Road Vehicle Automation History, Opportunities and Challenges

Steven E. Shladover, Sc.D.
California PATH Program
Institute of Transportation Studies
University of California, Berkeley

Tokyo, November 2016
Outline

• Historical development of automation
• Levels of road vehicle automation
• Benefits to be gained from automation
• Why cooperation (not autonomy) is needed
• Impacts of each level of automation on travel (and when?)
• Challenges (technical and non-technical)
• What to do now?
History of Automated Driving (pre-Google)

- 1939 – General Motors “Futurama” exhibit
- 1949 – RCA technical explorations begin
- 1950s – GM/RCA collaborative research
- 1950s – GM “Firebird II” concept car
- 1964 – GM “Futurama II” exhibit
- 1964-80 – Research by Fenton at OSU
- 1960s – Wire following in Japan (Kikuchi, Matsumoto)
- 1970s – Vision guidance in Japan (Tsugawa)
- 1986 – California PATH and PROMETHEUS programs start
- 1980s – Dickmanns vision guidance in Germany
- 1994 – PROMETHEUS demo in Paris
- 1994-98 – National AHS Consortium (Demo ‘97)
- 2003 – PATH automated bus and truck demos
General Motors 1939 Futurama

General Motors' Futurama
1939 New York World's Fair
GM Firebird II Publicity Video
GM Technology in 1960
General Motors 1964 Futurama II
Robert Fenton’s OSU Research

Automatically Controlled
1965 Plymouth at
Transportation Research Center of Ohio
The Ohio State University (OSU)
1977
Pioneering Automated Driving in Japan
(courtesy of Prof. Tsugawa, formerly at MITI)

1960s – Wire following Kikuchi and Matsumoto

1970s – Vision Guidance (Tsugawa)
Pioneering Automated Driving in Germany (1988 - courtesy Prof. Ernst Dickmanns, UniBWM)
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Terminology Problems

- Common misleading, vague to wrong terms:
  - “driverless” – but generally they’re not!
  - “self-driving”
  - “autonomous” – 4 common usages, but different in meaning (and 3 are wrong!)

- Central issues to clarify:
  - Roles of driver and “the system”
  - Degree of connectedness and cooperation
  - Operational Design Domain (ODD)

- See SAE J3016 (2016):
  http://standards.sae.org/j3016_201609/
Definitions (per Oxford English Dictionary)

- **autonomy:**
  1. *(of a state, institution, etc.)* the right of self-government, of making its own laws and administering its own affairs  
  2. *(biological)* (a) the condition of being controlled only by its own laws, and not subject to any higher one; (b) organic *independence*  
  3. a self-governing community.

- **autonomous:**
  1. of or pertaining to an autonomy  
  2. possessed of autonomy, self governing, independent  
  3. *(biological)* (a) conforming to its own laws only, and not subject to higher ones; (b) independent, i.e., not a mere form or state of some other organism.

- **automate:** to apply automation to; to convert to largely automatic operation

- **automation:** automatic control of the manufacture of a product through a number of successive stages; the application of automatic control to any branch of industry or science; by extension, the use of electronic or mechanical devices to replace human labour.
Autonomous and Cooperative ITS

Autonomous ITS (Unconnected) Systems

Cooperative ITS (Connected Vehicle) Systems

Automated Driving Systems
# SAE J3016 Definitions – Levels of Automation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAE Level</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Narrative Definition</th>
<th>Execution of Steering/ Acceleration/ Deceleration</th>
<th>Monitoring of Driving Environment</th>
<th>Fallback Performance of Dynamic Driving Task</th>
<th>System Capability (Driving Modes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No Automation</td>
<td>the full-time performance by the human driver of all aspects of the dynamic driving task, even when enhanced by warning or intervention systems</td>
<td>Human driver</td>
<td>Human driver</td>
<td>Human driver</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Driver Assistance</td>
<td>the driving mode-specific execution by a driver assistance system of either steering or acceleration/deceleration using information about the driving environment and with the expectation that the human driver perform all remaining aspects of the dynamic driving task</td>
<td>Human driver and system</td>
<td>Human driver</td>
<td>Human driver</td>
<td>Some driving modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Partial Automation</td>
<td>the driving mode-specific execution by one or more driver assistance systems of both steering and acceleration/deceleration using information about the driving environment and with the expectation that the human driver perform all remaining aspects of the dynamic driving task</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>Human driver</td>
<td>Human driver</td>
<td>Some driving modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conditional Automation</td>
<td>the driving mode-specific performance by an automated driving system of all aspects of the dynamic driving task with the expectation that the human driver will respond appropriately to a request to intervene</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>Human driver</td>
<td>Some driving modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High Automation</td>
<td>the driving mode-specific performance by an automated driving system of all aspects of the dynamic driving task, even if a human driver does not respond appropriately to a request to intervene</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>Some driving modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Full Automation</td>
<td>the full-time performance by an automated driving system of all aspects of the dynamic driving task under all roadway and environmental conditions that can be managed by a human driver</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>All driving modes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Example Systems at Each Automation Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Example Systems</th>
<th>Driver Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adaptive Cruise Control OR Lane Keeping Assistance</td>
<td>Must drive other function and monitor driving environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Adaptive Cruise Control AND Lane Keeping Assistance Traffic Jam Assist (Mercedes, Tesla, Infiniti, Volvo...) Parking with external supervision</td>
<td>Must monitor driving environment (system nags driver to try to ensure it).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Traffic Jam Pilot</td>
<td>May read a book, text, or web surf, BUT be prepared to intervene when needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Highway driving pilot Closed campus driverless shuttle “Driverless” valet parking in garage</td>
<td>May sleep, and system can revert to minimum risk condition if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Automated taxi (even for children) Car-share repositioning system</td>
<td>No driver needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outline

• Historical development of automation
• Levels of road vehicle automation
• **Benefits to be gained from automation**
• Why cooperation is needed
• Impacts of each level of automation on travel (and when?)
• Challenges (technical and non-technical)
• What to do now?
Automation Is a Tool for Solving Transportation Problems

- Alleviating congestion
  - Increase capacity of roadway infrastructure
  - Improve traffic flow dynamics
- Reducing energy use and emissions
  - Aerodynamic “drafting”
  - Improve traffic flow dynamics
- Improving safety
  - Reduce and mitigate crashes

...BUT the vehicles need to be connected
Alleviating Congestion

- Typical U.S. highway capacity is 2200 vehicles/hr/lane (or 750 trucks/hr/lane)
  - Governed by drivers’ car following and lane changing gap acceptance needs
  - Vehicles occupy only 5% of road surface at maximum capacity
- Stop and go disturbances (shock waves) result from drivers’ response delays
- **V2V Cooperative** automation provides shorter gaps, faster responses, and more consistency
- **I2V Cooperation** maximizes bottleneck capacity by setting most appropriate target speed

→ Significantly higher throughput per lane
→ Smooth out transient disturbances
Reducing Energy and Emissions

- At highway speeds, half of energy is used to overcome aerodynamic drag
  - Close-formation automated platoons can save 10% to 20% of total energy use
- Accelerate/decelerate cycles waste energy and produce excess emissions
  - Automation can eliminate stop-and-go disturbances, producing smoother and cleaner driving cycles
- I2V communication of traffic signal status enables eco-driving (smoother, more efficient)
- BUT, this only happens with cooperation
Improving Safety

• 95% of crashes in the U.S. are caused by driver behavior problems (perception, judgment, response, inattention) and environment (low visibility or road surface friction)

• Automation avoids driver behavior problems

• Appropriate sensors and communications are not vulnerable to weather problems
  – Automation systems can detect and compensate for poor road surface friction

• BUT, current U.S. traffic safety sets a very high bar:
  – 3.3 M vehicle hours between fatal crashes (375 years of non-stop 24/7 driving)
  – 65,000 vehicle hours between injury crashes (7+ years of non-stop driving)
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Cooperation Augments Sensing

• Autonomous vehicles cannot “talk” or “listen”
• Cooperative vehicles can “talk” and “listen” as well as “seeing” (using 5.9 GHz DSRC comm.)
  – NHTSA regulatory mandate in process in U.S.
• Communicate vehicle performance and condition directly rather than sensing indirectly
  – Faster, richer and more accurate information
  – Longer range
• Cooperative decision making for system benefits
• Enables closer separations between vehicles
• Expands performance envelope – safety, capacity, efficiency and ride quality
Examples of Performance That is Only Achievable Through Cooperation

- **Vehicle-Vehicle Cooperation**
  - Cooperative adaptive cruise control (CACC) to eliminate shock waves
  - Automated merging of vehicles, starting beyond line of sight, to smooth traffic
  - Multiple-vehicle automated platoons at short separations, to increase capacity
  - Truck platoons at short enough spacings to reduce drag and save energy

- **Vehicle-Infrastructure Cooperation**
  - Speed harmonization to maximize flow
  - Speed reduction approaching queue for safety
  - Precision docking of transit buses
  - Precision snowplow control
Example 1 – Production Autonomous ACC (at minimum gap 1.1 s)
Response of Production ACC Cars
Example 2 – V2V Cooperative ACC (at minimum gap 0.6 s)
V2V CACC Responses (3 followers)
PATH Automated Platoon Longitudinal Control and Merging (V2V)

1997

2000
PATH V2V Truck Platoons (2003, 2010)

2 trucks, 3 to 10 m gaps

3 trucks, 4 to 10 m gaps (6 m in video)
PATH Magnetic Bus Guidance in Eugene, OR
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No Automation and Driver Assistance (Levels 0, 1)

- Primary safety advancements likely at these levels, adding machine vigilance to driver vigilance
  - Safety warnings based on ranging sensors
  - Automation of one function facilitating driver focus on other functions
- Driving comfort and convenience from assistance systems (ACC)
- Traffic, energy, and environmental benefits depend on cooperation
- Widely available on cars and trucks now
International Standards for Level 1 Driving Automation Systems

- ISO 15622 – Adaptive Cruise Control
- ISO 22178 – Low Speed Following
- ISO 22179 – Full Speed Range Adaptive Cruise Control
- ISO 11270 – Lane Keeping Assistance
- ISO 16787 – Assisted Parking System
- (in development) – Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control
Partial Automation (Level 2) Impacts

- Primarily on limited-access highways
- Somewhat increased driving comfort and convenience (but driver still needs to be actively engaged)
- Possible safety increase, depending on effectiveness of driver engagement
  - Safety concerns if driver “tunes out”
- (only if cooperative) Increases in energy efficiency and traffic throughput
- When? Now (Mercedes, Infiniti, Volvo, Tesla)
Intentional Mis-Uses of Level 2

Mercedes S-Class

Infiniti Q50

Let's see how well the Active Lane Control works on the new Infiniti Q50S
International Standards in Development for Level 2 Driving Automation Systems

- Partially Automated Parking Systems
- Partially Automated In-Lane Driving Systems
- Partially Automated Lane Change Systems
Conditional Automation (Level 3) Impacts

- Driving comfort and convenience increase
  - Driver can do other things while driving, so disutility of travel time is reduced
  - Limited by requirement to be able to re-take control of vehicle in a few seconds when alerted

- Safety uncertain, depending on ability to re-take control in emergency conditions

- (only if cooperative) Increases in efficiency and traffic throughput

- When? Unclear – safety concerns could impede introduction
High Automation (Level 4) Impacts – General-purpose light duty vehicles

- Only usable in some places (limited access highways, maybe only in managed lanes)
- Large gain in driving comfort and convenience on available parts of trip (driver can sleep)
  - Significantly reduced value of time
- Safety improvement, based on automatic transition to minimal risk condition
- *(only if cooperative)* Significant increases in energy efficiency and traffic throughput from close-coupled platooning
- When? Starting 2020 – 2025?
High Automation (Level 4) Impacts – Special applications

• Buses on separate transitways
  – Narrow right of way – easier to fit in corridors
  – Rail-like quality of service at lower cost

• Heavy trucks on dedicated truck lanes
  – (cooperative) Platooning for energy and emission savings, higher capacity

• Automated (driverless) valet parking
  – More compact parking garages

• Driverless shuttles within campuses or pedestrian zones
  – Facilitating new urban designs

• When? Could be just a few years away
Full Automation (Level 5) Impacts

- Ubiquitous electronic taxi service for mobility-challenged travelers (young, old, impaired)
- Ubiquitous shared vehicle fleet repositioning (driverless)
- Driverless cargo pickup and delivery
- Full “electronic chauffeur” service anywhere

- Ultimate comfort and convenience
  - Travel time disutility plunge
- *(if cooperative)* Large energy efficiency and road capacity gains
- When? Many decades... (Ubiquitous operation without driver is a huge technical challenge)
### Personal Estimates of Market Introductions

**(based on technological feasibility)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Everywhere</th>
<th>Some urban streets</th>
<th>Campus or pedestrian zone</th>
<th>Limited-access highway</th>
<th>Fully Segregated Guideway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 (ACC)</td>
<td>Level 2 (ACC+ LKA)</td>
<td>Level 3 Conditional Automation</td>
<td>Level 4 High Automation</td>
<td>Level 5 Full Automation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Color Key:**
- **Now**
- **~2020s**
- **~2025s**
- **~2030s**
- **~~2075**

**Personal Estimates of Market Introductions**

**~2020s**

**~2025s**

**~2030s**

**~~2075**

**(based on technological feasibility)**
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Traffic Safety Challenges for Full Automation

• Extreme external conditions arising without advance warning (failure of another vehicle, dropped load, lightning,...)

• NEW CRASHES caused by automation:
  – Strange circumstances the system designer could not anticipate
  – Software bugs not exercised in testing
  – Undiagnosed faults in the vehicle
  – Catastrophic failures of vital vehicle systems (loss of electrical power...)

• Driver not available to act as the fall-back
Why this is a super-hard problem

- Software intensive system (no technology available to verify or validate its safety under its full range of operating conditions)
- Electro-mechanical elements don’t benefit from Moore’s Law improvements
  - Cannot afford extensive hardware redundancy for protection from failures
- Harsh and unpredictable hazard environment
- Non-professional vehicle owners and operators cannot ensure proper maintenance and training
Safety Challenges for Full Automation

• Must be “significantly” safer than today’s driving baseline (2X? 5X? 10X?)
  – Fatal crash MTBF > 3.3 million vehicle hours
  – Injury crash MTBF > 65,000 vehicle hours

• Cannot prove safety of software for safety-critical applications

• Complexity – cannot test all possible combinations of input conditions and their timing
  – How many hours of testing are needed to demonstrate safety better than this?

• How many hours of continuous, unassisted automated driving have been achieved in real traffic under diverse conditions?
## Much Harder than Commercial Aircraft Automation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure of Difficulty – Orders of Magnitude</th>
<th>Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of targets each vehicle needs to track (~10)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of vehicles the region needs to monitor (~10^6)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of range measurements needed to each target (~10 cm)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of speed difference measurements needed to each target (~1 m/s)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time available to respond to an emergency while cruising (~0.1 s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable cost to equip each vehicle (~$3000)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual production volume of automation systems (~10^6)</td>
<td>- 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum total of orders of magnitude</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Human Interactions with Technology

- Fundamental changes in the nature of the driving task
- Driver capabilities and preferences are extremely diverse, across and within drivers
- Unclear how to “train” drivers to acquire correct mental models of capabilities and limitations of automation systems
- Drivers will “push the envelope” beyond system capabilities, which could become extremely dangerous
- No viable experimental protocols to safely test drivers’ usage of higher automation levels
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What to do now?

- Focus on connected vehicle capabilities to provide technology for cooperation (V2V and I2V)
- Deploy Level 1 automation widely
- For earliest public benefits from higher levels of automation, focus on transit and trucking applications in protected rights of way
  - Professional drivers and maintenance
  - Direct economic benefits
- Develop fundamental enabling technologies for Level 4 and 5 automation (software verification and safety, real-time fault identification and management, hazard detection sensing, ...)

CALIFORNIA PATH