Who is responsible for a fatal crash when no one is "driving"?

With the increasing number of automated vehicles on the roads, the likelihood that one transporting an impaired person will crash and kill someone is almost inevitable. In Florida, the occupant of a self-driving Tesla was killed while utilizing the auto-pilot feature of the car. The Tesla failed to brake and crashed into a truck that turned in front of it. An investigation by the National Transportation Safety Board revealed evidence of a movie playing in the vehicle while it was operating autonomously and neither the person nor the Tesla saw the truck. The person who was killed in that crash was the occupant of the Tesla. Despite this and other incidents, technology companies and auto manufacturers are moving forward and developing more advanced automated vehicle technology that requires little or no human interaction. Additional technology and advancements may further reduce or even eliminate human interaction or operation. This may have a positive effect on reducing fatalities since human error is the “critical reason” for crashes roughly 94 percent of the time. Removing the human driving element, therefore, may help us move toward zero deaths. But should an impaired person in an automated vehicle not have any responsibility for someone else’s death?

Generally, legal discussions regarding automated vehicles focus on products liability and civil negligence. While these discussions should continue, monetary damages may not bring justice to the parents of an innocent child killed in a preventable traffic crash. For there to be criminal responsibility, however, prosecutors must determine whether the person watching the movie in the Tesla crash, for example, was “driving” or “operating” the vehicle. California and Nevada are leading the nation when it comes to laws regarding automated vehicles, but even those states require a person to drive or operate the vehicle for a vehicular homicide.

The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) defines an automated vehicle as one in which “at least some aspects of a safety-critical control function occur without direct driver input.” NHTSA’s Federal Automated Vehicles Policy describes the classification levels of vehicle automation based upon what the human driver does and when he or she does it. The levels are described as follows:

- Level 0, the human driver does everything;
- Level 1, an automated system on the vehicle can sometimes assist the human driver conduct some parts of the driving task;
- Level 2, an automated system on the vehicle can actually conduct some parts of the driving task, while the human continues to monitor the driving environment and performs the rest of the driving task;
- Level 3, an automated system can both actually conduct some parts of the driving
Because automated vehicle technology is rapidly advancing, violating any traffic laws during the operation of a vehicle.

Currently, vehicles on the road must include Level 1 automation. Automakers have begun to include Level 2 systems in vehicles currently in production. Some automakers have also expressed their plans to produce Level 3 or 4 vehicles that will be ready for the market by 2020.9

As manufacturers introduce new automated technologies, traffic safety professionals must ensure that existing vehicular homicide and impaired driving laws encompass these changes. How a jurisdiction defines driving or operation affects the prosecutors’ ability to hold impaired persons in automated vehicles responsible. Because jurisdictions vary, there is no singular definition of driving.12 Generally, however, it requires a driver to be in “actual physical control” of the vehicle.13 In a Level 3 vehicle, the computer controls a majority of the vehicle’s actions but a human driver must still be able to exercise manual control over it. Under current laws of most jurisdictions, a case involving impaired driving or vehicular homicide may depend on whether the occupant exercised manual control at the time of the crash. A different problem exists in a situation involving a Level 4 vehicle where the only occupant-involved action is simply turning on the car’s ignition. In that case, the definition of “driving” or “operating” must include more than active or manual control.

Most jurisdictions defined driving and operation for impaired driving and vehicular homicide purposes well before automated vehicle technology existed. Nevertheless, California has enacted legislation that includes a broad definition of operator that may be applied to impaired driving and vehicular homicide cases. In California, an “operator” of an automated vehicle is “the person who is seated in the driver’s seat, or, if there is no person in the driver’s seat, causes the autonomous technology to engage.”14 A prosecutor should argue that the “causes the autonomous technology to engage” applies regardless whether there is “no person in the driver’s seat.” In other words, if a person is in the driver’s seat and engages the technology, then he should be considered an “operator” as well as a person who sits in the passenger seat.15 Also, in California the law will likely require automated vehicle operators to possess a special certificate and those operators will be held responsible for violating any traffic laws during the operation of a vehicle.16

Because automated vehicle technology is rapidly advancing, the definition and use of driving and operation in all jurisdictions must be analyzed in the context of impaired driving and vehicular homicide statutes and case law. A few jurisdictions have enacted statutes and some have bills pending to provide guidance pertaining to automated vehicles but none of the laws or bills is focused solely on criminal responsibility.17 The determination of criminal responsibility should be evaluated by law enforcement. For law enforcement to be able to evaluate all the facts and circumstances surrounding a vehicular homicide based on impaired driving or otherwise, a broad definition of driving or operation should include “causing the autonomous technology to engage.”

Note: This article was written and edited by members of the National Traffic Law Center (NTLC). Members of the National District Attorney Association’s NTLC serve as resources for prosecutors, judges, law enforcement officers, and others in the traffic safety community. The mission of NTLC is to improve the quality of justice in traffic safety adjudications by increasing the awareness of highway safety issues through the compilation, creation, and dissemination of legal and technical information, and by providing training and reference services.
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