MEETING SUMMARY
Unconventional Vehicles Working Group

Date of Meeting: March 10-11, 2011
Summary Prepared By: Keith Kiser
Location: Austin, Texas
Agenda: Can be found at the end of this meeting summary.

1. Meeting Overview
The primary purpose of this meeting was to discuss the results of a membership survey regarding their unconventional vehicle concerns, and to determine which vehicle type(s) should become the next priority for the working group.

2. Attendance at Meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Invited</th>
<th>Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Francis</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Gerber</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig Root</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis Boissonault</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Hooper</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Blaney</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Bowman</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael McLin</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Bowman</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Blackwell</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Nilsen</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Termuende</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Clapper</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Kiser</td>
<td>AAMVA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil Schuster</td>
<td>AAMVA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Tomlinson</td>
<td>CCMTA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Action items

1. Keith will prepare and distribute a summary of the meeting.
2. Harold Blaney will send the IRE vehicle definitions to Keith (printed at the end of this meeting summary).
3. Keith will check to see if AAMVA has done surveys in the past related to modified vehicles and/or kit cars.
4. Keith will work with Mark to set up the next conference call of the working group as soon after the AAMVA Spring Workshop as possible.
5. Working group members will let Keith know of their availability for a working group meeting in Canada.

4. Meeting Notes, Decisions, Issues

1. Chairman Mark Francis welcomed attendees and thanked them for continued support and efforts. He noted the attendance of Neil Schuster, President and CEO of AAMVA, as well as Ian Tomlinson from CCMTA.
2. Ian Tomlinson was in Austin the previous day to meet with the Canadian members serving on the Unconventional Vehicles working group as those members also serve on a CCMTA committee looking at issues related to the registration of Low Speed Vehicles. That group had met in Austin the day before the Unconventional Vehicles working group meeting.
3. Neil indicated the Board continues to have a strong interest in and support for the activities of the various AAMVA working groups. They had been very appreciative of the Mini-Truck Best Practice that they reviewed and approved at their April 2011 meeting. Neil commented on the strong working relationship between the Board and the working groups, and the additional communication about committee and working group activities that has occurred the past couple of years. Neil provided an update on both REAL-ID and NMVTIS, and thanked the Unconventional Vehicles working group for their continued efforts.
4. Mark provided an overview of the CCMTA discussion paper on Motorized Personal Mobility Devices (MPMDs). The document contains a very good summary of the issues, problems, and possible solutions for a growing desire and need for owners to operate these vehicles on or across public roadways. Additionally, it is considered a living document and new relevant information will be added, as it becomes available. Paul Nilsen commented that Wisconsin is seeing these vehicles being used by DUI drivers who do not or cannot get a driver’s license. WI has not yet developed recommendations regarding these vehicles, but believes there may be appropriate use by professionals such as law enforcement, but also believes that, if these vehicles are permitted on public roads, the driver should have a valid driver’s license. One of the problems with these vehicles (and a number of other vehicle types) is that there is not good crash or fatalities data available as these vehicle types are generally not tracked as separate vehicle types when crash reports are written.
5. The working group discussed issues related to the operation of Segways on public roadways. Monica Blackwell indicated this is a local control issue in Texas but there is a company in Austin offering city tours using Segways. They are required to keep and report crash data and have restricted hours of operation, areas of use, and crossing privileges. Douglas Hooper indicated Georgia has similar requirements in some communities.
6. The working group discussed whether or not, given the limited amount of vehicle information in most crash reports, it would be possible to obtain valid crash information for LSV and other unconventional vehicles.
4. Meeting Notes, Decisions, Issues

7. Keith provided a Powerpoint presentation containing photos of a variety of unconventional vehicles either being manufactured or built for use on public highways.

8. The working group members discussed unconventional vehicle types of concern to their jurisdiction. Issues discussed included:

- **Oregon** – continue to have problems with homemade and custom built vehicles. They are also having problems with off-road vehicles being converted so they can be operated on public roads.

- **British Columbia** – is in the process of redefining “motor vehicle” to exclude industrial vehicles and those operating at less than 10 KPH. They are also continuing work on issues related to right-hand drive vehicles.

- **Delaware** – Having problems with military vehicle owners who want to title and register them.

- **Georgia** – Discussed their assembled and unconventional vehicle legislation. They are denying registration for military vehicles. Medium speed vehicle legislation was defeated because there is no federal definition. Georgia has enacted personal transportation vehicle legislation that specifies they are regulated by municipal governments, not the state. Trucks converted to recreational vehicles are a growing problem.

- **California** – No new or big issues at this point. Auto Moto vehicles will be titled and licensed as a motorcycle but does not require a motorcycle endorsement on the operator’s license.

- **CCMTA** - Ian Tomlinson showed a video from Transport Canada in which they crash tested a Low Speed Vehicle. The video shows extensive damage to the vehicles and serious to fatal injuries to the occupants. The working group discussed the fact that some states are now allowing Medium Speed Vehicles to be registered for us on public streets, often by modifying their Low Speed Vehicle definition to allow for a higher maximum speed. CCMTA is also working on a Discussion and Recommendations document with respect to LSV regulation in Canada. They are also working on issues and concerns related to vehicles converted from gas to electric and the Bombardier Can-AM Spyder.

- **Kansas** – Is working with Terrafugia (flying cars) to enact legislation allowing for the operation of the flying cars in Kansas, including the adoption of a definition for “lightweight roadable vehicle”. They are dealing with citizens who want to register and title bicycles with small electric or gas motors capable of speeds of 25 to 28 MPH. Neither the state nor the municipalities want these vehicles registered for use on public roadways.

- **Wisconsin** – Vehicles converted from gas to electric are a concern because there are no standards for these conversions. This is happening with both motor vehicles and motorcycles, and often involves builders who utilize junk vehicle chassis. Wisconsin is working with junk dealers and manufacturers to find possible solutions. Oversized military vehicles continue to be a concern, and Wisconsin has enacted a provision allowing for the issuance of historic military use license plates.

- **Texas** – Homemade vehicles and Chinese motorcycles continue to be major problems in Texas.

- **Quebec** – The province has an ongoing pilot project related to Low Speed Vehicles. The pilot is currently being reviewed by their new Minister. ZENN, the low speed vehicle manufacturer in Québec, has gone out of business. Québec also has a new rule to operate three-wheeled motorcycles. To operate this type of vehicle in Québec, a person must hold a Class 6A (all types of motorcycles) driver’s licence or hold a Class 5 (passenger vehicle) and successfully complete the Road Safety Education Program – Operating a Three-Wheeled Motorcycle driving one day course. A new ministerial order prohibiting the use of right-hand drive vehicles on the road network came into effect on April 24, 2010. Unlike the two previous ministerial orders, which were in effect for a period 180 days, this new order is permanent.
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9. The working group held an extensive discussion regarding the results of the February AAMVA membership survey. The survey was intended to get input from jurisdictions regarding their most pressing unconventional vehicle issues. 42 jurisdictions responded to the survey. Issues regarding merged vehicles and modified vehicles seem to be, overall, the vehicle types of most concern. However, it was difficult to determine if these might be the same issue as the terms were not clearly defined in the survey document. The working group discussed the merits of a follow-up survey or other contacts with the jurisdictions to further define the specific concerns express by the survey respondents.

Possible survey questions identified were:

- Ask what problems they have, how they are dealing with them, and what they see as possible solutions
- Survey members to be more specific as to their concerns to the two priority issues and homemade vehicles
- To what degree are homemade vehicles regulated or a problem in your jurisdictions – do they have statutes – current level of concern
- Ask about the level of effort and cost to deal with a relatively small number of vehicles that are modified or changed from their original configuration – are jurisdictions spending a lot of time and money for these vehicle types

10. The working group discussed possible definitions for a number of vehicle types identified in the survey. The following draft definitions were discussed but not finalized.

Homemade vehicles – build from the ground up does not resemble any existing vehicle – (see WI definition)

Reconstructed – A vehicle that has been permanently altered from original construction by removing, adding, or substituting major components which resembles the original vehicle

Rebuilt – repaired salvage vehicle

Merged – does not look the same after parts from two or more vehicles are joined

Amalgamated – looks the same after parts from two or more vehicles are joined

Modified – changes risk profile (motor change, suspension change, etc. Saskatchewan has done some work on altered height, as has CCMTA – modifications could include motor change, performance modifications, armoring, fuel conversions, etc.

Specially Constructed Vehicle – Craig Root suggested this could be a generic term for all of the above – (See CA vehicle code 580)

11. The working group concluded its first day by discussing the possibility of a best practice that would state that jurisdictions not title or register any vehicle that does not comply with the applicable federal US or Canadian vehicle safety standards. The group also discussed the need for such a best practice, if pursued, would probably need to have exceptions for homemade vehicles, rebuilt vehicles, vehicles that are more than 15 years old (in Canada) or 25 years old (in the US).
12. The working group began its second day by developing possible questions that would go into a follow-up survey of the AAMVA membership. The group agreed the survey should be broken into two primary sections. One section would contain questions related to merged vehicles and the other would contain questions related to modified vehicles. Modified would include specially constructed vehicles as well. Merged vehicles would include amalgamated vehicles (see BC definition) and homemade vehicles. The group agreed to “park” the reconstructed and rebuilt vehicle types for the time being. It was suggested that any survey include:

A list of vehicle “change” situations so that jurisdictions could provide responses based on a common understanding of the vehicle change being surveyed

A set of photos showing homemade or modified vehicles to help respondents understand the types of changes being surveyed

Specific questions about how the jurisdiction would or would not handle these vehicle changes

A determination by the respondent as to their level of concern (ranked on a scale of 1-10

Frequency of occurrence and level of resource drain to deal with these vehicle changes

13. Next Step - After discussion, it was decided that, at the upcoming AAMVA Spring Workshop, Mark will discuss the proposed idea of a best practice that would state that jurisdictions not title or register any vehicle that does not comply with the applicable federal US or Canadian vehicle safety standards. The intent is to get feedback from the membership on this idea, as well as generate some discussion that may provide a better understanding of the merged and modified vehicle issues in the jurisdictions.

14. Mark appointed a subcommittee to do further work on developing a possible survey. Subcommittee members will be Mark, Monica, Lori, and Paul. Rob will also assist and make his staff available to help as needed. The subcommittee will meet by conference call following the Spring workshop.

15. The working group discussed their comfort level on the proposed next steps. Most were in agreement, but a couple of concerns were expressed. Michael thought the definitions were a little too broad and probably needed some clarification. He also suggested it might be appropriate for the working group to also consider starting work on at least one other issue, possibly the vehicles converted from gas to electric. Lori agreed with Michael’s concerns, and wondered if the priority issues identified in the February survey are really priority concerns.
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16. The working group concluded their meeting with an open discussion of other issues of concern or interest. Issues discussed included:

The possibility of holding the next working group meeting in Canada. Keith asked US members of the working group to let him know if they had any travel restrictions related to out-of-country travel.

Collector vehicle registration programs

VIN stamping machines – the machine being used to create homemade VIN plates in BC is worn out and they are having difficulty finding a replacement.

Rob asked if states are using or moving toward multi-year registrations. OR currently has a two-year registration and Keith commented that he was aware that at least a few other states had two-year registration programs.

OR asked if jurisdictions are looking at lost revenue issues for gas taxes with the advent of alternative fuel vehicles. OR is looking at possible legislation to find an alternative to gas taxes. GA has a fee for all alternative fuel vehicles to compensate for the lost gas taxes.

5. Next Meeting

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conference Call</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unconventional Vehicles Working Group
Austin, Texas
March 8-9, 2011
Agenda

AGENDA

- Welcome/Introductions ................................................................. Mark Francis
- Roll Call/Agenda Review ............................................................... Keith Kiser
- CCMTA Personal Mobility Device Best Practice ......................... Mark Francis
- PowerPoint Review of Vehicle Types ........................................... Keith Kiser
- Review of Survey Results ............................................................ Keith Kiser
- Discussion of Survey Results ....................................................... All
- Prioritization of Future Efforts ...................................................... All
- Development of Expected Deliverables/Outcomes ....................... All
- Assignment of Tasks ................................................................. Mark Francis
- Open Discussion ........................................................................ All
- Closing Comments/Next Steps ..................................................... Mark Francis
CCMTA Interprovincial Record Exchange (IRE) Network

Vehicle Status standards in the IRE system are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>VEHICLE STATUS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>NORMAL</td>
<td>Vehicle exists and currently hasn’t any non-normal statuses</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>STOLEN</td>
<td>Declared stolen to the police and has not been reported recovered</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UNFIT</td>
<td>Deemed not road worthy - must be certified or pass inspection for unfit to be removed</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ABANDONED</td>
<td>Vehicle was found deserted and either unable to locate registered owner or there was no jurisdictional record of vehicle. Vehicle is in police custody</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SALVAGE</td>
<td>Damaged to the extent that cost of repairing the vehicle for legal operation on the public roads exceeds its fair market value immediately prior to damage</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MOVED</td>
<td>Vehicle registered by or exported to another jurisdiction</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>INCORRECT VIN</td>
<td>The VIN, though associated with a registered vehicle, has an illegitimate configuration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SOLD</td>
<td>Vehicle has been identified as sold by the registered owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>REBUILT</td>
<td>A salvage vehicle which has been repaired. It must have been certified or passed inspection to allow it to be registered.</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NONREPAIRABLE</td>
<td>Incapable of operation or use on public roads. It also has no resale value except as a source of parts or scrap.</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: When consulting a registration file in IRE the information returned may vary according to the jurisdiction. The right hand column shows the statuses used in Québec. Québec does not use the Abandoned, Incorrect VIN or Sold status.