535 536 because the technology works, and it continues to improve. Are AVs perfect? No. Do occasional glitches or fender 537 538 benders matter? Yes. But tens of thousands of traffic deaths on U.S. roads because of reckless, drunk, or 539 distracted humans, that matters too. So does accessible 540 transportation for seniors or individuals with disabilities. 541 So does a chance to reduce traffic congestion and create new 542 543 jobs and businesses.

I am sure it is rare that somebody from the private 544 sector comes before you to ask, to plead for their businesses 545 to be regulated from the Federal Government, but this is 546 exactly what we are seeking. We are not asking for taxpayer 547 money. We are not asking you to skirt or bypass a single 548 safety gate. We are simply asking Congress to do something 549 that only it can: pass a balanced Federal AV framework with 550 safequards, oversight, rules, and regulations to give this 551 transformative technology a chance to succeed in the United 552 553 States.

554 On this point we are grateful to the leadership of 555 Chairman Latta and Congresswoman Dingell, as well as the 556 leaders of the committee for their bipartisan work to keep

557	innovation here and prevent a capital and knowledge exodus to
558	countries like China.
559	Self-driving is hard. It is new. It is different. On
560	behalf of the AV developers and the Americans who benefit
561	from autonomy, let's work together to break America's AV
562	logjam.
563	Thank you for your attention, and I am happy to answer
564	your questions.
565	[The prepared statement of Mr. Bozzella follows:]
566	
567	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
568	

569	*Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate
570	it, very informative. I am glad you used that example. This
571	is what we need to hear.
572	Okay, next is Mr. Koopman, who is the associate
573	professor at Carnegie Mellon.
574	You are recognized, sir, for your five minutes of
575	testimony.
576	

577 STATEMENT OF PHILIP KOOPMAN

578

579 *Dr. Koopman. Good morning, and thank you for inviting 580 me to testify. My name is Philip Koopman.

In my early career I served as a U.S. Navy submarine 581 officer in the Cold War, and spent several years working in 582 industry, including automotive supplier work. I then became 583 a professor at Carnegie Mellon University, where I have been 584 585 working on self-driving car safety for more than 25 years. I originated the UL 4600 industry safety standard on autonomous 586 vehicle safety, and I have written two books on that topic. 587 I have worked with automotive industry partners such as 588 General Motors, and helped the U.S. military improve the 589 safety of their automated ground vehicles. I also have 590 extensive experience with safety-critical computer 591 applications in other industries such as rail transportation, 592 chemical processing, industrial controls, aviation, and so 593 on. 594

I started working on self-driving car safety at Carnegie Mellon University, right after they had driven 2,800 miles to San Diego, 98 percent hands off the steering wheel. That was back in 1995. The industry has since spent perhaps \$100

billion worldwide on that last 2 percent, because it turns
out to be really difficult, and we are still working on it.
There has been really impressive progress, especially on
city streets. But after 25 years we still need a lot more
work on reliability and safety so you can get a perfect ride,
as Mr. Bozzella said. But the catch is you need millions of
perfect rides, and that is a lot harder.

606 My written testimony provides more detail, so I will 607 summarize five key themes this morning.

You might have heard talking points that humans are 608 terrible drivers, and therefore computers will be better. 609 The 98 percent human error rate for crash causation mentioned 610 in the hearing memo has no basis in U.S. automotive safety 611 data I am aware of. There is a 94 percent error trope, but 612 that is a mischaracterization. Even the original NHTSA 613 report says it is not really blaming the humans, and it has 614 since been further discredited by the chair of NTSB. The 615 reality is that both human drivers and computer drivers will 616 617 make mistakes, and nobody knows how long it will take for computer drivers to be better than comparable human drivers 618 at the 40,000 fatality number we have been talking about. 619 The mobility, economic, and safety benefits promised by 620

manufacturers will only materialize if self-driving vehicles can be made safe and reliable at scale. The industry is not there yet, and it will easily be many years, if not decades, before the technology fully matures. Issuing overlypermissive regulations prematurely based on an assumption that it is already there is going to hurt the public interest.

Current regulations do not place any meaningful limits 628 629 on the ability of companies to develop the technology for fully autonomous vehicles. Moreover, there are significant 630 incentives for companies to cut corners on safety. 631 This, combined with any required private arbitration and generally 632 weak accountability, works against the interests of public 633 safety. The chaos and harm unfolding on our public roads 634 makes it clear that manufacturers pretty much have free rein 635 already. Federal preemption of state abilities to regulate 636 driving behaviors during a multi-year wait for Federal 637 regulations can make this even worse. 638

The race that counts for automated vehicles is the race to create reliable and safe vehicle automation technology. To win, the Federal Government should require companies to adopt their own industry's engineering safety standards and

643 best practices. There was a DoT framework in late 2020 that 644 proposed exactly this that is a good way forward.

Additionally, manufacturers should be required to be transparent about crash data and incidents, as well as be held accountable for safety issues caused by their computer drivers.

The economic impact that matters for the next 5 or 10 649 years or longer is partially automated systems, the so-called 650 651 level 2, 2-plus, maybe level 3 features that require driver oversight. This technology is not established to improve 652 safety. Driving automation technology does improve safety in 653 the form of automated emergency braking, but that is not the 654 steering down the road part of the technology. That is the 655 active safety systems. Vehicles with poor driver monitoring 656 and poorly conceived user interfaces are prone to causing 657 injury and death to road users, and that is happening. 658 So that part should be included in automated vehicle 659 regulations, and it is included in one of the bills. 660 661 In closing, key points I would ask you to keep in mind are, one, companies have shown they will be as opaque if we 662

663 let them, and that is causing them to lose the public's 664 trust.

665	Two, if the government does not find a way to
666	incentivize companies to be more reliable and safe, foreign
667	companies that do have a regulatory requirement to do that
668	will likely win in the long term.
669	And three, the core issue is public trust. Fake it
670	until you make it has run its course here. If we want to
671	have an automated vehicle industry in the future, Congress
672	needs to act to require transparency, accountability, and
673	adoption of the industry's own safety standards.
674	Thank you for the opportunity to testify.
675	
676	
677	[The prepared statement of Dr. Koopman follows:]
678	
679	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
680	

⁶⁸¹ *Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, sir. Now I will recognize
⁶⁸² Mr. Shapiro for his five minutes of testimony.

683 Welcome, sir.

685 STATEMENT OF GARY SHAPIRO

686

*Mr. Shapiro. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, members of the subcommittee. I am so grateful for your focus today on safety and saving lives, reducing injuries, and empowering Americans. I appreciate the opportunity to testify.

The Consumer Technology Association represents over 1,200 of America's leading and most innovative companies, 80 percent of whom are small businesses. And we produce the CES, the world's most powerful and most fun tech event.

696 [Laughter.]

Mr. Shapiro. It is full of innovation. The last one in January, we had 300 exhibitors just on the mobility area alone, and we invite all of you to see us in 2024, where you see a lot of self-driving technology.

You know, I last testified before you on this issue with similar testimony -- deja vu -- in February 2020. And since then I have become increasingly concerned by the lack of progress at the Federal level. There is a patchwork of state laws, some 34 different jurisdictions. And this refusal that we have as a Federal Government to embrace the future alarms

707 me. It is not who we are.

I have written 3 books and over 1,200 articles on innovation, and I am scared today to see the inaction that is affecting us.

As a nation we have been defined by our progress and our 711 innovation. That is who we are. That is what we do. And 712 Congress has an extremely rich history of being out there and 713 welcoming innovation, and embracing it, and not listening to 714 other parochial groups that say, "Slow it down, stop it, it 715 is going to threaten us, it is going to hurt us.'' And there 716 is very few examples of that, which has allowed us to be a 717 leader in so many different areas of technology and medicine 718 and elsewhere, because we favor the new, we favor the 719 720 innovative.

And the sad thing for us is our adversaries and allies are moving forward without us. And just since the last hearing we had on this in 2020, China, Europe, Japan have all moved forward -- and South Korea even has a target: half of its cars be self-driving by 2035.

We should be the leader. Instead, we are falling behind. And this is an issue that defines our future. It is an economic issue, a public safety issue, an accessibility

issue, and a national defense issue. As an economic issue, it could create 300 billion to 400 billion in revenue by 2035.

And of course, as many of you stated, we have to win in this race against China here, because I value our democracy, as I know all of you do, so much that being forced in a way to raise kids the way China does, and have that type of social structure is something we all must avoid, and the economy is part of the battle.

It is a public health and safety issue. Delay, every 738 year of delay is costing thousands of American lives. You 739 have heard about the loss of over 40,000 a year. Ninety-four 740 percent of the crashes are because of human error. There is 741 no other example it could be, other than the car breaking 742 down, which is very rare, or lightning, or big hole in the 743 road. Either that, or it is human error. And SDVs are never 744 distracted. They are never tired. They don't get drunk and 745 they don't fall asleep. And they are designed not to speed, 746 747 which is a contributing factor in many deaths and injuries. But we can't wait for them to be perfect. The perfect 748 should not be the enemy of the amazing. Even if we are only 749 saving 10 percent of lives in a couple of years -- or safety, 750

751 that is an astounding savings of lives and injuries and, 752 actually, economic savings as well, which will translate for 753 consumers in lower interest.

And of course, it is an accessibility issue, as you have heard. It could create over 4 million jobs and support an aging population, as 1 in 6 Americans are like me, older than 65.

And it is a national defense issue. As our adversaries develop self-driving, we will be unnecessarily risking young American lives who have to fight and drive abroad.

AVs are driving today on our roads. There is a lot of success stories. Thanks to innovation by American companies, Waymo is increasing passenger rides tenfold by next summer. Cruise has driverless taxi services in several cities. Aurora has 30 autonomous trucks on the roads in Texas. And 80 self-driving companies are testing across 30 states.

Consumers want these products. All the research shows
that about two-thirds of Americans are interested in
replacing their cars with self-driving vehicles.

And not every company will succeed. We have seen failures. Ford, Volkswagen's AG shut down. One of the reasons they cited? Regulatory uncertainty. Local Motors

bankruptcy. Uber and Lyft sold their companies. Not every 773 774 company will be successful, but we need legislative and regulatory action to move our nation forward, to stay 775 776 competitive, to save lives, and to reduce our -- and to allow investment, which is a very long timeframe in self-driving. 777 So what do we recommend? We need some goals. A 778 national goal, time bound on deaths and injuries reduced 779 would be really helpful. NHTSA has to update outdated safety 780 781 standards. We think there should be a national policy so that any bill ensures that the Federal Government remains 782 solely responsible for regulating vehicle safety and 783 performance. And we must expand the exemption authority of 784 It is so tiny right now that it doesn't allow 785 NHTSA. commercial viability, and has massive amount of billions of 786 dollars investment that American companies are ready to have. 787 Also, the more exemptions, the more data you collect, the 788 more oversight ability. 789 790 Thank you for this opportunity. I look forward to 791 answering questions.

792 [The prepared statement of Mr. Shapiro follows:]

793

794 ********COMMITTEE INSERT********

795

*Mr. Bilirakis. I appreciate it, sir. Thank you.
And last, but certainly not least, Mr. Riccobono, you
are recognized, sir, for your five minutes of testimony.

800 STATEMENT OF MARK RICCOBONO

801

*Mr. Riccobono. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and Ranking Member Schakowsky, and to the chair and ranking member of the committee and to all members. It is a true pleasure and honor to be here.

My name is Mark Riccobono. I serve as president of the 806 National Federation of the Blind, America's transformative 807 808 membership organization of blind people, and I want to thank the committee for including the voice, experience, and 809 perspectives of blind people in the consideration of 810 autonomous vehicle technology and the necessary legislation 811 and regulatory schemes that must be adopted in order to make 812 813 sure we have a responsible and meaningful implementation of this technology. 814

In addition to representing tens of thousands of blind Americans, I have ridden in, I think now, autonomous vehicles from half a dozen companies over the last 10 years. And I have been a strong advocate for advancing the accessibility conversation with this industry, beginning with my representation of the National Federation of the Blind to be the first -- well, first and only blind person to drive a car

822 using non-visual access technologies at the Daytona

823 International Speedway back in 2011.

More importantly, my wife and I are both blind, and we have two blind daughters. And so I echo the chairman's sentiment that on a daily basis we experience the struggles of equal access to transportation.

I also want to echo the chairman's comments in beginning by celebrating that this is the 33rd anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act, which was, as noted, a bipartisan effort to protect the rights of people with disabilities and to elevate people with disabilities, enable to live in and contribute to our society.

This hearing today is an important moment in fulfilling 834 the goals of the Americans with Disabilities Act. The 835 opportunity for our nation to innovate with this technology, 836 but also to make sure that all people with disabilities have 837 equal access to this important form of transportation is an 838 opportunity that really cannot be overstated. Congress has 839 840 not just the opportunity, but the responsibility to lead on these issues, and really bring the lived experience and 841 wisdom of people with disabilities to this effort. 842

And in that respect, there are two key principles. The

first, of course, is nothing without us. People with 844 845 disabilities need to be included from the beginning. And I celebrate the members of the committee who have made that a 846 847 priority in this discussion. But secondly, and maybe more importantly, is that we know from our experience that it is 848 not just including with -- people with disabilities, that 849 actually our perspective makes innovations better. The 850 access and the perspectives that we bring actually make the 851 852 development of technology better for everybody.

And I will add a side principle, and that is that, especially for blind people, taking humans out of the mix will eliminate the discrimination that many, many blind people feel, especially with rideshare drivers that deny them equal access.

Related to this bill, my written testimony has a number of important points that I won't take the moment to emphasize, but I will say that taking discrimination out of licensing schemes, including people with disabilities at the table from the beginning, and making sure that the United States Department of Transportation finds ways to include people with disabilities is important.

I will give one side note, which is although our members

866	are not primarily people who use wheelchairs, there are a
867	number of important considerations and concerns that the
868	committee should keep in mind and that we would elevate.
869	And finally, I would call on the committee to recognize
870	that the United States Access Board can play an important
871	role, and is an asset to the Federal Government in these
872	issues.
873	I appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today,
874	and I look forward to answering your questions.
875	[The prepared statement of Mr. Riccobono follows:]
876	
877	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
878	

*Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you very much, sir. I appreciate 879 880 it. I will go ahead and recognize myself for questioning for 881 882 five minutes. I want to ask Mr. Riccobono. I am so pleased, again, that you are here today, and 883 members of the National Federation of the Blind. Again, so 884 many of our friends who advocate for people living with 885 disabilities are here in the audience. I really appreciate 886 887 you making the effort to be here today. It makes a big difference. 888 I also want to thank you for your support of the 889 amendment offered last Congress on the infrastructure bill 890 regarding protections from discrimination for disability --891 for the disability community. I am still disappointed that 892 the majority at the time didn't allow it to be voted on as 893 part of that package that was enacted without our input. 894 Can you briefly share with us your experience with 895 self-driving vehicles, and maybe elaborate on how much of an 896 897 impact this will have for people living with disabilities?

And elaborate again on what opportunities this could bring if this technology is developed specifically with this community in mind. Is this a major priority for the National

901 Federation of the Blind?

902 *Mr. Riccobono. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, great 903 question.

Well, obviously, especially for blind people, but many people with disabilities, blind people are excluded from the driving class. You know, what I like to say is that 100 percent of accidents are caused by sighted drivers.

908 [Laughter.]

909 *Mr. Riccobono. I think I said that -- it still gets a 910 laugh. I think I said it last time I testified.

But the reality is that transportation is a significant barrier, easy transportation, access to affordable

913 transportation.

But also, as I alluded to, especially today in the rideshare environment -- but it has always been true with taxi drivers, as well -- there is a level of discrimination against people with disabilities, especially people -- blind people who use service animals. So there is a tremendous opportunity here.

But as I have noted, I have had the opportunity to ride in many autonomous vehicles, being involved in these discussions over the last decade. And I had a similar

923 experience as already has been shared related to Cruise in 924 San Francisco.

And I will say, you know, I was in a vehicle that was 925 926 not 100 percent successful. The vehicle actually had an issue at one point, and I was really kind of excited not to 927 have a perfect experience because it illuminated how much 928 thought has been put into both the safety and help teams that 929 are behind this technology. As a blind person not being able 930 931 to know, you know, look out the windshield and see what is happening outside the car in that moment -- and I will just 932 say we were at a red light, and when the light turned green 933 the car failed to move. But the help team engaged very 934 quickly, was very communicative about what was going on, and 935 I was impressed by the user experience that I will say is 936 much different than cars that I have been in with real, human 937 drivers. 938

So for people with disabilities, but, really, I think all people, there is a tremendous opportunity here to not only innovate by incorporating new ideas about accessibility, but to increase the safety and eliminate discrimination that happens in rideshare, where we have humans that are continuing to discriminate against people with disabilities

945 or people of color.

I think the technology and the thoughtful approach that the industry but also Congress is taking in these conversations give me a lot of hope for the safety and implementation of this technology.

*Mr. Bilirakis. Well, thank you very much. And I know 950 in my area, in the Tampa Bay area, most areas do not have a 951 strong public transportation system. We are not fortunate 952 953 enough to have a metro, what have you. So I think it is very appropriate that we have the discussion today and the work 954 you are doing, sir, to ensure people living with disabilities 955 is widely supported, including by the Consortium for 956 Constituents with Disabilities, who sent a letter to this 957 committee regarding the need to move AV legislation as soon 958 as possible. 959

960 I would like to submit that for the record.

961 Without objection, so ordered.

962 [The information follows:]

963

964 ********COMMITTEE INSERT********

965

966	*Mr. Bilirakis. I know I don't have a lot of time.
967	Well, why don't I go ahead and yield back and recognize the
968	ranking member? I will submit the rest of the questions for
969	the record.
970	[The information follows:]
971	
972	********COMMITTEE INSERT********
973	

974 *Mr. Bilirakis. I appreciate it.

975 *Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. 976 Dr. Koopman, you talked about -- you used the word 977 "trust,'' the assurance that Americans have when we talk 978 about autonomous vehicles. Trust becomes a very important 979 issue.

I want to thank the advocates for highway, auto -highway and auto safety, Cathy Chase, who is here in the audience, who has done a lot of work talking about what we need to do to make our highways safer.

But I want to ask you, Doctor, at this point do you feel that we could be saying that autonomous vehicles are, in fact, safer than human drivers?

987 *Dr. Koopman. At this point -- thank you for the 988 question, Ms. Schakowsky.

989 *Mr. Bilirakis. Press the button.

990 *Dr. Koopman. It is on, yes.

Where we are is that it is too soon to tell how it will turn out for fatalities. There is data saying it is a little bit safer. Maybe it is not as safe for crashes, and we are going to see how that plays out, but it is way too soon to tell for fatalities.

And the issue is that, while human drivers absolutely 996 make mistakes, computers make mistakes, too. And the 94 997 percent number you recently heard in the report that comes 998 999 from -- it is a NHTSA report -- it says 94 percent involved some element of a human. But sometimes the human didn't 1000 clean up a mess. The very next sentence in that report says 1001 this does not mean the driver was to blame. So it is 1002 important to realize the jury is still out. We have a long 1003 1004 way to go to find out how this turns out for fatalities. *Ms. Schakowsky. Let me also ask you this. You 1005 mentioned in your testimony a number of ways that AVs should 1006 be subjected to safety regulations. But let me ask you this. 1007 What are the kinds of things that Congress should be thinking 1008 1009 about as a start, and the role that we can play right now in assuring the kind of trust and safety for autonomous 1010 vehicles? 1011

1012 *Dr. Koopman. Well, I think that the main principles 1013 have to be transparency, accountability, and independent 1014 oversight.

But for something very actionable, NHTSA already has an advanced notice of proposed rulemaking for -- from December 2020 that has a pretty good starting point for a framework,

1018 including requiring conforming to engineering safety

1019 standards, telling engineers how to get the design right to 1020 address things.

And so just moving that ANPRM forward would provide a really robust platform to get consensus from both sides on how to provide. So people say we need a regulatory framework. We have one. It has been sitting there since December 2020. We need to move forward.

Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. I also just wanted you to comment on whether we should consider what is happening -what could happen to the workforce as we move forward with autonomous vehicles, and if we should be working to do some legislation in that regard.

1031 *Dr. Koopman. Absolutely. Any new technology will bring with it workforce disruptions. There are no 1032 exceptions. That just always happens. So I think it is 1033 really important to consider the workforce impact. 1034 There will be jobs, no doubt, eventually there will be jobs lost. 1035 1036 But there is going to be opportunities for a lot of new jobs and, in many cases, more highly skilled, better jobs that 1037 become available. 1038

1039 *Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you for that.

1040	I wanted to also add to something to the record.
1041	Several transportation labor organizations have written
1042	letters and that are calling on Congress to account for
1043	the potential loss of jobs. And I seek the and I ask for
1044	unanimous consent to put three of them in the record.
1045	*Mr. Bilirakis. Without objection, so ordered.
1046	[The information follows:]
1047	
1048	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
1049	

*Ms. Schakowsky. Okay. Really, that is the gist of my 1050 1051 questions. But what I would like -- there is a lot of sense of urgency in this room. How long -- do you have any 1052 1053 projection -- do you see it will take us to get to the point that we can really move significantly forward? 1054 *Dr. Koopman. I think there is two aspects to that. 1055 Ι am talking about 5 or 10 or 25 years before we see the 1056 complete transition. That doesn't mean we have to wait that 1057 1058 long to see benefit. We can see benefit, essentially, right away if we are careful to deploy the technology in niches 1059 where we can ensure that the public harm is not increased, 1060 and that there is a public benefit. 1061 So it is absolutely fine to deploy the technology in a 1062 1063 sensible, incremental way, making sure we do no harm as we do That can still proceed quite quickly. But it is going 1064 so. to need some regulatory frameworks to ensure that the 1065 industry is conforming to their very own industry engineering 1066 safety standards as they do it. 1067 1068 *Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. I am out of time. "Incremental'' may be the word. 1069 Thank you. I yield back. 1070

1071 *Mr. Bilirakis. The gentlelady yields back. I will now

1072 recognize the chairman of the full committee, Mrs. Rodgers, 1073 for her five minutes of questioning.

*The Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think I would 1074 1075 rather say the word is "nothing as powerful as an idea whose time has come, '' and this is an idea whose time has come. 1076 And I am so excited about what this transformational 1077 technology is going to mean on so many different fronts. 1078 But I wanted to start with Mr. Riccobono and, just 1079 1080 again, thank you for your powerful testimony, and it is great to have so many in the audience today advocating for those 1081 with disabilities. I wanted you to speak about the work that 1082 you are doing with these associations and members on the 1083 accessibility needs for people living with disabilities, and 1084 1085 how limiting will it be for your members if this important technology only comes to fruition in certain parts of the 1086 country or just certain populations. And if it is not 1087 available, is there a workforce to address your mobility 1088 1089 needs?

Mr. Riccobono. Yes. So thank you for the question.
One thing that has been, I think, impressive in the
trajectory of this technology is the inclusion of people with
disabilities in the discussion of how this technology is

developed and what the user interfaces will be. So it is not 1094 1095 just putting a person with a disability in a vehicle and pressing go, that the -- you know, making sure that people 1096 1097 with disabilities, from getting connected with a vehicle at the curb to having independent control within the vehicle to 1098 know what is happening to being able to get there safely, 1099 that we have been having discussions all throughout the 1100 process with the various companies and the industry on this. 1101 1102 You know, what is really important, especially for a person like me, is that ultimate, fully autonomous driving, 1103 right? Because the pathway we are on is helpful, but, you 1104 know, if there is still a requirement that you have to be 1105 able to see out the window to take control of the vehicle at 1106 1107 some point, that is not ultimately going to benefit someone 1108 like me.

And the other thing I would say is that I agree that, you know, people who live in many parts of this nation where there is limited or no public transportation system, the ability to independently get a car to come to you and take you to your doctor's appointment or some other important aspect of work, or even fun, for that matter, will be life changing.

And I don't use the term "life changing'' very often, 1116 but the transportation barrier --1117 *The Chair. Thank you, yes. 1118 1119 *Mr. Riccobono. -- that so many Americans face in getting --1120 1121 *The Chair. Thank you. *Mr. Riccobono. -- access to reliable transportation, 1122 it is transformative. 1123 1124 *The Chair. Yes, thank you. I have too many other 1125 questions, but I just appreciate that perspective so much. You know, I have deep concerns about the Chinese 1126 Communist Party embedding themselves in American 1127 infrastructure. And I do believe that there is an urgency. 1128 1129 We are spending billions of dollars right now to rip and replace Huawei equipment from our telecommunications system, 1130 and inaction on the AV front is letting history repeat 1131 itself. And, you know, we know there is at least seven 1132 Chinese companies testing on our roads today. So to the 1133 1134 question, I want to start with Mr. Shapiro. How long -- you heard -- how long should it take? 1135 What components of the discussion drafts before us today 1136 will spur the innovation, and what -- and which are a recipe 1137

1138 for failure?

1139And then I want to give Mr. Bozzella a chance to also1140answer that --

1141 *Mr. Shapiro. Is this in the context of China or 1142 overall?

*The Chair. Well, I will just say for -- I would like to -- let's keep it on the context of the bills before us, and AVs, and just -- what is going to spur the innovation, and what parts of these bills do you think are a recipe for failure?

Mr. Shapiro. I think Congressman Latta has presented a great framework that will allow rapid development of ATV [sic], as well. It will give the encouragement that the companies need.

There are, like, 8-year, 10-year planning cycles. You 1152 have to build a factory, invest billions of dollars. You 1153 have to know where your government is going to be. And right 1154 now, for example, the limitation on exclusions is so low that 1155 1156 there is no commercial way you could do that and make money -- 2,500 vehicles just doesn't cut it for a car company, 1157 considering everything: hiring the workers, training the 1158 workers, doing all the things that are necessary. And I 1159

think Congressman Latta has done that beautifully, as have 1160 1161 other parts of the bill. I would like to see a timetable in there, personally, of 1162 1163 when things -- when we will be at certain guideposts. I think it is always good, especially in the business world, to 1164 have measurements so you can measure your success. 1165 *The Chair. Thank you. I am going to take back my 1166 time --1167 1168 *Mr. Shapiro. Okay. 1169 *The Chair. -- and yield the remainder to Mr. Bozzella. Thank you. 1170 *Mr. Bozzella. Thank you, Chair McMorris Rodgers. So 1171 very quickly, three things that the bills do that are really 1172 1173 important. 1174 One, they ensure that NHTSA reimagines and modernizes Federal motor vehicle safety standards for this future. That 1175 is critical to innovation and development here in the United 1176 States. 1177 1178 Secondly, we need a bridge because it is going to take NHTSA some time to do that. We need a bridge that ensures 1179 safety so NHTSA would expand under this bill exemptions, 1180

1181 ensuring vehicles that don't have specific traditional

technologies like steering wheels and pedals are as safe or 1182 1183 safer than the vehicles they would replace. So that is the second piece. 1184 1185 The third piece that is really important is let's make sure that we adhere to and respect the traditional roles of 1186 the Federal Government with regard to design, construction, 1187 and operation of vehicles, and the traditional roles of 1188 states with regard to licensing and traffic enforcement. 1189 1190 So --1191 *The Chair. Thank you. *Mr. Bozzella. -- three important things. 1192 *The Chair. Thank you. Yes, my time is expired. I 1193 will -- I do have further follow-up questions that I will 1194 1195 submit in writing. 1196 [The information follows:] 1197 1198 1199

1200 *The Chair. I yield back, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.
1201 *Mr. Bilirakis. The gentlelady yields back, and I will
1202 recognize the ranking member, Mr. Pallone, for his five
1203 minutes of questioning.

*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to ask some questions first about preemption of state and local laws, and then about forced arbitration.

1207 So if we spend too much time on the first one, I may cut 1208 some of you off because I want to get to the second one.

For people with disabilities, AVs are a transformational technology that holds the promise of greatly improving independence and mobility. But we can't overcome barriers to independence by preempting state and local accessibility laws and weakening the enforcement of the ADA.

The Consortium for Constituents with Disabilities, which 1214 includes organizations like the Disability Rights Education 1215 and Defense Fund, the Paralyzed Veterans of America, and the 1216 American Foundation for the Blind has submitted a letter for 1217 1218 the record expressing concerns that preemption language -and I quote -- "regarding the design, construction, or 1219 performance of AVs could harm efforts to improve access and 1220 benefits for disabled and other historically underserved 1221

Mr. Pallone. Thank you. So let me ask some questions. Mr. Riccobono, would you concern -- would you be concerned about Federal legislation preempting state and local laws adopting accessibility requirements for the benefit of people with disabilities?

*Mr. Riccobono. Well -- and thank you for the question -- what I would say to that is that, you know, the accessibility requirements need to be standard across the country. This is a problem we see sometimes in other areas where there is variation.

So the Federal Government, I think, plays an important role, and that is where I referenced the United States Access Board is a tremendous resource for NHTSA and others on this issue to set a reasonable and powerful standard to make sure whatever happens in this area, that it is fully inclusive for people with disabilities.

1246 *Mr. Pallone. Thank you.

1247 Mr. Shapiro, do your members support preempting state 1248 and local laws adopting accessibility requirements for the 1249 benefit of people with disabilities?

*Mr. Shapiro. For -- in the sense of building cars?
Absolutely, because to build a car on a national basis, as

opposed to do it for local requirements, the economies of 1252 1253 scale are such that we will be charging consumers more because -- if there are local requirements. 1254 1255 And it has been how cars have developed in our regulatory structure is that the safety features of the car 1256 are regulated nationally. In terms of driver requirements, 1257 things like that, that is a state -- and that is what this 1258 legislation envisions. 1259 1260 *Mr. Pallone. And then Mr. Bozzella, same question. Do your members support preempting state and local laws, 1261 adopting accessibility requirements for the benefit of people 1262 with disabilities? 1263 *Mr. Bozzella. I think accessibility is critically 1264 1265 important, and it is one of the opportunities we have in terms of the benefits this technology provides. However, we 1266 need to build one fleet for the nation, and so those 1267 accessibility requirements should be established in a way 1268

1269 that allows us to make sure that they are part of every 1270 vehicle, one fleet of vehicles for the nation.

*Mr. Pallone. Thank you. I am going to then -- I am
going to go to Mr. Koopman instead on the forced arbitration.
This same letter from the Consortium for Constituents

with Disabilities encourages us to prohibit forced 1274 arbitration clauses in AV legislation to ensure AV providers 1275 can be -- and it quotes -- "held accountable for injuries and 1276 1277 property damage.'' So, Mr. Koopman, what would be the effect of forced 1278 arbitration agreements imposed on AV users on mobility and 1279 safety for the disabled community? 1280 *Dr. Koopman. I think that a forced arbitration 1281 1282 provision would make it much more difficult for the disabled to assert their rights and hold companies accountable. 1283 Mr. Riccobono mentioned the problems they have with ride 1284 hailing networks. I remember a time when we were promised 1285 that ride hailing was going to solve all the mobility needs, 1286 1287 and deliver food to food deserts, and help out folks who had mobility problems. I remember that time, and it didn't work 1288 out. And my understanding is that forced arbitration has 1289 played a large role in that outcome. 1290

*Mr. Pallone. And then lastly, are there unique safety and operational considerations with respect to AVs and people with disabilities that we should take into account as we consider the AV legislation?

¹²⁹⁵ *Dr. Koopman. Yes, there are. And the engineering

1296 safety standards I mentioned actually speak directly to

1297 those.

For example, Mr. Riccobono, again, was talking about how the companies are addressing this, and that is great that some companies are addressing it, things that -- if you don't have sight, that signs inside the cars aren't going to work; if you are hearing impaired, audio cues aren't going to work. And so those things definitely have to be taken into account in designing these vehicles.

*Mr. Pallone. All right, thanks so much. I really think that the deployment of AVs doesn't have to come at the expense of state and local accessibility laws and the rights of the disabled to seek justice for ADA violations.

1309 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you. The ranking member yields back, and I will recognize Dr. Bucshon for his five minutes of questioning.

Mr. Bucshon. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for calling today's hearing. This is an important step in establishing a clear Federal regulatory framework for autonomous vehicles in the United States.

1317 While we are years from broad deployment, I hesitate to

1318 call this an emerging technology because it is already being 1319 utilized across our country, with more than 44 million miles 1320 traveled here. While the United States has been a leader in 1321 developing various autonomous driving technologies that can 1322 help make our roads safer, our competitors abroad in Europe 1323 and China are closing the gap with us, as developers in the 1324 U.S. are stuck in regulatory purgatory.

1325That didn't sound quite right, but -- "regulatory1326purgatory.''

1327 [Laughter.]

*Mr. Bucshon. One technology that I believe is critical in the future of this industry is LiDAR or, light detection and ranging that uses pulsed lasers to map the surrounding environment. In 2018 the United States had over 85 percent of the LiDAR market share worldwide. Today we have less than 50 percent.

China has identified this as a key enabling technology in its Belt and Road strategy, and is increasing their production at a feverish pace. They know this technology will not only be pivotal in technologies like AVs, but also in public transportation, industrial automation, defense, and more. This seems eerily similar to 20 years ago, when the

1340 CCP recognized how critical semiconductors would be, and took 1341 steps to dominate the market. Today we are still struggling 1342 with that aftermath. We cannot let this happen again with 1343 LiDAR or any AV technologies.

1344 So Mr. Shapiro, do you think that enacting legislation 1345 like the SELF DRIVE Act will help boost U.S. production of 1346 critical technologies like LiDAR, and prevent such 1347 bottlenecks from happening again?

Mr. Shapiro. I think that the legislation going forward as proposed will be a great big step in ensuring that does not happen, because the alternative is there is not going to be a lot of investment in the U.S. in self-driving.

In terms of the specific focus on specific ingredient technologies like LiDAR technology, you would have to look at the patent portfolio ownership and see if patents are being violated. I think there is different steps that government can take if it is seeking to protect a critical part of a supply chain like LiDAR, or as has been done with chips. But that is a policy decision.

I think the important thing is that we go forward and start letting companies know that this is going to be massproduced technology so they can invest in the United States

1362 and manufacture in the United States.

Mr. Bucshon. Yes, I mean, I think that is the critical thing: investment in the United States. And we certainly don't want to inhibit that.

1366 Mr. Bozzella, do you think that U.S. manufacturers would 1367 be able to meet the production caps proposed in

1368 Representative Latta's discussion draft before the committee 1369 today?

*Mr. Bozzella. Yes, I do. But I am more concerned that if we don't expand those exemptions and provide a bridge to test and deploy at scale, that there are going to be fewer companies doing fewer -- less innovation here in the United States.

1375 *Mr. Bucshon. And do you -- are there any other 1376 regulatory hurdles that this legislation should address to 1377 ensure that they can?

Mr. Bozzella. Yes. We should ensure that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration does the hard but necessary and critical work of modernizing Federal motor vehicle safety standards.

1382 *Mr. Bucshon. Great. I mean, my hope would be that 1383 this increased production would lead to more AV deployments

1384 in rural areas like Indiana's 8th district.

1385 [Laughter.]

1386 *Mr. Bucshon. As an example.

1387 [Laughter.]

1388 *Mr. Bucshon. It seems like I am getting a lot of 1389 laughs today for some reason.

1390 [Laughter.]

*Mr. Bucshon. Where individuals with impaired vision or other disabilities, the elderly, and every Hoosier would be able to benefit from AVs. I mean, rural America has been addressed, right, and it is critical. It is a bigger challenge, probably, than urban America is.

So, Mr. Riccobono, would you agree that implementing the national regulatory framework like the SELF DRIVE Act would accomplish this goal of increasing access in rural America to individuals who have impaired vision or other disabilities? Mr. Riccobono. Yes, 100 percent, especially with

1401 accessibility and the inclusion of the wisdom of people with 1402 disabilities being central to it. So I agree.

1403 *Mr. Bucshon. Thank you. And I also, just in closing, 1404 I want to make sure that safety is a critical issue. And we 1405 obviously do not want to over overlook that. And that is

1406 something I think we can find solutions for.

Also, you know, the displacement of workers,
potentially, is another thing we can find solutions to. And

1409 I think, ultimately, at the end of the day, it will create 1410 more jobs out there. But it will increase access to the 1411 roadways for the people that we have discussed -- and improve 1412 safety. Thank you.

1413 I yield back.

1414 *Mr. Bilirakis. The gentleman yields back. Now I
1415 recognize Representative Clarke from the great State of New
1416 York for your five minutes of questioning.

1417 *Ms. Clarke. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and let 1418 me thank our Ranking Member Schakowsky for holding today's 1419 hearing. And I want to thank our witnesses for being here to 1420 testify on these bills today.

Before I get to my questions I would like to take a moment to recognize the irony in this subcommittee holding a hearing on the need for regulatory certainty for autonomous vehicles, almost all of which will be electric. And then the fact that tomorrow our full committee plans to mark up multiple bills that will reverse clear Federal rules on vehicle emissions in an attempt to thwart investments the

1428 auto industry and Congress have made in electrification.

As the young people say, "Just saying.''

1430 [Laughter.]

1431 *Ms. Clarke. Last month, unfortunately, an automated vehicle driving system activated -- excuse me, a vehicle with 1432 an automated driving system activated ran into the sidewalk 1433 in my district, killing one of my constituents and seriously 1434 injuring another. And while I recognize the clear 1435 1436 differences between highly automated, fully autonomous vehicles and the advanced driver assistance systems present 1437 in this incident, it would be unfortunate if this committee 1438 did not recognize the present dangers of automated technology 1439 being marketed and used in vehicles today. So we cannot look 1440 1441 so far into the future that we fail to protect our

1442 constituents today. Just saying.

I am also, like, excuse me, Ranking Member Pallone, concerned that broad preemption of state and local laws could limit the ability of cities like New York to enforce their local traffic laws, including the AVs, are allowed to operate [sic].

1448 Mr. Bozzella, you state in your testimony that states 1449 should continue to have jurisdiction over operation of

vehicles on public roads, including enforcement of traffic 1450 1451 laws. Could you elaborate on that position, and how does broad preemption of state and local laws impact and 1452 1453 potentially limit safety? *Mr. Bozzella. Yes. Well, thank you very much for the 1454 question. I very much appreciate it. 1455 The key here is, to my mind, is making sure that we 1456 recognize the traditional roles that state and local 1457 1458 governments have. And I have a background in local government, having worked for the mayor of the City of New 1459 York back in my day. So I appreciate where you come from. 1460 It is really important that we do that. But it is also 1461 important that we recognize the Federal role with regard to 1462 design, construction, and performance of vehicles. And so 1463 that is what we are looking for. 1464 AVs are going to follow local traffic laws. AVs 1465 currently follow local traffic laws where they are already 1466 operating, and that will be true in the future, as well. 1467 1468 *Ms. Clarke. Very well.

Dr. Koopman, would broad preemption prevent cities from prohibiting AVs in certain areas like school zones, or traffic laws requiring full stops at stop signs, or safe lane

1472 changes?

1473 *Dr. Koopman. I think Federal preemption could be a1474 problem.

In New York City, for example, right now, is the only place in the country that requires companies doing testing to follow the industry standard -- testing safety standard, J3018. It is the only place in the country that does that. And with this Federal preemption, you would get that taken away from you.

1481 *Ms. Clarke. Okay, so state and local governments have a duty to protect the public from vehicle crashes, a role 1482 that becomes even more important in the absence of strong 1483 Federal action and leadership. And since NHTSA's inception, 1484 the relationship between Federal, state, and local law have 1485 been clear. Once a Federal safety standard is in effect, 1486 state and local governments cannot enact or enforce safety --1487 different safety standards. 1488

I am concerned with any proposal that creates a regulatory black hole where the Federal Government could fail to prescribe safety standards, and state and local governments would be prohibited from filing that -- filling that void and enforcing local traffic laws.

There is a consortium of seven organizations 1494 representing the nation's state and local elected and 1495 appointed officials. They have written a letter calling on 1496 1497 Congress to preserve and -- preserve state and local authority to promote traffic safety, and I ask for unanimous 1498 consent that this letter be entered into the record. 1499 My final question. As co-chair of the Smart Cities 1500 Caucus and the former chair of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee 1501 1502 at the Committee on Homeland Security, I am especially conscious of the threats posed by increasingly digitized and 1503 connected technologies. Dr. Koopman, would you consider an 1504 autonomous vehicle that does not adhere to adequate 1505 1506 cybersecurity practices an unreasonable risk to roadway 1507 safety?

*Dr. Koopman. I think it is really important that the vehicles, all vehicles, conform to the industry standard for cybersecurity. It is not -- this is not just an AV problem, it is an any vehicle with a camera problem. And so AVs get swept into that, as well. Yes, they should conform.

*Ms. Clarke. Very well. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.
*Mr. Walberg. [Presiding] I thank the gentlelady, and I
recognize myself for five minutes of questioning.

AVs clearly, from our discussion today and research otherwise, have the potential for extensive transformation. But we cannot fully realize the potential if we do not lead the world in this technology. I think we would all agree with that.

1521 My legislation, the Safe Car Act, is included in Mr. 1522 Latta's draft we are discussing today.

I also sent a bipartisan letter last week with 1523 1524 Representative Dingell, Latta, and Veasey outlining the concerns with Chinese AV companies testing in the United 1525 States. It is frustrating to think that the -- China will 1526 not allow American companies to any extensive nature test 1527 their AVs in China. When you stop and think about the 1528 1529 competitive problem that is, but also the security problem of having more data collected and make AVs better, day by day, 1530 drive by drive, think how much data the CCP is collecting on 1531 the United States and its citizens. That is a concern. 1532

I am thankful that Secretary Buttigieg did respond to this letter publicly, and I think it is a concern that we have. So, Mr. Chairman -- I guess I am the chairman at this point in time.

1537 [Laughter.]

1538	*Mr. Walberg. So there is no problem with unanimous
1539	consent to have that letter included in the record.
1540	[Laughter.]
1541	*Mr. Walberg. I hear no objection.
1542	[The information follows:]
1543	
1544	********COMMITTEE INSERT********
1545	

*Mr. Walberg. It is imperative that we approach this issue from both sides, boosting American AV leadership by offering regulatory certainty and protecting against national security and competitive risks through increasing China's concerns and addressing those concerns. My legislation seeks to address the latter.

Mr. Koopman -- and all the panel, thank you for being here -- do you support the language in the discussion draft that I authored which would give the Secretary of Transportation authority to prohibit or limit testing vehicles within the U.S., depending on whether companies are under the control of the CCP, or if companies within China pose a threat to the security of the United States?

1559 *Dr. Koopman. Sir, I am here to talk about safety, and1560 I don't really have an opinion on that topic.

1561 *Mr. Walberg. I am concerned about that, and we could 1562 talk about that further.

1563 *Dr. Koopman. I would love to follow up with you and 1564 understand more.

- 1565 *Mr. Walberg. Yes.
- 1566 *Dr. Koopman. At this point --

1567 *Mr. Walberg. I know that you have been a consultant to

1568	numerous companies, including, I believe, some Chinese
1569	companies, as well, but we will leave that for further
1570	discussion.
1571	*Dr. Koopman. No, sir, I am not consulting to any
1572	Chinese companies.
1573	*Mr. Walberg. I am interested with your work with the
1574	Voluntary Standards Committee. Are there Chinese companies
1575	that participate in this?
1576	And second, given their numbers, do they have an
1577	outsized role on development of the standards?
1578	*Dr. Koopman. There are Chinese representatives on all
1579	the standards I am aware of. I don't have a list for some of
1580	the ISO standards I work on. For sure, there are Chinese
1581	participants in UL 4600.
1582	They absolutely do not have an outsized influence. They
1583	are not calling the shots by any stretch. It is the
1584	direction is set by the U.S. and by Europe.
1585	*Mr. Walberg. Yes. Well, the concern is that there are
1586	Chinese involved.
1587	Let me move on to the next question, turning to a
1588	separate issue. I am an avid motorcycle guy, co-chair of the
1589	Congressional Motorcycle Caucus, lifetime member of the
	81

American Motorcycle Association. As I said, true autonomous vehicles will offer many safety benefits. But many in the motorcycle community are concerned that technology is able to properly detect and protect motorcyclists on the road. We are a very different from pedestrians and bicyclists because we are in and amongst the traffic.

1596 Mr. Shapiro, how are AV companies considering 1597 motorcyclists in their safety tests?

And how does the technology used by level four and five autonomous vehicles differ from those in self-proclaimed full driving mode when it comes to motorcycle awareness and safety?

*Mr. Shapiro. Thank you, Mr. Walberg. My understanding 1602 1603 is that they are taking into account motorcyclists, bicyclists, and they don't have blind spots on self-driving 1604 vehicles, as opposed to what human drivers have in many 1605 vehicles. So it will definitely be safer for motorcyclists 1606 in a self-driving environment, and it is even getting safer 1607 1608 today before we get there, just with active collision avoidance, things like that. 1609

1610 So motorcyclists are identifiable on, my understanding 1611 is, most self-driving vehicles today.

1612	*Mr. Walberg. They are out amongst the traffic, unlike
1613	bicyclists and pedestrians, to a greater degree.
1614	*Mr. Shapiro. Absolutely.
1615	*Mr. Walberg. And going in between. So it is a
1616	concern, and I hope we continue to address that.
1617	I appreciate your response and
1618	*Mr. Shapiro. Could I come back to your China question?
1619	*Mr. Walberg. I think I have run out of time. I would
1620	love to have you come back to the China question, but we will
1621	talk about it later.
1622	*Voice. Yield to Mrs. Dingell.
1623	*Mr. Walberg. I now yield to Mrs. Dingell.
1624	*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I laid out
1625	in my opening remarks, I am very firmly committed to working
1626	towards bipartisan agreement on AV legislation.
1627	Earlier this spring Representative Latta and I agreed to
1628	roll up our sleeves and get to work on finding a path
1629	forward. Our staffs have been meeting regularly with each
1630	other, engaging all the stakeholders. I have also been
1631	directly engaged in having good, bipartisan conversations,
1632	not only with Representative Latta, as well as Chair Rodgers,
1633	Ranking Member Pallone and I also want to say that the

ranking member of this committee, Jan Schakowsky, has been 1634 1635 like -- for years now, also involved in being in all these meetings, and she is getting to know the industry well. 1636 1637 [Laughter.] *Mrs. Dingell. She loves it. And as my colleague who 1638 is currently sitting in the chair mentioned, we led a letter 1639 with Representative Walberg, Representative Latta, and 1640 Representative Veasey about the national security and 1641 1642 competitiveness concerns related to Chinese companies deploying AVs on U.S. roads, and I look forward to addressing 1643 this mutual concern as part of our bipartisan AV legislation. 1644 What does all this work demonstrate? It shows that we 1645 can have meaningful, bipartisan collaboration on AVs this 1646 1647 Congress, and we got a lot more work ahead of us. I am committed to continuing this important work with my 1648 Republican colleagues and my colleagues on this side of the 1649 aisle to forge in advance comprehensive, bipartisan AV 1650 legislation. And I am confident that Representative Latta 1651 1652 also really wants to get a bipartisan AV bill done, as well. 1653 So we are in lock step. My first question to -- for all of the witnesses is are 1654

84

you committed to continuing to work with Representative

1656	Latta, myself, you, and others as we craft and move forward
1657	bipartisan AV legislation this Congress? Are you willing to
1658	make that commitment, yes or no?
1659	*Mr. Bozzella. Yes.
1660	*Dr. Koopman. Yes.
1661	*Mr. Shapiro. Yes.
1662	*Mr. Riccobono. Yes.
1663	*Mrs. Dingell. A yes from everybody. Thank you for
1664	those collective comments, commitments. They were
1665	collective, too.
1666	Second, do you agree that it would be harmful overall to
1667	the prospects of enacting any meaningful AV legislation this
1668	Congress if the House or Senate moves forward with a strictly
1669	partisan bill? Yes or no. I better go down the line.
1670	Mr. Bozzella?
1671	*Mr. Bozzella. Yes, we need a bipartisan, bicameral
1672	bill.
1673	*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you.
1674	*Dr. Koopman. Bipartisan sounds good to me.
1675	*Mr. Shapiro. We love bipartisan.
1676	[Laughter.]
1677	*Mr. Riccobono. I agree, bipartisan in the spirit of
	85

1678 the Americans with Disabilities Act.

1679 *Mrs. Dingell. Great. In the spirit of bipartisanship, 1680 in reaching compromise across a diverse group of 1681 stakeholders, do you think we can collectively overcome the 1682 obstacles of the past on AV legislation, and will you work 1683 with us to do so?

1684 Down the line again.

1685 *Mr. Bozzella. We must, because we are out of time.

1686 *Dr. Koopman. I am happy to work with anyone to ensure1687 the safety of this technology and its benefits.

1688 *Mr. Shapiro. The House passed legislation unanimously.
1689 There is no reason it can't do it again.

1690 *Mr. Riccobono. And I will say I believe that there is 1691 no effort to diminish people with disabilities in this 1692 process. So yes.

Mrs. Dingell. Thank you. I had to bite my tongue and say the United States Senate sometimes, but I will behave.
John Dingell is thinking it above.

Now I have another question. As I mentioned at the top, I share the concerns of my colleagues, Representative Walberg, both on national security and competitiveness fronts regarding the deployment of Chinese-made AVs on U.S. roads,

1700 and I thank him for his leadership with me on this issue, and 1701 Mr. Latta and Veasey.

Mr. Bozzella, could you elaborate on the very real impacts to American competitiveness, our supply chains, and the American workforce if Congress fails to finally advance comprehensive bipartisan legislation?

Mr. Bozzella. Yes, I think it is critical that we do so. I mentioned in my -- in both the written and oral testimony that I have a concern, and that we are at a crossroads. And without a comprehensive AV policy framework, that companies are not going to be able to succeed in the way they need to.

What we need to do is allow companies to safely scale so 1712 1713 that they can provide these benefits and so, importantly, NHTSA has the data they need to make sure that motor vehicle 1714 safety standards are modernized, and that we have a 1715 regulatory framework going forward. If we don't do that, our 1716 competitors in other nations will seize this opportunity. 1717 1718 *Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, and I want to thank all of our witnesses for being here today, for your important 1719 testimony and responses on the two bills included in today's 1720 hearing. 1721

Again, I am going to reinforce we are -- I am committed and I know my colleagues are committed to working with Representative Latta, the members of this committee, and all of the interested stakeholders on getting the policy right, and drafting comprehensive bipartisan AV legislation for the safe deployment of this technology.

Thank you to the Energy and Commerce Committee leadership for holding this important hearing, and this is the beginning of getting it done this year.

1731 Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I yield back.

Mr. Bilirakis. [Presiding] I am all for that. Okay, the gentlelady yields back. I now recognize the gentlelady from Arizona, my good friend, Mrs. Lesko. Thank you.

1735 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and thank1736 you, all of you, for being here.

I am a huge supporter of autonomous vehicles. I think they are very beneficial to everyone. I think they will be make the roads more safe. I also think they will be very beneficial to senior citizens and the disabled. In fact, in Arizona, my home state, our Republican Governor Ducey was -put in policies that really incentivized autonomous vehicle companies to come to Arizona.

In fact, we have Waymo One, which operates 24/7 across 1744 1745 225 miles in metro Phoenix area. I have riden -- rode in one of them in downtown Phoenix, in the city of Peoria, Arizona, 1746 1747 where I live. We had a robo-ride medical autonomous electric vehicle that operated in a health care district where there 1748 were home to more than 100 medical facilities and more than 1749 500 senior living residences. We also have May Mobility, 1750 which is funded by AARP, operating in Sun City, Arizona, 1751 1752 which is a senior citizen community. And they have two 1753 wheelchair-accessible vehicles that operate to help senior citizens get around. 1754

So, Mr. Riccobono -- sorry if I said your name wrong --1755 you indicated that increased deployment of autonomous 1756 vehicles would significantly improve the independence and 1757 economic prospects for people with disabilities and mobility 1758 limitations. In my district the Valley wAVe project, which 1759 is May Mobility, operates a wheelchair-accessible vehicle 1760 with additional audio and visual accessibility -- or 1761 1762 accessory features. However, under the current regulations, these deployments use existing FMVSS-compliant vehicle 1763 designs, and modify them to be more accessible. 1764

1765 My question is, how can the deployment of purpose-built

automated vehicles enabled by this legislation unlock even 1766 1767 greater accessibility designs from the ground up? *Mr. Riccobono. So it is a great question. I would say 1768 1769 two things. One is there is a real opportunity here to innovate 1770 around accessible design, especially in the physical 1771 environment when we think about building vehicles that don't 1772 require some of the controls that we have had in the past. 1773 1774 I also think, you know, part of this is we need to build that bridge to the future. So really centering people with 1775 disabilities in terms of physical design, there is still 1776 innovations to be had there. So I know my colleagues, 1777 especially who do you utilize wheelchairs, have concerns that 1778 1779 we can use some of the existing exemptions and modifications while we get to a future where we have safety restraints that 1780 work for all types of people, including those who use various 1781 varieties of wheelchairs. 1782

1783 *Mrs. Lesko. Thank you.

Mr. Shapiro, you mentioned that autonomous vehicle technology will empower millions of Americans -- I agree with you -- providing greater independence and mobility for seniors and people with disabilities. In my district --

1788	again, in Sun City, Arizona we are seeing just that with
1789	the AARP sponsoring the deployment of May Mobility's
1790	wheelchair-accessible vehicles in service of a retirement
1791	community.
1792	Arizona is home to a growing retirement population, and
1793	this will bring increased mobility needs as residents age.
1794	My question is what can we do to ensure we are leveraging
1795	autonomous vehicle technology to meet the needs of
1796	populations who are aging and may have subsequent mobility
1797	limitations?
1798	My next question is please expand on what you wanted to
1799	talk about on competition with China.
1800	[Laughter.]
1801	*Mr. Shapiro. Thank you very much for those questions.
1802	So just to lay the groundwork, in 2021 there was 42,000-
1803	plus deaths, 1.7 million injuries in the United States with
1804	vehicles, 4.3 million accidents, collision. Think of the
1805	money every American will save on insurance if he could even
1806	cut those down by half. Think of the how the hospital
1807	rooms will be emptied out, and the doctors could do what they
1808	should be doing in other areas, the nurses, the anesthetists,
1809	so many other people. There will be a huge savings, it will

benefit every American, not just those with disabilities.
As a person on the panel who is over 65, I say I look
forward to it because I could get a lot of work done, as
opposed -- you know, when I am going on longer drives and
things like that, that I would appreciate. That would add to
our economy.

In terms of China, I have long maintained that we should treat China the way they treat us. We should have reciprocity. If they are not letting us test our vehicles there, we shouldn't let them test there. And that goes into a lot of other areas. But you are focusing in this area specifically.

We have had a business at a big event in China. 1822 I have 1823 had to deal with it. I have had to have the government partnerships. There is a -- it is a longer discussion about 1824 China, but clearly, they are our biggest long-term strategic 1825 threat, not only militarily but in terms of what -- the type 1826 of lifestyle they want compared to what we want our kids and 1827 1828 grandkids to be. So if you are talking about China, I am 1829 interested.

1830 *Mrs. Lesko. All right, thank you.

1831 And I yield back.

*Mr. Bilirakis. The gentlelady yields back. 1832 Now I recognize my friend from the State of Florida, Mr. Soto, for 1833 his five minutes of questioning. 1834 1835 *Mr. Soto. Thank you, Chairman. Autonomous vehicles are part of a bold future for the 1836 United States, and I envision many benefits and also 1837 recognize challenges that we are going to have to negotiate 1838 through. 1839 1840 I think about the empowerment for so many Americans. We have heard from Mr. Riccobono already about how it could help 1841 Americans with disabilities, also seniors and young people. 1842 And advancements in technology can increase public safety, as 1843 was testified by Mr. Shapiro and others. 1844 1845 We have challenges, though, obviously. We have a long road ahead to advance the technology. We have job 1846 disruptions in training and retraining that are real, and we 1847 want to make sure to get on the proactive side of it. We 1848 need to ensure these systems are resilient to cyber attacks, 1849 1850 and ensure we have access to the courts in the case of 1851 negligence.

1852 In central Florida we have Beep, which is the longest 1853 running local transit system in the nation, way back in 2019.

That is how new this technology is. They take veterans in 1854 1855 Lake Nona from different areas in the city to the VA hospital. They take families to Nemours for cancer 1856 1857 treatment, and tourists around the Lake Nona area. They have also been used in Chairman Bilirakis's area in Tampa Bay, I 1858 am sure he is familiar with. And so we need to encourage 1859 companies like this with new and innovative technology. 1860 We also need to see where we need to delineate between 1861 1862 what new laws NHTSA needs and what existing authority they already have. Mr. Bozzella and Mr. Koopman -- or Dr. 1863 Koopman, my first question is so NHTSA has exemption 1864 authority and expertise already. What additional -- take 1865 these bills aside for a second, right, this is where we are 1866 1867 kind of going. What do you think is the additional authority and guidance they will need to keep pace with the development 1868 of autonomous vehicles? 1869

1870 We will start with Mr. Bozzella and then go to Mr. 1871 Koopman.

*Mr. Bozzella. Thank you for the question. I think the most important thing NHTSA needs is data. What they need is they need to understand what is working. They need the data to be able to modernize motor vehicle safety standards.

Right now those standards depend on feet and hands and 1876 eyes. And so vehicles without steering wheels and pedals 1877 need modernized standards. So the agency needs the data. 1878 1879 What the laws -- what the bills, both bills, do is give NHTSA a framework for that -- to collect that data at a much 1880 greater rate, and more quickly to modernize those standards. 1881 *Mr. Soto. Dr. Koopman, what additional authorities 1882 does NHTSA need, do you think? 1883 1884 *Dr. Koopman. I think there is two things they need.

The first is that, traditionally, they have not enforced the government -- the general government desire to make use of existing industry consensus engineering standards. And NHTSA has not done that historically. The framework proposed in 2020 goes there, and I think that they need encouragement. They may even need a mandate to go down that path and figure that out.

The second thing is they need more staffing. They are chronically understaffed in computer expertise. They have a small ability to hire now in that area, but they have been understaffed for a couple decades, and they need to really beef up their capabilities in that area to keep up with this technology. And that is probably going to require funding.

1898 *Mr. Soto. So the appropriations process, cutting 15 1899 percent off of NHTSA's budget this year from the President's 1900 request, probably wouldn't be helpful.

Dr. Koopman, you talked about potential new jobs, better jobs training. For a lot of folks who are concerned about the future autonomous vehicles, can you elaborate on some of those examples?

*Dr. Koopman. Some examples are we heard earlier that if there is a problem in the middle of the ride, which -- my friends tell me this is happening regularly -- that there is a remote staff to help people out. Well, those are jobs that are going to be created that aren't there.

Another one is going to be higher-skilled technicians and higher-skilled safety drivers, because every new software release, which will happen monthly or weekly, basically forever, needs testers to make sure it is safe before it is put out in the wild.

Another one is some of the jobs will be there, but change in nature. Somebody still has to babysit a hazardous load, even if the truck is driving itself. Someone has got to be there to unload the crates until that part gets automated.

1920	So I think there is a lot of different opportunities,
1921	but they are a little bit different than just a driver behind
1922	the wheel.
1923	*Mr. Soto. Thank you. And there are concerns about our
1924	constituents' rights like access to the courts, avoiding
1925	forced arbitration, designating manufacturers as the
1926	responsible entities, protecting state laws and common laws.
1927	And Mr. Chairman, we have a letter from dozens of
1928	consumer groups talking about these types of concerns. I
1929	move to introduce this.
1930	*Mr. Bilirakis. Yes, without objection, so ordered.
1931	[The information follows:]
1932	
1933	*********COMMITTEE INSERT********
1934	

1935 *Mr. Soto. And I yield back.

Mr. Bilirakis. The gentleman yields back. Now I will recognize the gentleman from the great State of Georgia, Mr. Allen, for his five minutes of questioning.

Mr. Allen. Thank you, Chair Bilirakis, for convening this hearing. I also want to thank our witnesses for being here today.

I strongly support the development of self-driving 1942 1943 vehicles, and I am glad we are considering Representative Latta's discussion draft today, which would establish a 1944 preemptive national standard for these vehicles for the 1945 future. If Congress does not act on this issue, I believe it 1946 is a matter of national security. Allowing China to lead in 1947 1948 the development of AVs would cause serious damage to our automotive and technology sectors. 1949

An important component of Mr. Latta's draft is language that would increase the number of AVs that the DoT may provide an exemption for if they qualify as safe or safer than the current motor vehicle -- Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards.

As a small business entrepreneur, one of the reasons I came to Congress was to make sure that the Federal Government

supports our start-up industries, and is not a roadblock. 1957 1958 For AV companies to be able to prove their value in the free market, they must be allowed to sell their vehicles. 1959 1960 This is a question for Mr. Bozzella and Mr. Shapiro. NHTSA has a standing government order to require 1961 manufacturers to report all crashes involving vehicles 1962 equipped with advanced driver assistance systems, or 1963 automated driving systems. Unfortunately, the reported data 1964 1965 does not specify whether the crashes were caused by those 1966 vehicles.

1967 Do you have concerns with the lack of transparency in 1968 this reporting system?

1969And do you think this reporting problem could lead to1970consumer confusion over the safety of these vehicles?

1971 And I will start with you, Mr. Bozzella.

Mr. Bozzella. Thank you. Thank you for the question. I agree that context is really important here, and I am not sure that the data in the standing general order provides the appropriate context. And so, as we do consider, for example, what the future of the standing general order would be, and how we think about data and transparency, I think making sure that we have context is important.

1979	And I agree with you 100 percent that that is important
1980	to consumer awareness and confidence in the technology going
1981	forward, that we understand what is working and the overall
1982	context. In other words, how it fits in with what is
1983	happening on the roads more broadly.
1984	*Mr. Allen. Right. Mr. Shapiro?
1985	*Mr. Shapiro. Thank you. I would agree with that.
1986	Right now, under the standing order, you have to report
1987	just about anything. And it counts if a bird hit your car,
1988	or there is a social media report that there was a
1989	self-driving vehicle involved in an accident, even though it
1990	may not have happened. So those are counted in the
1991	statistics. So they really need to be sharpened up, frankly.
1992	But I think, if you look at the absolute numbers, which
1993	are incredibly low, especially more recently almost no
1994	deaths, very few injuries, some minor crashes it is
1995	phenomenal. And there is the opportunity that everyone in
1996	this country has is to pay lower insurance rates, to have a
1997	whole new creation of jobs, lower costs, and stop the
1998	carnage. And that is what we need to do.
1999	*Mr. Allen. Right, exactly. Well, I remember when the
2000	horse and buggy was replaced by the automobile. All these

2001 people were scared to death of it.

2002 [Laughter.]

2003 *Voice. How old are you?

2004 [Laughter.]

2005 *Mr. Allen. Well, yes, I watched movies, okay?

How can we encourage productive collaboration between government and private sector to deliver this important

2008 technology for the American people?

Mr. Bozzella. I think collaboration is essential. And what we can do is ensure that we have the certainty of a comprehensive regulatory framework for the testing and deployment at scale. That is where the partnership is at its most essential.

You mentioned a moment ago you are concerned about start-ups. This is an opportunity for a rising tide to lift all boats. There is so much activity happening with innovation, technology, and start-ups in this country that will benefit as this industry goes to scale.

2019 *Mr. Allen. And I have got about 39 seconds. You know, 2020 obviously, we have some preemptive legislation here.

2021 Obviously, we hope it is bipartisan and it moves very

2022 rapidly, but things don't happen that quick up here. But I

see this as a great opportunity to expand this economy. 2023 Would any of you disagree with that? 2024 Okay --2025 2026 *Mr. Bozzella. No, sir. *Mr. Allen. So this is the future. Great. 2027 Thank you very much, and I yield back, Chair. 2028 *Mr. Bilirakis. I appreciate it very much. Now I will 2029 recognize Mrs. Trahan for her five minutes of questioning. 2030 2031 *Mrs. Trahan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to our expert witnesses for taking the time to be here today. 2032 As many of my colleagues have already said, this 2033 committee has a longstanding history of working to ensure 2034 that the automotive industry prioritizes the safety of 2035 2036 families who ride in their cars. And it is my hope that we can once again find bipartisan consensus to ensure that that 2037 legacy continues, particularly when it comes to the issues of 2038 autonomous vehicles. 2039 Like millions of families across our country, I am 2040

excited by the promise of AVs, and I share in the belief that we need to do everything in our power to make sure they are deployed safely. And I am grateful to my colleagues who have rightly pointed out the many concerns, safety concerns with

AVs. And instead of repeating much of what has already been said, I would like to talk about the impact of AVs on the more than four million Americans who rely on the driving profession.

Just as ATMs reduced the need for bank tellers and self-2049 checkout lanes displaced many cashiers, I am concerned that 2050 AVs, once deployed at high volumes, are destined to displace 2051 Americans employed as drivers. And while our committee only 2052 2053 covers the personal vehicle portion, AVs have the potential to cause even greater effects to commercial and public 2054 transportation sectors, potentially displacing bus and truck 2055 drivers and delivery workers, as well. 2056

Dr. Koopman, both of these bills would set the rules of the road for decades to come, and set precedents that other committees and policymakers will follow. Shouldn't Congress consider workforce protections while drafting legislation that could have such a lasting effect?

*Dr. Koopman. Yes, absolutely. This technology can affect the workforce just like any other technological innovation. And it is -- but it is also important to ensure the safety of the workers who are in the vehicles being driven by this technology, as well.

*Mrs. Trahan. Thank you. And as exciting as the promise of AVs are in our changing economy, we can't afford to write off those who could be displaced by the rapid deployment of AVs as the cost of this technological advancement.

Dr. Koopman, are there opportunities for Americans who are gainfully employed in the driving profession to transition to some high-quality jobs that may become available as AVs are more broadly deployed?

*Dr. Koopman. Yes, I think there are. I think it is 2076 important to recognize that this is not a you wake up the 2077 next morning and all of a sudden all the truckers are out of 2078 That is not going to happen. And I see other 2079 a job. 2080 witnesses nodding along. It is not going to happen. This is going to take years to play out. That doesn't mean -- as was 2081 mentioned earlier, this is a 20, 30-year perspective. I get 2082 that eventually we will get there, but it is not an overnight 2083 thing. So the aging out of the current workforce also 2084 2085 factors in.

But the big thing here is, yes, the jobs will be changed, and it is going to be important to make sure those workers land on their feet with other jobs, such as I

2089	mentioned before, in the back room, helping intervene when
2090	there is a problem on the road, making sure that the safety
2091	is there, more highly trained technicians, because now the
2092	LiDAR, if the LiDAR doesn't work, somebody could die. You
2093	better make sure that LiDAR works.
2094	Yes, there is redundancy and so on, but this starts
2095	looking more like aircraft maintenance than vehicle
2096	maintenance.
2097	*Mrs. Trahan. Thank you, Dr. Koopman.
2098	Mr. Chairman, on that point I would like to request
2099	unanimous consent to submit for the record several letters
2100	from the Transit Workers Union calling on Congress to include
2101	workforce protections in AV legislation.
2102	*Mr. Bilirakis. Without objection, so ordered.
2103	[The information follows:]
2104	
2105	********COMMITTEE INSERT********
2106	

2107 *Mrs. Trahan. Thank you.

And to my colleague, Congresswoman Dingell, I commend you for working to ensure that unions and workers have a voice in your bill.

While I still have a little bit more time -- which never 2111 happens -- state and local governments are largely writing 2112 the rules for the road for AV testing on their public 2113 streets. Dr. Koopman, again, should state and local 2114 2115 governments be permitted to continue to play this role? And would you be concerned about a Federal AV framework 2116 preempting state and local traffic related to AV testing? 2117 *Dr. Koopman. I think that is a great question. I 2118 2119 think there is two phases.

The first phase is while we are waiting for the Federal regulations to actually come into effect, the states need to be able to manage what is going on on the roads to protect their constituents.

The second part is when that transition does happen, the way I envision it is the Federal Government still controls equipment, as they do, but that should not prevent the ability of the states to control their own locally necessary rules of the road. So the Federal Government should make

sure that the vehicles are able to follow whatever the local 2129 2130 road rules are, and the states and localities should be able to set the local road rules responsive to local conditions. 2131 2132 So, for example, in Pittsburgh there is a school for disabled, and the City of Pittsburgh might not want testing 2133 to happen at their front doorstep. They should be allowed, 2134 if they so desire, to say, no, you can't test on that block. 2135 *Mrs. Trahan. Great. Thank you. 2136 2137 I yield back. 2138 *Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you very much. Now I will recognize the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of 2139 the Energy Subcommittee, Mr. Duncan, for his five minutes of 2140 2141 questioning. 2142 *Mr. Duncan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, many of my colleagues have dedicated their 2143 time to talk about safety and, obviously, that is an 2144 important issue and part of this discussion. But I want to 2145 pivot a moment to talk about a different aspect of public 2146 2147 safety, namely how to safequard our individual liberties as

2148 American citizens.

2149 Several AV companies are offering ride hailing services 2150 on apps they control using fleets they own, rather than

2151 selling those cars to American consumers who may wish to 2152 maintain control of their own vehicles, as most of us do 2153 today. Many of my constituents are wary of the potential to 2154 be forced into autonomous rideshare platforms, rather than 2155 continuing to own their own vehicle.

Mr. Bozzella, how can we ensure that consumers will retain this choice in the future, the choice to own and maintain their own cars, whether they are autonomous or not? Mr. Bozzella. Yes, thank you. What I think you are going to see -- in fact, what I know you are going to see with regard to this technology -- is a number of different use cases.

So, for example, when you think about the definition of 2163 2164 autonomous vehicles today, we are talking about not only fully autonomous self-drive vehicles with absolutely no 2165 driver, but we are also talking about what we refer to as 2166 level three vehicles, which are very likely to be owned by 2167 individuals. And in that case, you have a situation where 2168 2169 sometimes the technology, the automated driving system, is driving the vehicles and sometimes the owner or the driver of 2170 the vehicles operating those --2171

2172 *Mr. Duncan. Like Teslas today, where you reach out --

*Mr. Bozzella. Yes. Although Tesla, as I understand 2173 it, is not a level three vehicle. Those are actual driver 2174 assist technologies. We are talking about a step beyond 2175 2176 that. And there is a big bright line between assistance technologies and the type of technology I am talking about. 2177 But that is an example where I think you will see 2178 private ownership continue to flourish in a much safer 2179 2180 context.

2181 *Mr. Duncan. Yes, thank you for that.

Those of us who have watched the development of AI in the past few months have noticed a glaring problem that we have seen with Big Tech for years, namely the problem of bias, and in this case programmatic bias.

As a strong supporter of the Bill of Rights, I want to make sure that we have strong guardrails in this industry as it takes off, ensuring that we protect First Amendment rights of freedom of religion, speech, assembly, impacted mobility, the Second Amendment freedom to bear arms, and the Fourth Amendment freedom from warrantless search and seizures.

2192 So I would like to hear from the witnesses. How do we 2193 protect against a biased algorithm deciding which locations 2194 an AV will or will not go to, like gun shops, or houses of

2195 worship, or such a thing?

2196 Mr. Shapiro, would you comment on that?

*Mr. Shapiro. I think that this concern and the one prior are -- will be addressed in time. But I know you want to hear that they can be addressed today.

I think the question of choice that you raise in your first question is something that will be debated perhaps 5, lo years from now still, because it would be too premature with so many options out there. There is no mandates anywhere.

In terms of algorithmic bias, in terms of location, I can't imagine that is going to occur, unless it

2207 potentially --

2208 *Mr. Duncan. Well, I mean, it is already occurring with Airbnb, it is already occurring with some other app-based 2209 services where, you know, based on some political position 2210 you take, your support for certain constitutional rights 2211 prohibits that private contractor or private ownership 2212 2213 company from allowing individuals to stay there, and possibly, for an AV like we are talking about today, to take 2214 that person to that location. 2215

2216 Mr. Bozzella, would you like to comment on that?

*Mr. Bozzella. Well, I would say this. It is -- it would be hard to make a business that is not supportive of choice and customers broadly.

2220 What the goal of the companies we work every day at with 2221 is to expand access to this type of transportation -- urban, 2222 rural, everywhere -- because, ultimately, it is about safety, 2223 and it is about choice, and it is about freedom of movement. 2224 That is what really defines this technology at this stage in 2225 the game.

2226 So it would be hard for me to imagine a scenario where a 2227 company could be successful doing that.

2228 *Mr. Duncan. Airbnb is really successful, and they 2229 banned Michelle Malkin just for her political views.

How do we ensure that citizens have the right to concealed carry, and it can continue to do so in autonomous vehicles that other people own in a rideshare situation?

2233 Mr. Bozzella or Mr. Shapiro, or anyone else on the 2234 panel?

*Mr. Shapiro. Well, I think the way it works today is that companies follow local laws, and that is what they do. Companies are very concerned about their reputations. And the concept of entering social issues is increasingly

2239 becoming disfavored because they recognize it is very

2240 difficult.

2241 So I think companies are just -- the number-one thing 2242 they are trying to do is make sure they go in the areas and 2243 follow the local speed limits that everyone is talking about. 2244 And I can't imagine that they start saying we can't go into 2245 this area, unless it is considered unsafe for self-driving 2246 vehicles or people are, like, throwing things at them or 2247 something.

2248 So in terms of issues like gun control or gun rights, 2249 depending on your view, I think that is an issue which I 2250 would like to come back to the committee on, because I 2251 haven't thought about it before.

*Mr. Duncan. Yes, I mean, we are already seeing companies prohibit services to folks because of their political positions that they have taken publicly. And I just want to make sure it doesn't happen if we are moving toward AVs for rideshare apps, that sort of thing.

2257 Mr. Chairman, my time is up and I yield back.

2258 *Mr. Bilirakis. The gentleman yields back. Now we will 2259 recognize Mr. Armstrong for -- oh, excuse me, Mrs.

2260 Harshbarger is next. I am sorry.

2261 *Mrs. Harshbarger. Oh, okay.

*Mr. Bilirakis. You are recognized for five minutes.

2263 *Mrs. Harshbarger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2264 *Mr. Bilirakis. My pleasure.

2265 *Mrs. Harshbarger. This will go to Mr. Bozzella or Mr.
2266 Shapiro.

You know, I live in a very rural district in east Tennessee, and not every road is going to be mapped. You can go down a long driveway, long, long driveways, and it will require the same precision that is required for an autonomous vehicle to operate on the road. And I know there has been tremendous strides in preparing the technology for urban areas, but we can't forget about rural America.

2274 What is being done to ensure that the people that live 2275 in east Tennessee will be able to reap the same benefits of 2276 autonomous vehicles that they do in urban areas?

*Mr. Bozzella. Well, thank you for the question.

Right now there are over 80 companies in 30 different states that are already operating, already testing, already developing. That needs to be 50 states, and it needs to be everywhere. And the benefits need to be available to everybody.

2283	The way to do that is to expand the opportunity to test
2284	and deploy across the country. That is what Chairman Latta's
2285	bill does, and it is also what Congresswoman Dingell's bill
2286	does. That is the fastest way to get there, is to allow the
2287	companies to safely and carefully expand. That is going to
2288	allow more use cases. It is going to allow more
2289	opportunities in places like your district.
2290	*Mrs. Harshbarger. Okay.
2291	*Mr. Shapiro. I would agree with that. And although I
2292	said before I love Congressman Latta's bill, I would love it
2293	more if it had greater exemptions in it, because if you want
2294	to scale up, you want to get into the rural community, you
2295	want to get out there, you need to be able to have a
2296	commercially viable product.
2297	*Mrs. Harshbarger. Yes. Well, thank you for that, sir.
2298	Are you doing anything in rural areas like Tennessee or
2299	across Tennessee?
2300	*Mr. Bozzella. There are tests happening and different
2301	use cases being explored, whether it is getting people to
2302	health care or moving people to shopping and those types of
2303	things. There is no question that we need more of that. And

as I said, the fastest way to get more of that is to allow

2305 companies to scale.

*Mrs. Harshbarger. Okay. Mr. Riccobono, would you like to comment on the need for access to transportation in rural parts of our country, sir?

2309 *Mr. Riccobono. Well, sure. I mean, disability is not 2310 geographically bound, right?

2311 *Mrs. Harshbarger. Right.

Mr. Riccobono. So the thing about disability is it can happen to any of us. And so, you know, a lot of times when people experience disabilities, they are living in the community they were in when they acquired that disability. And so the need for transportation, reliable transportation, is emergent when it happens.

2318 So making sure that this technology is available in all communities, including rural communities, is important 2319 because, you know, especially when people have acquired 2320 disabilities, they are not in a position to move to a 2321 different location to continue their life. So having this 2322 2323 available and not be geographically bound is really critical to truly making sure that we can all benefit from the 2324 technology. 2325

2326 *Mrs. Harshbarger. Well, I appreciate that answer, and

2327 I guess we will be looking at exemptions, gentlemen. Thank2328 you.

2329 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. Bilirakis. Does anybody want the time? Mr. Latta, do you want some time? You have got about a minute and 22 seconds.

2333 [Laughter.]

Mr. Latta. I will always take a minute. But, you know, first of all, thanks very much for letting me waive on, and I will get to have my time a little bit later. But let me just say this real quick, and I was just -- for an opening.

You know, we have covered a lot of ground in today's 2339 2340 hearing, and I hope to put a finer point on a few areas of interest to our discussion. When I began working on this 2341 issue in 2016, AVs were largely an aspirational concept that 2342 held the promise of opening new mobility opportunities for 2343 our seniors and those with disabilities, reducing congestion 2344 2345 on our streets, and making our roadways safer. Now, as we sit here today, it has become clear that it is not just a 2346 theory. AVs have already traveled millions of miles on 2347 American roads, and companies deploying AVs have been 2348

2349 reporting any incidents to NHTSA.

2350 And let me just say this in my -- this last 30 seconds of the time. When I started on this legislation, I said two 2351 2352 things. Number one, these vehicles have to be as safe as or safer than anything that is on the road today. And the 2353 second point is it is safety first, safety last, safety 2354 always, because we want to make sure that people, when they 2355 are driving down that road either in that vehicle or another 2356 2357 vehicle that might be autonomous that is coming at them, they 2358 know it is safe, that you are not going to have something crossing the road on you. 2359

2360 So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the minute and a quarter 2361 I had, and I appreciate again the opportunity to be on the 2362 subcommittee today, waiving on.

Mr. Bilirakis. Well, I appreciate that. And that is not taken away from your five minutes. I just thought that -- I know you are an expert in this area, and I appreciate your leadership.

2367 Now I will recognize vice chairman of the full 2368 committee, Mr. Armstrong, for his five minutes of

2369 questioning.

2370 *Mr. Armstrong. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I am by no

2371 means an expert in this area. However, I think the second 2372 part of safety becomes really important.

July 27, 2017, a year-and-a-half before I came to Congress, this committee passed the SELF DRIVE Act by a vote of 54 to 0. Unfortunately, that bill died in the Senate, due largely in part to civil liability questions. And it is important because the most common personal injury case are vehicle accidents. In fact, they are 52 percent of all personal injury cases.

And it is July of 2023, 6 years later, and we really haven't addressed those issues. We can address it from science. We can address it from safety. But the second part of that is when somebody gets injured, somebody gets sued, and -- which means the industry continues to operate without certainty, risking billions in capital and undermining U.S. leadership in this field.

Perhaps one day, with the universal adoption of level five automation, we will have minimal auto accidents and injury. But the future may allow for a regime in which the current fault-orientated standards yield to a simplified products liability. This is essentially what Representative Dingell's draft states, that liability is assigned to the

2393 original automated driver -- driving system, a replacement 2394 automated driving system.

However, in the near term we will see a mix of highly autonomous vehicles and conventional vehicles. That means the current fault-orientated liability regime remains, but with increasing efforts to impose product liability claims against manufacturers of a highly autonomous vehicle.

We have already seen warning defect claims and risk 2400 2401 utility design defect claims with level two vehicles, but let's take a level three vehicle: conditional driving 2402 automation and a driver actively monitoring and ready to take 2403 over. So the questions are, did the driver act reasonably in 2404 taking over the vehicle after an alert? Did the driver 2405 2406 respond fast enough to take over the vehicle? Did an unanticipated hazard arise requiring a rapid response which 2407 did not provide adequate time for a driver to take over? How 2408 do we account for comparative and contributory negligence? 2409

And these are all going to be challenging questions for courts to consider regarding design risk, utility, and feasibility. And these issues will be even more challenging for juries, as it will require reliance upon expert testimony about advanced automotive engineering. And maybe that is the

leave it to a state-based tort claims law. 2415 answer: Perhaps we adopt what some have called a manufacturer 2416 enterprise responsibility. This is basically a government 2417 2418 compensation fund for those injured. It is financed by an upfront assessment on highly autonomous vehicle 2419 manufacturers, and no liability on the back end. 2420 My question -- and it will be for you, Mr. Shapiro --2421 what liability regime, if any, should we enact for level 2422 2423 three and four vehicles which allows the industry to mature and produce level five vehicles? 2424 *Mr. Shapiro. Well, thank you for the question, and I 2425 appreciate the level -- I know you have a litigation 2426 2427 background. 2428 *Mr. Armstrong. Yes, I am not nearly smart enough to talk about the science, but --2429 *Mr. Shapiro. No, I felt like I was --2430 *Mr. Armstrong. When a minivan goes off the road in 2431 Florida and five people are killed, somebody is getting sued. 2432 2433 *Mr. Shapiro. I feel this is like my final exam question in law school. You raised the correct issues, 2434 absolutely. 2435 But the big picture is we got to get and make safer 2436

cars, given the carnage on the road. How do we get there, and how do we get there in a way which gets us there quicker? Because every year we get there quicker, we are saving lives and injuries and property damage. You didn't mention the 4.3 million car accidents we had in 2021, and all the costs that imposed on consumers and the insurance rates.

But right now I think that the Federal arbitration standard is good, because it basically makes the system much more efficient. It cuts down on the costs involved for all the parties involved. The consumers end up getting more money. The manufacturers may end up paying less. But the system works, and there is no slippage through other people trying to make money off it.

2450 And the other thing is I think, as we get more and more cars on the road, those problems dissipate. It doesn't wait 2451 until we get to all level five everywhere. If we could get 2452 90 percent of these car accidents out of the way -- and as 2453 Secretary Buttigieg said, that even if we get -- AVs reduce 2454 2455 50 percent of lives, they are still going to be criticized. So we have to also get the public to expect there are 2456 going to be issues. What do you do if someone intentionally 2457 has an accident with an AV? I mean, what do you do if they 2458

are throwing rocks and breaking things? What do you do in 2459 2460 different situations? And I think these are areas for discussion, but they -- I don't think Congress has to resolve 2461 2462 those today, because there is a state tort system which is set up and can resolve them on a state-by-state basis. 2463 And if Congress has to then step in, it will step in. 2464 But meanwhile, insurance will go down in rates for most 2465 consumers, especially if they have self-driving cars. 2466

2467 *Mr. Armstrong. So I think the science and the technology will get you there. And I think, in the totality, 2468 you are absolutely 100 percent correct. But in order to have 2469 a commercially viable automobile, you have to have insurance 2470 on it. And if you think Congress moves slow, if I can't walk 2471 2472 into any car dealership anywhere in the country and buy a car that I can get insured, then we run the real risk of the 2473 technology far outpacing the policy. 2474

Because I agree, on the abstract, it is going to be safer. But each one of these individual cases is still going to be subject to a plaintiff's lawyer, an insurance company, and a defense lawyer. And until we figure that out, unfortunately, this is just a science project.

2480 *Mr. Shapiro. Well, I won't speak for the insurance

2481 industry, but I would be shocked if they are not willing to

2482 have a lower insurance rate for self-driving cars.

2483 *Mr. Armstrong. I yield.

*Mr. Bilirakis. The gentleman yields back. I now recognize my fellow Florida gator. I think something like this is going on in Gainesville, isn't it, with AVs? I believe so. So I recognize you for five minutes of questioning. Thank you.

Mrs. Cammack. Yes, we actually do have an AV in downtown Gainesville, and it moves -- not very fast, so there is a lot of frustrations with it, I will say that. But thank you, Chairman Bilirakis. Go Gators. This is a very important hearing today. Excited to be a part of the conversation.

2495 Like my colleague Representative Armstrong, I am not a science person. I cannot explain the science or the data or 2496 the technology, so I will stick to really what I know. But I 2497 do want to, as we jump into this line of questioning, 2498 2499 highlight the importance of data security, privacy concerns that have been expressed. I think, as we talk about this 2500 important issue, we have to have that lens and that concern 2501 in the back of our head because this can quickly get out of 2502

hand, as we have seen in so many areas of our life. 2503 2504 I think this has been hit on quite a bit before, but just for the interest of having it on the record for myself, 2505 Mr. Shapiro and Congress around the country, many are 2506 concerned about the growing threat of the Chinese Communist 2507 Party, and we have seen that Americans increasingly, 2508 2509 regardless of party affiliation, where they are in the country, any sort of background, they share this concern 2510 2511 about the CCP. 2512 And tying that into autonomous vehicles and the testing situation that we are faced with, are there any U.S. 2513 companies currently testing in mainland China? That is the 2514 2515 first question. 2516 Second is, are these companies able to send the data that they collect back to the United States from the 2517 2518 mainland? *Mr. Shapiro. I am not aware of any U.S. companies 2519 testing in China, but I would like to follow up with a 2520 2521 response, especially if I am wrong. 2522 *Mrs. Cammack. Okay. No, I would appreciate that. But on the --2523 *Mr. Shapiro. And the second question, can they 2524

transfer data back and -- there is plenty of laws in China 2525 that they have that we don't have. 2526 *Mrs. Cammack. Right. 2527 2528 *Mr. Shapiro. And definitely, Chinese companies are treated better in the United States, by far, than American 2529 companies are treated in China in almost every way possible. 2530 Having closed down our Chinese office there as a trade 2531 association, I can tell you part of the concern was for our 2532 2533 own American employees. 2534 *Mrs. Cammack. Right. *Mr. Shapiro. Because I say things before Congress that 2535 are sometimes controversial, and it is --2536 2537 *Mrs. Cammack. Me too. I get that. [Laughter.] 2538 2539 *Mr. Shapiro. And I think in this room we share a concern that China is a major strategic threat, and what we 2540 should do about it. 2541

But I think we should beat them in the marketplace. And the way we beat them in the marketplace is we get this legislation passed, we get it out there. Of course, we focus on cybersecurity and our own things. But we have to get there, because we have done nothing as a government for

several years now, and other governments have seen that, and 2547 2548 they are speeding ahead, and they don't have the privacy restrictions we have. They don't have the cybersecurity, 2549 2550 they don't have the lawyers we have. They don't have everything, and the challenges we face. They just get it 2551 done. And that is what scares me. 2552 *Mrs. Cammack. Do you want to tell me how you really 2553 feel? 2554 2555 [Laughter.] *Mrs. Cammack. No. And just to put a button on it, 2556 there are Chinese companies that are testing in the United 2557 States sending that data back to the mainland. Correct? 2558 *Mr. Shapiro. I honestly don't -- I know there are 2559 2560 Chinese companies testing here. I don't know what they are 2561 doing with their data. *Mrs. Cammack. You are chomping at the bit down there. 2562

*Mr. Bozzella. No, I was simply saying I was going to add that -- the same thing that Gary said. There are definitely Chinese companies testing here. I don't know where the data is going. I have no idea.

2567 *Mrs. Cammack. I think it is safe to assume that it is 2568 making it back, given some of the legislative issues that we

2569 contend with here versus over in mainland China.

2570 *Mr. Shapiro. Can I just add a cautionary note, though? I agree with the intent on the legislation for China, but we 2571 2572 have to be very careful. When we are talking about our publicly-traded companies, if -- there are probably 2573 shareholders in China. And so if you own even a little bit 2574 of an American company, I don't think that should ruin the 2575 ability of an American company to do what it has to do to 2576 2577 compete in this country and globally, frankly.

*Mrs. Cammack. I understand. And because I am running 2578 short on time, I want to jump into this next section. 2579 But shifting gears, I think we can all agree that the 2580 National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's goal of 2581 2582 creating a reporting process for AVs and driver assistance systems and real AVs, it was it was a good one, right? 2583 However, the process that they employed to create this 2584 reporting requirement was really incredible, and should be 2585 part of the record. Instead of using their broad authority 2586 2587 under the safety act to write a new rule, they used special emergency provisions to escape the Paperwork Reduction Act 2588 requirement for notice and comment when putting a general 2589 industry reporting requirement in place. Once they did start 2590

a comment period six months later, NHTSA gave companies month-to-month notice of extensions for an entire year while they finished the rule.

Now, this rule requires reporting of everything from an actual crash to a bird hitting a vehicle to someone posting on social media without any evidence that they were in a crash with an AV.

Now, on top of that, if a company incorrectly submits data, NHTSA does not correct or redact inaccurate data from the record. For example, incorrectly labeling level two driver assistance systems as a level four autonomous system before publishing it monthly on their website. Bad data equals bad outcomes and bad decisions.

So this committee passed the TREAD Act in 2000, requiring reporting from all OEMs. Now, this committee knows how to structure reporting so that NHTSA can conduct oversight and get the data from industry. The AV SGO misses the mark. Sorry, I know that is a mouthful, but I am getting to it.

2610 Mr. Shapiro, did NHTSA ever reach out to CTA for 2611 feedback on reporting requirements?

And are you concerned about how they are approaching

regulating AVs? 2613 2614 And I know I am over time, but take it away because I know the chairman wants to hear this answer too. 2615 2616 *Mr. Shapiro. I am sorry, I can't answer that question. I will have to check with our team. 2617 But I will say I am a big fan of the Administrative 2618 Procedures Act, and I think it is important that it be 2619 followed. And increasingly, as each new administration comes 2620 2621 in, it seems we are diminishing the role of Congress and giving the executive agencies ability to, frankly, do things 2622 they shouldn't be doing. 2623 *Mrs. Cammack. Absolutely. I appreciate your 2624 2625 commentary. 2626 Thank you to all our witnesses, and thank you for -everyone for being here and in the committee today. 2627 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. 2628 *Mr. Bilirakis. The gentlelady yields back. I now 2629 recognize the sponsor of one of the bills in this legislative 2630 2631 hearing, Mr. Latta, for your five minutes of questioning. *Mr. Latta. Well, thanks, Mr. Chairman. And again, 2632 thanks for letting me waive on today. 2633 Mr. Shapiro, let's talk preemption. Other than the fact 2634

that California made clear it needed to preempt its own cities on traveling the state, it seems a bit odd that there wouldn't be a Federal policy that didn't recognize the need to cross state lines, especially for this committee. The interstate commerce clause is very important.

2640 Would you provide some perspective on the need to 2641 establish preemptive standards to set uniformity over the 2642 design, performance, and construction of AVs? Because I sure 2643 don't want to be driving in an AV in northwest Ohio and get 2644 to the Indiana and Michigan line and it just says we are 2645 pulling over.

*Mr. Shapiro. I agree with the premise of the question. 2646 2647 What distinguishes the United States, which has been 2648 incredibly innovative and successful, from our friends in Europe is that we have national -- the national ability to 2649 reach our 330 million or so marketplace with standardized 2650 products. To the extent we deviate from that, we are hurting 2651 our competitiveness. And Europe hasn't had a lot of 2652 2653 innovation in a lot of areas, to be honest, lately for a whole bunch of reasons. And I think they are the model that 2654 -- we love them, but we don't want to emulate them. 2655 And I think, if you have to change your license plate 2656

and change your rules as you cross state lines, that is a problem. New York has a rule that says that every car there you have to have a foot and -- touching the brake, and things like that. There is rules which are difficult and impossible to follow.

I do agree, though, that there is state and local rights. They have the right to set speed limits. They have the right to figure out their traffic and what they are doing. But -- and there is areas of overlap and balance. [Pause.]

*Mr. Latta. Sorry about that. It is 55 as you cross 2667 the next road. You know, we understand that. But we are 2668 talking, on the preemption side, that bumper to bumper. 2669 *Mr. Shapiro. Well, certainly self-driving, if we 2670 deploy it as your legislation and the Dingell compliment 2671 envisions, we will reduce the bumper to bumper. We will 2672 reduce the disparity in speed among the different cars. We 2673 will be more efficient, we will be greener. We will have 2674 2675 fewer parking structures, we will greater deploy cars in a sense that right now the average car is using about 10 to 12 2676 hours a week. These cars could be used for 40 to 50 hours, 2677 they could be shared, they could be cheaper. They won't have 2678

the heavy weight that is required, and the cost of having all the driver features.

The opportunities here are enormous. And I can't say that we could predict exactly what they will be, but just -any one of them is great: empowering the disabled, helping the economy, increasing -- being more efficient in energy. Like, there won't be cars -- people driving around lost anymore.

I mean, we are going to get some people off the road, and the driving there will be much more efficient. If we could just get rid of even 50 percent of the accidents, we are in great shape.

This is like -- I have testified before Congress dozens of times now. And let me tell you, this is the most important testimony I feel I am giving, because we have got to get there for so many different reasons.

2695 *Mr. Latta. Absolutely.

2696 Mr. Bozzella, let me -- you mentioned something. I 2697 think we need to go back to this. You mentioned about 2698 companies out there right now -- you know, we have been 2699 working on this for years, and I know it. There has been a 2700 lot of work done by so many different companies.

Are we losing companies out there on the innovation side that are just saying, you know, we are going to throw up our hands and say this isn't going to get done in the United States, and they just can't keep funneling money into a company or into projects that aren't going to -- they don't see an end to?

2707 *Mr. Bozzella. Yes, the short answer is yes. And that 2708 is unfortunate.

2709 We are very much, in my opinion, at a crossroads here. There is massive capital that needs to be deployed to develop 2710 and build out and commercialize this technology. We have 2711 been at it for quite some time. As you referenced in your 2712 comments, when we first started this exercise together, it 2713 2714 was an R&D exercise. Now we are deploying technology, proving out business cases, and showing use cases. This is 2715 critical that we get this done now. We are going to lose 2716 more companies and our innovative edge to other countries if 2717 we don't do this now. 2718

2719 *Mr. Latta. You know, just real quickly, how much have 2720 we lost? How many companies out there have just said we give 2721 up? And pretty much, as you mentioned about that technology 2722 and that expertise going someplace else?

Mr. Bozzella. Yes, you know, it is hard to know
because there is so much change and flux in this environment
right now, new companies starting all the time and challenged
companies moving out.

But there is certainly one well-known company that was partnered with major automotive manufacturers that -- and I think Mr. Shapiro referenced it in his testimony, a company known as Argo that is no longer operating as a result of uncertainty and capital allocation decisions that had to be made by their partners.

This is real, and it can continue to happen if we cannot provide an opportunity and a framework to scale.

*Mr. Shapiro. Can I just add something quickly to that? I will say, though, that if your legislation becomes law, that will be not only a strong message to those who are already in there, but for others that want to enter and for those that are considering investments and coming up with the money that is a statement, especially if you include some milestones in the legislation.

2742 *Mr. Latta. Right. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much 2743 for allowing me to waive on, and I yield back.

2744 *Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you. Thank you. I believe Mr.

2745 Veasey is here, so we will recognize Mr. Veasey for five 2746 minutes of questioning. Thank you.

*Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

2748 First responders, police, fire, EMS selflessly put their lives on the line every day to keep our communities safe. 2749 And autonomous vehicles must not become another danger to our 2750 nation's emergency services. And I know that, while AVs are 2751 being commercially deployed in limited areas -- we have seen 2752 2753 them in Arlington, Texas, we have seen them in San Francisco -- I think the San Francisco Fire Department has already 2754 logged 66 troubling incidents involving AVs since May 2022, 2755 including events in which AVs blocked fire engines, entered 2756 2757 into active emergency scenes, and ran over fire hoses, and 2758 NHTSA has launched a Federal investigation following over a dozen documented cases in which Teslas operating in autopilot 2759 mode have crashed into first responder vehicles. 2760

2761 Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the 2762 record a letter from the International Association of Fire 2763 Chiefs and International Association of Firefighters and the 2764 National Volunteer Fire Council calling on Congress to ensure 2765 AVs safely interact with first responders.

2766 *Mr. Bilirakis. Without objection, so ordered.

2767	[The information follows:]
2768	
2769	**************************************
2770	

*Mr. Veasey. And so my first question is to Dr. 2771 2772 Koopman. Why are these incidents involving first responders occurring? 2773 2774 And is there something we should come to expect as more AVs are deployed? 2775 There are a couple of reasons, and the 2776 *Dr. Koopman. first responder situation is very troubling. 2777 The first reason is that the engineering safety 2778 standards that I mentioned before that are in that framework 2779 tell you, hey, don't forget this. Did you think of this? 2780 Did you think of this? So you can solve the problems before 2781 you happen in the real world. And those kind of scenarios 2782 are already in those standards. So if somebody is following 2783 2784 the standards, they are not going to have those problems. But the second issue is, once the problems started 2785 happening, one of the companies did not stand down operations 2786 or put a backup driver in the car until they could get it 2787 straightened out. They just scaled up. So unless that 2788 2789 changes as there are more cars on the road, we are going to keep seeing the problems until they fix it. It hasn't 2790 happened yet. 2791 *Mr. Veasey. Yes, interesting. Dr. Koopman, you have 2792

also stated that autonomous vehicle legislation should include rulemakings validating the safety of automated driving systems, the software and sensors actually driving the cars. How would such rulemaking reduce the likelihood of AVs interfering with first responders?

*Dr. Koopman. As I mentioned, the engineering standards already have requirements to deal with emergency responder situations. In fact, the Maryland Transportation Authority weighed in on the latest version of the standard, and put us in contact with emergency responders to make sure we got those parts right. So there is a lot of good wisdom in the standards. The companies just have to follow them.

2805 *Mr. Veasey. Thank you very much.

2806 Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for this letter to be entered into the record. It is from the International 2807 Union of Police Associations, which represent active duty law 2808 enforcement professionals that are, again, concerned about 2809 the broad preemption provisions in AV legislation that may 2810 2811 invalidate laws requiring AVs to yield to emergency response vehicles and otherwise operate lawfully in case of emergency. 2812 *Mr. Bilirakis. Without objection, so ordered. 2813

2814 [The information follows:]

2815 2816 *******COMMITTEE INSERT******** 2817

2818 *Mr. Veasey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And Dr. Koopman, I also wanted to ask you, could preempting state and local laws regarding design, construction, and performance of AVs potentially invalidate state and local traffic laws requiring AVs to yield to emergency vehicles?

*Dr. Koopman. I think that is a very real risk. And the way I look at it is it is completely reasonable for the Federal Government to control the equipment that can drive the vehicle in various ways. But the states and localities need to keep control over the envelopes of the behaviors that are permissible.

So, for example, there may be in a fire, an emergency response scene, the emergency responders may need the ability to make sure that vehicle is 100 percent disabled, and they may need to put requirements specific to their unique geographic and other population needs. But the Federal Government, sure, they should be in charge of making sure the equipment obeys whatever the local traffic laws are.

2837 *Mr. Veasey. Yes, thank you.

2838 *Dr. Koopman. We don't want preemption to take that 2839 away from the localities.

*Mr. Veasey. I wanted to ask you also -- I know that Representative Dingell's bill explicitly saves state and local traffic laws, and requires that NHTSA complete a ongoing proceeding to establish safety engineering practices and standards for computer driver safety. How would these requirements help ensure AVs interact safely with first responders?

*Dr. Koopman. Well, the conformance to the standards requires the companies to consider various emergency responder scenarios with some level of specificity, and make sure that they have considered in the safety case -- a safety case is a well-reasoned discussion based on evidence why they think they are safe. And the safety case has to consider emergency response scenes.

And so, if the ANPRM is carried forward, it will invoke standards that require considering that during the design of these vehicles.

2857 *Mr. Veasey. Thank you very much.

2858 Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Thank you for allowing me 2859 to waive on.

2860 *Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you. I appreciate it. Now I2861 will recognize Mr. Obernolte for his five minutes of

questioning, and I appreciate his patience. Thank you. 2862 2863 *Mr. Obernolte. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I would like to also thank you for allowing me 2864 2865 to waive on. This is a really critically important topic for me. I think the technology that is being developed here is 2866 going to dramatically change the world for the better. And I 2867 think it is incumbent on us here in Congress to get it right 2868 when it comes to regulation. 2869

2870 Dr. Koopman, I am really glad that you are here because you said something that really resonated with me. You said 2871 that the core issue here is public trust. And I completely 2872 agree with you. And I also appreciate the fact that the 2873 viewpoint that you are bringing to public trust is one that 2874 2875 has to be validated by accident data, which I think is correct. I think that we demonstrate that public trust is 2876 merited by the accident data that is generated from the AVs. 2877 And so I think it is incumbent on us to gather that data. 2878

2879 So I wanted to ask you, the state of the data that we 2880 have right now, do we have enough data to reach a conclusion 2881 about whether or not the current generation of AVs is safer 2882 than human drivers?

*Dr. Koopman. We are part of the way there, but we are

2884 not all the way there.

And it is important to note that data only happens after you have been operating. And if you want public trust, I think you need more than that. You need transparency, accountability, and independent oversight. Because in things like the 737 MAX crashes, those were what were compromised, and that degraded trust.

But to make sure I hit your question, the data we have 2891 2892 now is about crashes, but it is not about fatalities. It is about 100 million miles between fatality in round numbers for 2893 the U.S. fleet. There is lots of tailoring to do, but we are 2894 talking 100 million miles. These companies have done one or 2895 two or three million miles. So it is great that they have a 2896 2897 mathematical prediction, an estimation. They think they are 2898 safe enough. That is fantastic to hear. But it can only be confirmed by that data you are talking about. And okay, one, 2899 two, three million miles of data, that is great. Ninetv-2900 seven more million miles to go before we get to a hundred 2901 2902 million to see how it turns out.

2903 *Mr. Obernolte. Right. Well, what about the current 2904 accident rate for level two-enabled vehicles? Because those, 2905 you know, have been here for a few years.

Do we have any data to compare the accident rate for a vehicle that is being piloted on level two compared with one that is human piloted?

2909 *Dr. Koopman. That is problematic. The current SGO data that was talked about before -- in fact, one of the most 2910 important uses that has not been mentioned is for the level 2911 two vehicles, the autopilot-type crashes. We are seeing lots 2912 of fatalities. We have seen lots of crashes. But the SGO 2913 2914 does not require enough mileage reporting. So we know how many crashes, we don't know how many miles with the feature 2915 So we can't do the division to compare it to human 2916 enabled. So that is -- now, there have been studies done, 2917 drivers. there have been claims made. Most of the claims made have 2918 2919 also been debunked. So it is hard to say.

What I have seen so far is there is no data showing that 2920 automated steering improves safety. It is a convenience 2921 There is data showing newer cars are safer, but it feature. 2922 is not the automated steering, it is the automatic emergency 2923 2924 braking. And really, if I had a limited bucket of money to spend on improving highway safety, I would spend it on the 2925 automated -- the active safety features because it is a lot 2926 more bang for the buck than fully automated driving. 2927

*Mr. Obernolte. I think context probably matters, too. 2928 I mean, it is not -- from a non-empirical standpoint, it is 2929 hard to imagine that a car on a highway being driven with 2930 2931 level two technology and a human monitoring is not safer, substantially, than one that doesn't have that technology 2932 available because you do away with things like distracted 2933 driving, you do away with things like drunk driving, falling 2934 asleep, you know? 2935

But as you say, we don't have the data.

*Dr. Koopman. Well, you would think that, but it is not true. National Transportation Safety Board says that you invoke automation complacency, which counterbalances it. So there is no clear reason why it should be safer. Humans are terrible at supervising automation.

2942 *Mr. Obernolte. Well --

*Dr. Koopman. They are terrible.

Mr. Obernolte. We won't know until we have the data. Mr. Bozzella, in this conversation that Dr. Koopman and I have been having, I mean, we are talking about this issue of public trust. And we already have a perceptual problem, which you brought up in your testimony, with public trust because we might have tens of thousands of auto accidents

- 2950 across the country in any given day, but if one Tesla on 2951 autopilot gets in an accident on the opposite side of the 2952 country, it is front page news.
- 2953 So what do we do with this issue of public trust? 2954 Because this is not going to go away. This is going to get 2955 worse because we are -- I mean, perfection is the goal here, 2956 but we are not going to have perfection. It is always 2957 pursued, never achieved.
- 2958 *Mr. Bozzella. Yes.

2959 *Mr. Obernolte. How do we establish this trust?
2960 *Mr. Bozzella. Trust is absolutely essential. If the
2961 technology is not trusted, we can't produce these benefits.
2962 You are 100 percent right.

I want to make sure that we distinguish, however, between automated -- autonomous vehicle technology that this committee is talking about, which is level three, four, or five, and assistance technology, which is level two. There is a bright line. In every case, a level two vehicle, the driver must always be engaged in the driving task. And so there is a significant difference between those two

2970 technologies and between those data sets.

And unfortunately, I think what it will take with the

level two technology is a combination of things: education, but also companies making sure that they express limitations of the technology, as well as the benefits, and that we work on things like driver monitoring and human engagement. And that is in the infrastructure bill, for example, that was passed on a bipartisan basis. These are things that we need to continue to work on.

2979 *Mr. Obernolte. I agree. Well, I am out of time.

2980 *Mr. Bozzella. I am sorry. Thank you.

Mr. Obernolte. Let me just point out, though, that, I mean, we need to have a dialogue about the metric. And the metric ought to be if AVs are substantially safer than a human vehicle, then they are beneficial, regardless of the fact that they will still be causing accidents and fatalities. And that is what we need to communicate to the public.

2988 *Mr. Bozzella. I agree.

2989 *Mr. Obernolte. And frankly, I mean, that is a huge 2990 barrier, because the public is not going to be receptive to 2991 that message.

2992 *Mr. Bozzella. Agreed.

2993 *Mr. Obernolte. Anyway, I want to thank everyone for

2994 your testimony. I apologize for running over, Mr. Chairman.
2995 *Mr. Bozzella. Thank you.
2996 *Mr. Bilirakis. All right. Very informative. I
2997 appreciate it very much.

I think we are pretty much finished. I tell you, this was a tremendous hearing, as far as I am concerned, extremely informative.

If somebody wants to comment on this -- and I will let Jan also, if she wants to ask a question or make a statement -- what about affordability?

You know, we talk about access for persons with disabilities, seniors, what have you. I know that the EVs are available, but they are -- in some cases, the average person -- they are too expensive. What about affordability? Is that an issue? Do we need to explore that even more? Do you have any opinions on that? Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Shapiro. Yes, I have opinions. Having watched new technology be introduced for four decades now, it starts out expensive, and rapidly goes down with competition. So the initial introductions of the first cars -- because there will be high demand -- will be more expensive.

3015 On the positive side, especially if you don't have the

3016 driver requirement, you take a lot of cost out of the bill --3017 out of the vehicle. So I think there will be a balance 3018 there.

And in terms of the battery required for an electric car, to the extent it is lighter, you need less of a battery. Or you could have the same size battery and get, obviously, further distance. They are all -- they are physical tradeoffs.

If the insurance companies respond, it will be lower insurance costs for a self-driving vehicle. But there will be a transition period. There is a question of trust. The congressman is right about -- public education is really important.

3029 *Mr. Bilirakis. Yes.

*Mr. Shapiro. So I think that, you know, obviously, we 3030 represent competitors. We are an association. So talking 3031 about price is what we usually avoid. But in terms of the 3032 inputs and the cost and how things operate in a normal 3033 3034 introduction environment, every new product that is great and cool, whether it is high definition television or a faster 3035 computer or video game, costs a lot more because the early 3036 adopters pay the most money. 3037

3038 *Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you.

3039 Does anyone else want to comment on that?

3040 *Mr. Bozzella. Yes, I would just add I agree with what 3041 Mr. Shapiro said completely. I would just add that the 3042 supply chain and manufacturing here in the United States 3043 aspect, that is really important, and that is an essential 3044 ingredient to the legislation.

If we design here, and we build here, and we have supply chains here, that will help address some of the affordability challenges that we face. And so this gives us the opportunity to control our destiny, this legislation.

3049 *Mr. Bilirakis. All right. Very good, I appreciate -3050 *Mr. Shapiro. I have something to add, as well, which
3051 is I agree completely. This is all about getting scale. But
3052 I think we are not going to get scale until we get safety and
3053 reliability. We need to have those, too.

3054 *Mr. Bilirakis. Very good. So do you want to comment 3055 with regard to the affordability?

Mr. Riccobono. Well, I will take my chance. One thing would add to this is that this also affords an opportunity for innovative transportation models. And if you think about people with disabilities, and also what has happened with

3060	rideshare, we can see that these automated vehicles present
3061	new ways to present public transportation, paratransit
3062	service, limited transportation in certain areas like health
3063	care.
3064	So that also, although it may be expensive, affords new
3065	transportation opportunities. And there is a tremendous
3066	benefit on the other side of that cost.
3067	*Mr. Bilirakis. Very good. I appreciate that very
3068	much.
3069	Jan, do you have anything to add?
3070	*Ms. Schakowsky. I just really wanted to thank our
3071	panel for the wonderful conversation.
3072	Mr. Riccobono, I didn't ask you questions or talk to
3073	you, but I wanted to tell you how especially much I
3074	appreciate you being just an incredibly articulate and
3075	effective spokesperson for the blind community, the needs
3076	that you have and the hopes that you have for this
3077	technology.
3078	All of us are hoping for the best and, I believe,
3079	committed to work together on both sides of the aisle.
3080	Again, a special thank you to Debbie Dingell for all the
3081	work that she has put in over the many years.
	4.5.4

3082	And I do also believe that the devil is in the details.
3083	We want to get it right. And I look forward to being part of
3084	that, and participating with all of you. Thank you.
3085	*Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you. I appreciate it very much.
3086	Let me remind Mr. Koopman that the City of Pittsburgh
3087	you mentioned the City of Pittsburgh is the city of
3088	innovation and technology, that is for sure. So let's work
3089	together and get this done for the American people. I
3090	appreciate it very much.
3091	Let's see what else I have here.
3092	I ask unanimous consent that the documents on the staff
3093	document list be submitted for the record.
3094	Without objection, so ordered.
3095	[The information follows:]
3096	
3097	*******COMMITTEE INSERT*******
3098	

3099	*Mr. Bilirakis. I remind members that they have 10
3100	business days to submit questions for the record, and I ask
3101	the witnesses to respond to the questions promptly. Members
3102	should submit their questions by the close of business on
3103	August 9. I know I will.
3104	So without objection, the subcommittee is adjourned.
3105	[Whereupon, at 1:09 p.m., the subcommittee was
3106	adjourned.]