

**BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Order Instituting Rulemaking on Regulations  
Relating to Passenger Carriers, Ridesharing,  
And New On-Line-Enabled Transportation  
Services

R.12-12-011

**REPLY COMMENTS OF SAN FRANCISCO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, THE SAN  
FRANCISCO MUNICIPAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY, AND THE SAN FRANCISCO  
COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY TO PROPOSED DECISION AUTHORIZING  
PILOT TEST PROGRAM FOR AUTONOMOUS VEHICLE PASSENGER SERVICE**

Edward D. Reiskin  
Director of Transportation  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency  
One South Van Ness Avenue, 7th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94013  
(415) 701-4720

Ivar C. Satero  
Airport Director  
San Francisco International Airport  
International Terminal, 5th Floor  
P.O. Box 8097  
San Francisco, CA 94128  
(650) 821-5006

Tilly Chang  
Executive Director  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority  
1455 Market Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94103  
(415) 522-4800

## INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Rule 14.3(d) of the California Public Utilities Commission (“Commission”) Rules of Practice and Procedure, these Reply Comments are submitted jointly by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (“SFMTA”), the San Francisco International Airport (“Airport” or “SFO”) and the San Francisco Transportation Authority (“Authority”)<sup>1</sup>, collectively “SF” or “the City”. The Reply Comments were originally filed on May 4, 2018, pursuant to Administrative Law Judge Mason’s April 27, 2018 email ruling granting, in part, Lyft Inc.’s Motion for Extension of Time for Reply Briefing.<sup>2</sup>

The City urges the Commission to fulfill its mandate by implementing the two proposed pilot programs for autonomous vehicles (“AVs”) for TCP passenger service as set forth in its Proposed Decision (“PD”) with the minor adjustments the City suggested in its Opening Comments and proposed modifications to the Order.<sup>3</sup> Although AVs have the potential for delivering safe transportation service, companies testing AVs on California roads have not, as yet, reached a level of safe operation to assure both consumers and the general public of their safe deployment on public roads without significant governmental regulation and oversight. There have been a significant number of incidents (“disengagements”) reported to the California Department of Motor Vehicles (“DMV”) by the companies testing AVs that warrant public concern if these vehicles are now allowed full passenger service deployment.<sup>4</sup> Locally, a GM Cruise AV was cited by the San Francisco Police Department for driving through a crosswalk and not yielding to a pedestrian, a violation of local law, and a potential threat to pedestrians lawfully crossing the street.<sup>5</sup> Finally, everyone is aware of the tragic fatality that occurred in Tempe, Arizona on March 18, 2018.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Transportation Authority Board consists of the eleven members of the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, who act as Transportation Authority Commissioners.

<sup>2</sup> The City is resubmitting its Reply Comments at the request of the Commission’s Docket Office and in order to comply with Rule 11.6 and ALJ Mason’s May 10, 2018 email ruling.

<sup>3</sup> See the City’s Opening Comments and proposed modifications to the Order attached as Appendix A.

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.mercurynews.com/2018/05/01/self-driving-cars-shortcomings-revealed-in-dmv-reports/>

<sup>5</sup> <http://sanfrancisco.cbslocal.com/2018/03/27/self-driving-car-ticketed-san-francisco/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/19/technology/uber-driverless-fatality.html>;  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/23/technology/uber-self-driving-cars-arizona.html>

But, instead of acknowledging the role government must play in ensuring public safety, the AV industry asks the Commission to move ahead with allowing AVs to be put into revenue passenger service with little or no governmental regulation. We respectfully disagree with this approach and urge the Commission to move forward with the two proposed pilot programs.

## COMMENTS

### **A. The Commission's Proposed Pilot Programs**

The overall purpose behind the Commission's proposed pilot programs is to find out how AVs put into passenger service will interact with the urban landscape, customers, and the general public, and collect information that can inform a future AV Passenger Service Permit program. In order to answer these questions, and ensure that public safety is adequately protected, an incremental pilot program of a limited duration is more than warranted.

The City routinely implements pilot programs to inform regulations for emerging mobility services in order to protect public safety, understand and study the new service's needs and impacts on the urban environment, prohibit potential nuisance activity - such as obstructions in the public right-of-way, ensure compliance with local laws, and collect data.<sup>7</sup> This approach reflects a desire by the City to gradually roll-out new mobility services without overwhelming the existing status quo and protect public safety. While the City acknowledges that a number of companies have conducted significant testing of AVs on public streets as well as simulated driving, this is not a substitute for understanding how public safety can be ensured when AVs are used to carry members of the public. GM Cruise argues that its AVs are the safest thing around and the Commission should commit to a schedule of finalizing full-scale deployment of AVs into passenger service.<sup>8</sup> However, the traffic collision reports posted on the DMV's website suggest otherwise. Fourteen collision reports have been filed with DMV during the first quarter of 2018. Eleven of these reports (79%) involve GM Cruise and all of these collisions were in San Francisco.<sup>9</sup> The story in 2017 is similar. A total of 27 collisions were

---

<sup>7</sup> <http://abc7news.com/traffic/sfnta-votes-in-favor-of-pilot-program-for-dockless-scooters/3415717/>;  
<https://www.sfnta.com/blog/sfnta-creates-pilot-study-electric-stationless-bike-sharing>

<sup>8</sup> See GM Cruise's Opening Comments, p. 3, 5-7.

<sup>9</sup> See [https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/dmv/detail/vr/autonomous/autonomousveh\\_0l316](https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/dmv/detail/vr/autonomous/autonomousveh_0l316)

reported in 2017, 22 of which involved GM Cruise (81%) and *all* occurred in San Francisco as well.

Given that public safety is at risk, the City implores the Commission to ensure that California is not jeopardizing the safety of its people merely to accommodate a rush to commercialize new technology.

**B. 90-Day Operational Experience Requirement**

GM Cruise and Lyft contend that either the 90-day operational requirement apply per entity (as opposed to individual vehicles) or not at all.<sup>10</sup> The City disagrees. The Commission’s rationale for including such a requirement is to “ensure that the actual vehicles that will carry passengers obtain on-road experience in California before beginning such service.” Since we do not know the details about each manufacturer’s internal testing and development practices, including when and where they are tested, the City would like to ensure that their AVs have undergone a minimum amount of practical operation and interaction with pedestrians, bicyclists, seniors, and children, among other vulnerable road users, before accepting passengers on a commercial basis.

**C. No Airport is Required to Allow AVs to Operate on Their Premises**

The PD prohibits Driverless AVs at airports and requires TCP-AV permit holders to provide the Commission with a plan for ensuring that Driverless AVs will not operate at airports. Waymo proposes alternative language concerning operation of driverless AVs, which suggests Waymo’s failure to understand the authority that municipal airports have over the businesses that operate on their premises. Specifically, Waymo asserts that the Commission could require “airport interaction” plans. Approved plans would allow Waymo to “Collaborate with airports on the best method of testing ...”

Implicit in this argument is the notion that the Commission and TCP-AV permit holders will determine whether Driverless AVs will provide commercial passenger services at airports, and that the role of airports is to simply “collaborate” with TCP-AV permit holders over the logistics of providing

---

<sup>10</sup> See GM Cruise’s Opening Comments, p. 8; Lyft’s Opening Comments, p. 2.

services. As the City noted in its Opening Comments, municipal airports have the sole authority for determining what businesses may operate on their premises.<sup>11</sup> The City requests the Commission include in its final Decision an unequivocal statement that no TCP-AV may operate at a municipal airport in *any* capacity – Drivered, Driverless or otherwise – without the express authorization of the airport authority, and that no airport authority is required to authorize TCP-AV services.

**D. No Fare Collection or Fare-Splitting During the Pilot Programs**

As mentioned earlier in this brief, we encourage the Commission to take an incremental approach in allowing AVs to be placed into passenger service. This includes not allowing fare collection or fare-splitting during the pilot program. The initial focus of these pilot programs should be public safety rather than profit or testing business models. Both Waymo and GM Cruise argue that DMV regulations already allow for commercial use of AVs.<sup>12</sup> However, this statement is incorrect.

The DMV’s regulations provide that:

“Deployment” means the operation of an autonomous vehicle on public roads by members of the public who are not employees, contractors, or designees of a manufacturer or for purposes of sale, lease, *providing transportation services for a fee*, or otherwise making commercially available outside of the testing program.” (*emphasis added*.)<sup>13</sup>

But it is the Commission – not the DMV – that regulates Charter-Party Carriers in California and issues permits and certificates authorizing charter-party carriers to conduct passenger transportation services.<sup>14</sup> Simply because the DMV may permit AV manufacturers to sell, lease or use these vehicles for providing passenger services does not mean that the Commission lacks authority to regulate how, when, and under what conditions these vehicles may be put into commercial passenger service in California.

**E. Public Disclosure of Pilot Program Data**

---

<sup>11</sup> See City’s Opening Comments at p. 8-10.

<sup>12</sup> See GM Cruise’s Opening Comments p. 5-7 and Waymo’s Opening Comments p. 2, 7.

<sup>13</sup> Cal. Code of Regulations, Title 13, §228.02(c).

<sup>14</sup> California Public Utilities Code §§5351, et al.

The PD requires TCP-AV permittees to report eight sets of data on a monthly basis, which will be posted on the Commission's website. Given the Commission's stated goal of establishing an AV Passenger Service Permit in Q1 2019, monthly reporting of data is critical to inform the proposed CPUC-DMV workshop and the conditions of the eventual permit. The collected data must be publicly available to cities, members of the public and other stakeholders to properly shape any permanent AV Passenger Service Permit program so that the public interest is protected. All of the data that is required to be publicly disclosed is aggregate trip data in which no personal information regarding passengers is provided.

**F. Accessibility Reporting Requirement**

While the City agrees with the companies' request that accessibility reporting requirements be changed from reporting requests made by disabled passengers to reporting requests for accessible vehicles instead, the City urges the Commission to adopt a regulation that requires AVs deployed for passenger service to provide universal accessibility, including wheelchair accessibility, in which case such data reporting would become unnecessary.

**CONCLUSION**

The City echoes its prior comment that the introduction of commercial AVs is an exciting prospect. However, reasonable regulations must be promulgated that balance encouraging new technological innovation while protecting public safety.

Dated: May 4, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/

Ivar C. Satero  
Airport Director  
San Francisco International Airport

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/

Edward D. Reiskin  
Director of Transportation  
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/

Tilly Chang  
Executive Director  
San Francisco County Transportation Authority