Preprint. This paper has been published in Transportation Research Part C. For the latest published version with graphics refer to https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0968090X18305199?via%3Dihub

Energy Saving Potentials of Connected and Automated Vehicles

Ardalan Vahidi Antonio Sciarretta

Abstract—**Connected and automated vehicles (CAV) are marketed for their increased safety, driving comfort, and time saving potential. With much easier access to information, increased processing power, and precision control, they also offer unprecedented opportunities for energy efficient driving. This paper is an attempt to highlight the energy saving potential of connected and automated vehicles based on first principles of motion, optimal control theory, and a review of the vast but scattered eco-driving literature. We explain that connectivity to other vehicles and infrastructure allows better anticipation of upcoming events, such as hills, curves, slow traffic, state of traffic signals, and movement of neighboring vehicles. Automation allows vehicles to adjust their motion more precisely in anticipation of upcoming events, and save energy. Opportunities for cooperative driving could further increase energy efficiency of a group of vehicles by allowing them to move in a coordinated manner. Energy efficient motion of connected and automated vehicles could have a harmonizing effect on mixed traffic, leading to additional energy savings for neighboring vehicles.**

I. INTRODUCTION

THE shift that we are witnessing toward vehicle connectivity and autonomy is going to be perhaps, the most disruptive since the early days of automobiles and could revolutionize movement of people and goods. According to IHS Automotive, the number of connected cars sold globally will grow more to 152 million across the globe by 2020, a six fold increase with respect to 2015 [1]. Another estimate puts the number of connected vehicles at 250 million vehicles by 2020 [2], a fourth of the billion cars that are in service today. In 2016 the US Department of Transportation issued a notice of proposed rule making, that if implemented would require Vehicle-to-Vehicle (V2V) connectivity on all new light-duty vehicles and is intended to reduce the number of car accidents [3]. Similar provisions and guidelines are envisioned for Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I) communication [4]. With implementation of such mandates the number of connected cars with access to information and data will rapidly increase. On a different front, major auto manufacturers, technology firms, and startup companies have started a race toward building fully automated cars. Many automated functions such as adaptive cruise control and lane keeping assist are already available on several production vehicles. It is expected that first fully automated vehicles be available for sale before 2020 [5], [6]. A projection is that 20-40% of vehicle sales be automated by 2030 and full penetration could happen in several stages over the next few decades [7].

A.Vahidi (corresponding author, avahidi@clemson.edu) is with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA. A. Sciarretta (antonio.sciarretta@ifpen.fr) is with Technology, Computer Science, and Applied Mathematics Div. IFP Energies Nouvelles, Rueil-Malmaison, France. The first author was a scientific visitor at IFP, France for the duration of this collaborative work and thankfully acknowledges the support provided by IFP.

This level of connectivity and autonomy will transform transportation of people and goods in several dimensions with important societal and economical impacts: improved safety, increased comfort, time saving potential, and more efficient road utilization are among the most widely discussed positive impacts of CAVs. Fully automated vehicles could improve mobility of young, elderly, and people with disability who are unable to drive today. Ride sharing and on-demand mobility services could gain more popularity due to reduced labor cost, influencing also urban planning and land use.

Energy use has not been the core consideration in development of connected and automated vehicles, but it could be impacted significantly. The impact could be positive or negative according to [8], [9] which is summarized in Table I. A careful scenario analysis in [9] shows vehicle automation could reduce energy use and green house gas emissions in half in an optimistic scenario or double them in a "dystopian nightmare", depending on the effects that come to dominate. Increased opportunities for eco-driving and platooning, traffic harmonization, vehicle light-weighting enabled by lower crash risk, vehicle right-sizing for number of travelers, de-emphasized vehicle performance, car-sharing and on-demand mobility, and reduced infrastructure footprint of automated vehicles all contribute to improved energy utilization according to [9]. But according to the same study, the increase in vehicle miles traveled due to lower travel costs, addition of new user groups (young, elderly, disabled), higher highway speeds, and increased vehicle features can also dramatically increase the energy footprint of vehicle automation. The outcomes depend on which scenarios prevail and proactive policy making is essential to steer the technology toward energy efficiency as also emphasized in [9], [10], [6]. The authors of [11] speculate that the aggregate energy and environmental impact of automated and on-demand mobility could be positive; but acknowledge a big shift from historical trends that needs to be carefully watched by policy makers and planners.

This paper takes a more in-depth look at increased opportunities for energy efficient driving with connected and automated vehicles, disregarding second order effects of connectivity and automation, such as increased vehicle miles traveled or reduced vehicle weight. Because CAVs are capable of sensing more accurately, processing more information, and can be more tightly controlled, they benefit more from information offered by connectivity and road preview. With higher penetration rate of CAVs, opportunities increase for vehicle to vehicle communication and cooperative control; which can lead to additional energy efficiency gains. Despite

TABLE I: Potential Impact of CAVs on a) energy intensity or user intensity according to [8] b) operational energy use by year 2050 according to [9].

Contributing Factors	Ref. [8]	Ref. [9]
platooning	(-)10 % EI*	(-) 2-10 %
eco-driving	(-)15-40 % EI	(-) 20 %
eco-routing	(-) 5 % EI	NA
congestion mitigation	NA	(-)2-4%
de-emphasized performance	NA	(-) 5-23 %
vehicle light-weighting	(-) 50 % EI	(-) 5-23 %
vehicle right-sizing	(-) 12† % UI**	(-) 20-45 %
changed mobility services	NA	(-) 0-20 %
infrastructure footprint	NA	(-) 2-5%
reduced parking search	(-) 4 % UI	NA
enabling electrification	(-) 75 % FI***	NA
higher highway speeds	(+) 30 %	(+) 5-25 %
increased features	NA	(+) 0-10 %
travel cost reduction	(+) 50 % UI	(+) 5-60 %
new user groups	(+) 40 % UI	(+) 2-10 %

*EI: Energy Intensity **UI: User Intensity ***FI: Fuel Intensity
† higher occupancy facilitated by IT and automated carpooling

these prospects, connected and automated vehicle research and development have been mostly on software, sensing, and safety and there are limited results on energy efficiency potentials.

Over the past decade, various research groups have shown the positive influence of telematics, road preview, and connectivity on energy efficiency of conventional and hybrid vehicles through simulation and experimental investigations. For instance, in [12] it is shown that as little as 7 seconds traffic look-ahead capability could have the same energy efficiency benefit as hybridization. Due the complex nature of the problem (different vehicle configurations, variability of scenarios, and sensitivity to choice of algorithms) the reported values for energy efficiency benefits are scattered and a concerted effort is needed to summarize the findings and put them in context. Such a summary not only helps researchers in the field but can inform policy making in regulatory units.

We start by discussing the fundamentals of energy efficient driving based on a first principle energy analysis in Section II. Our reference to eco-driving implies economic and not ecologic driving as they are not necessarily the same; lowering energy use is not equivalent to lowering emissions [13]. As formalized in [14] and [15] many eco-driving problems are optimal control problems; but to keep the paper readable to a more general audience we limit use of theory of optimal control to an appendix. The flow of the rest of the paper is shaped by the authors' past research on eco-driving and backed by the many papers that have emerged on the topic, mostly over the past decade. This is by no means a comprehensive review of existing literature as a wide range of publications exists. In particular we do not consider the topic of eco-routing that has been discussed in several recent publications, for instance in [16], [17], [18], [19].

In Section III the importance of anticipation for efficient driving is explained. In particular we discuss opportunities that arise for individual CAVs by anticipating future road slope and geometry, macroscopic state of traffic, color of upcoming traffic signals, and microscopic motion of their neighboring vehicles. This allows CAVs to more judiciously choose their velocity and lane to minimize wasteful braking and idling and also enables predictive powertrain control due to increased certainty about future vehicle motion. With increased penetration of CAVs, more opportunities arise for collaborative driving which could further enhance energy efficiency as discussed in Section IV. In particular we discuss platooning, cooperative adaptive cruise control, cooperative lane change and merge, and cooperative intersection control for a CAV fleet. The impact on mixed traffic is discussed briefly in Section IV-D, followed by conclusions in Section V.

II. Fundamentals of Energy Efficient Driving

Energy used by a vehicle depends very much on the way its driven. There is a large body of scientific literature on energy efficient- or eco- driving [20], [14], practical guides on hypermiling [21], and the potential impact on energy use and carbon emissions [22]. Connected and automated vehicles have the potential to excel at efficient driving because of their increased situational awareness and ability to execute more complex maneuvers more precisely. Before discussing specific scenarios where CAVs can save energy, here we take a closer look at fundamentals of energy efficient driving. We will consider only a vehicle's longitudinal motion governed by Newton's second law of motion:

$$m\frac{dv}{dt} = F_w - mg(sin\theta + C_{rr}cos\theta) - \frac{1}{2}\rho_a A C_D v^2 \qquad (1)$$

where m is mass of the vehicle, including powertrain inertial effects, v is forward velocity. Here F_w is chosen to be the the sum of tractive or braking force at the wheels, thus decoupling the role of vehicle powertrain in the initial part of this discussion. In the term representing road loads, C_{rr} is the coefficient of rolling resistance and θ is the road slope. In the term representing aerodynamic drag, ρ_a is air density, A is vehicle front area, C_D is aerodynamic drag coefficient.

The instantaneous power needed at the wheel is $F_w(t)v(t)$. Therefore, the net energy needed at the wheel, E_w, to cover a distance s_f in t_f unit of time can then be calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned} E_w = \int_0^{t_f} F_w(t)v(t)dt = \int_0^{s_f} F_w(s)ds = \\ \int_0^{s_f}\left(m\frac{dv}{dt} + mg(sin\theta + C_{rr}cos\theta) + \frac{1}{2}\rho_a A C_D v^2\right)ds \end{aligned} \qquad (2)$$

With the reasonable assumption that m, g, C_{rr}, ρ_a, and A are constants during a trip, integration yields:

$$E_w = \frac{1}{2}m(v_f^2 - v_0^2) + mg\Delta h + mgC_{rr}\Delta x + \frac{1}{2}\rho_a A\int_0^{s_f} C_D(s)v^2(s)ds \qquad (3)$$

where v_0 and v_f are velocities at origin and destination respectively, Δh is total elevation change during the trip, and Δx is the horizontal distance covered. Here we assume the drag coefficient can vary along the road, due to potential for platooning or drafting which could reduce aerodynamic drag.

The first and the second terms in Equation (3) represent the change in kinetic and potential energy respectively and are dictated by initial and terminal conditions, so they do not offer opportunities for reducing E_w. Note that road grade does not appear after integration; however we will explain later that because of constraints on velocity and powertrain output, the elevation profile along a trip can have a significant effect on energy use and prior knowledge of it can help save fuel via better constraint management. The term $mgC_{rr}\Delta x$ represents the irreversible frictional loss and is a function of (horizontal) trip distance and C_{rr}. So if there is a choice, one must choose shorter routes with lower C_{rr} (concrete road over sand road) to save energy. With connectivity there may be opportunities to evaluate this term more accurately. The last term, the energy lost to aerodynamic drag, is the only term that can be influenced by the decisions along the route and therefore should be a core consideration in eco-driving. The energy needed at the wheel can be reduced by joining a tight platoon thus lowering C_D. The vehicle velocity plays an important role and obviously lower speeds result in lower losses to drag. More specifically when C_D is constant the drag term can be easily reorganized as follows [18]:

$$\frac{1}{2}\rho_a A \int_0^{s_f} C_D(s) v^2(s) ds = \frac{1}{2}\rho_a A C_D(\bar{v}^2 + \sigma_v^2) s_f \tag{4}$$

where $\bar{v} = \frac{\int_0^{sf} v(s)ds}{s_f}$ is the average velocity over position and $\sigma_v^2 = \frac{\int_0^{sf}(v(s)-\bar{v})^2 ds}{s_f}$ is its variance. Therefore to minimize drag losses it is best to drive with a low and constant ($\sigma_v^2 = 0$) speed. Note also that at constant speed, the drag loss is proportional to s_f^3, therefore taking a road that is 10% shorter, reduces drag losses by 27% which can be significant at high speeds.

When the initial and final velocity are different, the velocity cannot be constant. Our optimal control analysis presented in the Appendix, indicates that in such a situation, it is best to accelerate (or decelerate) as quickly as possible to a constant low speed and then decelerate (or accelerate) quickly to the final desired speed (bang-singular-bang solution). Note that we postpone the discussion of velocity and position constraints to Sections III-A and III-C respectively.

Depending on initial and final conditions, the required energy at wheel E_w could be negative. Moreover $\frac{d}{ds}E_w$ which is equal to the required wheel force F_w, can be negative: for instance when decelerating to a stop ($\frac{dv}{dt} < 0$) or on downhill slopes ($\theta < 0$) as inferred from Equation (1). When $F_w < 0$, it is necessary to apply the brakes or rely on engine braking, thus wasting energy as heat. Even in hybrid and electric vehicles with recuperative brakes, a part of available braking energy is lost as heat. Therefore for eco-driving it is best to minimize situations in which $F_w < 0$, in particular braking should be avoided when possible. This means that when deciding to slow down or to stop, it is best to coast with the engine disengaged ($F_w \approx 0$) and rely on rolling resistance and aerodynamic drag to slow the vehicle down. We note that coasting will increase the stopping distance which may not be always safe or desirable. Therefore anticipation of slow downs in advance, provides more time and opportunity for gradually reducing the speed. Vehicle connectivity could enable anticipative driving as discussed in more detail in Section III. We also note that pure coasting may not be always energy optimal, for instance when traveling between two stops in a fixed time, the best final decelerating strategy is a combination of coasting and maximal braking as explained in the Appendix. This is classic problem that has been addressed in optimal control of trains that have to travel between two stations in a fixed amount of time [23], [24].

When descending down a steep road and in a hypothetical scenario when there are no upper bounds on velocity, it is more energy efficient to coast down the hill ($F_w \approx 0$) allowing the velocity to increase toward the equilibrium imposed by rolling resistance and aerodynamic drag. Unfortunately this is very unsafe and often impractical due to road speed limits and the bounds imposed by preceding vehicles. However if the road profile is known in advance, the vehicle can start coasting early in anticipation of an imminent descent, allowing it to utilize the limited velocity band more effectively. An automated vehicle can execute such a maneuver more precisely than a human driven vehicle as explained in more detail in Section III-A.

The above discussion was focused on increasing "wheel-to-distance" [14] energy efficiency and did not address "tank-to-wheel" en ergy efficiency which is powertrain dependent. The two problems are not entirely decoupled: for instance we showed that low constant velocities improve "wheel-to-distance" energy efficiency due to lower drag. A gasoline engine on the other hand is not most efficient at low loads seen at low speeds. The engine sweet spot is typically at relatively large engine loads. To strike a balance (running the engine efficiently and maintaining a low average speed), the engine could be periodically turned on at high load and then turn off; in a "pulse-and-glide" strategy. The effectiveness of pulse and glide algorithms is shown analytically in [25], using theory of optimal control in [26], [27], and experimentally in [28] but overall the existing literature presents mixed and sometimes conflicting results. We note that pulse and glide may not be a practical eco-driving strategy because velocity variations are uncomfortable to passengers and disruptive to traffic. Also according to [28] pulse and glide may not be an effective approach in vehicles with automatic transmission due to torque converter losses.

In hybrid vehicles, the battery energy storage buffer allows to (partially) decouple the engine load/speed from the wheel load/speed. Therefore the engine can be run more often near its sweet spot, even at low road loads and speeds. Moreover, regenerative brakes contribute to higher energy efficiency. Nevertheless, because the electromechanical energy conversion is always lossy, eco-driving practices can be beneficial even for hybrid vehicles. For instance using connectivity and road preview allows predictive utilization of the limited battery energy buffer to save energy. A pulse and glide strategy can save fuel in hybrids as well [28] but may be undesirable.

The electric motor in electric vehicles is more efficient at lower torques and therefore the energy-optimal operation strategy, unlike for gasoline vehicles, is not pulse and glide [14], [29]. Analytical solutions based on optimal control theory show that the optimal speed profile for an electric vehicle is a parabolic function of time, quite different from that of gasoline engine vehicles [29]. Here automated driving may provide an advantage in the ability to adhere to more complex speed profiles for energy saving.

III. Anticipation in Connected and Automated Driving

CAVs offer huge potentials for boosting road safety, capacity, and efficiency, because of their ability to process data from many more sources (e.g. V2X fused with on-board sensing) and their ability for more precise positioning and control than human drivers. While similar information can be processed, and provided to connected human-driven vehicles [30] [31] (e.g. as optimal speed/lane advisories), only fully automated vehicles can be made to comply with and reliably follow real-time energy-efficient commands. Even in mixed-traffic that involves other non-automated vehicles, energy-efficient automated vehicles can have a positive impact on the energy efficiency of surrounding traffic as will be illustrated later. Automated cars have the potential to uncover the "driving signature" of their neighboring vehicles and predict their most likely actions. They can also anticipate probable locations of slow-downs by systematic evaluation of historical data. Connectivity between cars and infrastructure can make much more information available to each vehicle and the vehicles can form groups and act cooperatively. All of these advances, when put into an organized framework, can help better anticipation and enable improved traffic flow, increased safety, and reduced energy consumption.

A. Anticipating State of the Road

Prior knowledge of road speed limits, safe speeds on curved roads, and an estimate of average traffic speed allows for more energy efficient velocity transitions in anticipation of the change in velocity constraints. Speed limit is a standard feature on modern onboard navigation units. Road curvature may be extracted from navigation maps to calculate the likely (safe) speed on a curve. Curve speeds can also be crowdsourced from connected vehicle data. Average traffic speeds for upcoming segments of a trip can be queried from a Traffic Management Center (TMC) that operate based on local sensors and cameras or estimated from traffic feeds that mostly rely on crowdsourced information, such as feeds of Google, Here, Waze, and Inrix as of 2017. Dynamic spatiotemporal evolution of traffic speed can be estimated via a faster-than-real-time traffic simulation model which is initialized by current traffic speed, deterministically [32] or probabilistically [33]. In absence of real-time traffic information services, time- and location-specific historical traffic data can be used as a baseline predictor [34]. Traffic speed can be imposed as a spatio-temporally varying upper bound on the CAV speed [32]. Speed limit, curve and traffic speeds can be unified [35] into a single spatiotemporal bound on CAV velocity and used not only to optimize velocity transitions of a CAV but also inform its predictive powertrain control functions.

Another dominating factor in vehicle power demand is road grade, in particular on steep roads, and more so for heavier vehicles. While road grade does not explicitly impact E_w as shown in Equation (3), it influences velocity and torque constraints and gear selection. Therefore advanced knowledge of the road grade, obtained from 3D road maps, is very beneficial in predictive powertrain control as shown for instance in [36], [37]. Additionally, due to constraints on velocity, prior knowledge of road grade will allow more judicious use of available velocity band and gear selection [38], [39], [40], [41], [42], [43], [44]; for instance a vehicle can slow down in anticipation of a steep descent or speed up in preparation for a climb. The optimal solution can be non-trivial as shown for a heavy duty vehicle in [45]. Daimler already has a predictive cruise control function in production that adjust a heavy duty truck speed [46] and gear [47] in anticipation of upcoming road grade to increase its energy efficiency by 3% on a highway. This level of achievable improvement is consistent with results in literature as summarized in Table II. Predicted velocity transitions and road grade can reduce energy use also via predictive power split in hybrid powertrains [48], fuel cut-off [49] and cylinder deactivation [50] in combustion engines, and thermal load management [51]. While such predictive powertrain control functions can be exercised in conventionally driven vehicles and some have been extensively studied, they will have a larger impact in CAVs. Real-time access to information due to connectivity and absence of a human driver in a CAV increases certainty of predictions and therefore effectiveness of predictive powertrain control.

TABLE II: Summary of selected published results on energy efficiency gain enabled by road grade preview.

Ref.	Methods and Conditions	Efficiency gain (%)
[40]	S[†], 32 ton class 8 truck constrained NLP, preview horizon: 1500m optimized velocity, gear, and throttle input route 1: $-3.7° \leqslant \theta \leqslant +4.7°$, $\mu_\theta = 0.29°$, $\sigma_\theta = 1.32°$ route 2: $-4.3° \leqslant \theta \leqslant +3.0°$, $\mu_\theta = -0.21°$, $\sigma_\theta = 1.06°$	 +2.6 +2.0
[41] [42]	E[††] 39 ton SCANIA truck 120km highway, Södertälje to Norrköping, Sweden dynamic programming, preview horizon: 1500m optimized velocity; gear was preselected	+3.5
[45]	S, 29 ton class 8 Navistar truck 4 km single valley profile $h(s) = 30(1-s/2000)^2$ Pontryagin Min. Principle & numerical continuation horizon=4000 m, optimized velocity and gear	+11.6 over a single valley
[43]	S, 1.3 Liter gasoline engine passenger car Simplified polynomial fuel consumption model Model predictive control, optimized velocity 2.5km Yuniba Dori Road, Fukuka City, Japan $-5.0° \leqslant \theta \leqslant +6.0°$	+4-7
[37]	S, 2000 kg hybrid electric vehicle dynamic programming, preview horizon: full trip constant speed, optimized power split 36 and 48 km hilly roads, Contra Costa, California PSAT [52] fuel economy evaluation route 1 $-4.3° \leqslant \theta \leqslant +3.0°$, $\mu_\theta = -0.21°$, $\sigma_\theta = 1.04°$ route 2: $-8.0° \leqslant \theta \leqslant +5.3°$, $\mu_\theta = -0.17°$, $\sigma_\theta = 2.3°$	 +0-3.0 +0-6.0

[†]S: Simulation [††]E: Experimental

B. Anticipating Signal Phase and Timing

When driving on arterial roads, repetitive stops at traffic signals results in loss of energy due to braking and idling, engine and brake wear, and can be uncomfortable and frustrating for passengers. Some of these stops are unnecessary, in particular under light to medium traffic conditions, and are due to lack of information about the state of traffic lights. In an ideal connected urban area with Vehicle-to-Infrastructure (V2I) connectivity, Signal Phase and Timing (SPaT) can be broadcast to approaching vehicles; so that connected vehicles adjust their speed for a timely arrival at a green light. Vehicle autonomy further facilitates this scenario by taking the burden of speed adjustments away from human drivers.

Eco-driving at signalized intersections and its impact on energy efficiency has been the topic of many papers in recent years. One of the earlier works was presented in [53] and expanded in [54] and showed potential for significant fuel savings in a simulation study. These positive results have been corroborated in [55], [56], [57] and many more publications that have followed them. Experimental results in isolated environments [58], [59] and in real-world traffic conditions [60], [61], [62] show that considerable fuel saving (5-15%) is possible with human drivers in the loop. Even more energy saving is expected in automated driving (or with automated cruise control) where vehicles can adjust their speeds more precisely and effortlessly.

The technology for transmitting traffic signal information to subscribing vehicles has been demonstrated in several research projects [63], [58] and [62]. The SPaT information may be directly transmitted to vehicles within range using Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC) technology [61] or may become available by the traffic control center via cellular networks as shown in [62]. A software architecture for cellular communication of SPaT from a server to subscribing connected vehicles is described in [62]. Alternative means of inferring SPaT information via on-board cameras [63] and via crowd-sourcing [64], [65] have also been proposed. Connected Signals [66] is a company in Oregon, USA that has been attempting to build a SPaT information repository one city at a time and provides speed advisory to human drivers via a mobile app [67]. However a much needed real-time server that covers large urban areas is still missing. In absence of real-time SPaT information, it is still possible to use history of observation during daily commutes and to estimate the probability of a green or red over a future horizon, conditioned on the current color of the light [57]. Even when SPaT is available in real-time; the future color of the light is not known with certainty, for instance when the light is actuated by the state of loop detectors. In such a scenario one can still use historical trends, to predict the probability of a red or green over a future time horizon [68].

While simple logical rules, such as those in [53], can be effectively used when approaching a single traffic signal, optimizing the trajectory for a sequence of traffic lights can benefit from more formal methods. The velocity planning problem can be formulated as an optimal control problem where the goal could be minimizing or reducing energy consumption subject to the constraint imposed by red signals. Analytical solution, obtained using Pontryagin Minimum Principle, indicate that fuel optimal solution for a conventional vehicle[1] is not intuitive and requires switching between maximum engine torque (pulse) and engine shut-down (glide) and could include a period of constant speed (cruise) [71], [72]. Obviously the resulting speed profile, while fuel optimal, is uncomfortable to drivers and may also be disruptive to surrounding traffic. Therefore alternative cost functions can be used that take into account passenger comfort; for instance penalizing a weighted sum of travel time and acceleration results in smoother trajectories and less braking, thus saving fuel. Optimizing for multiple lights ahead requires numerical solution methods; in [73] and [57], Dynamic Programming (DP) is utilized to solve the optimal control problem. In [57] lack of deterministic information about the color of the light is handled by including probability of a green in the DP cost function and encourages vehicles to target probable green windows. Receding horizon optimization (model predictive control) has been used in [54] and [74] and to obtain near optimal trajectories at signalized intersections. In [75] the queue is considered when calculating the optimal speed. Eco departure of geared vehicles at traffic signals is discussed in [76]. In [77] speed advisory is proposed in conjunction with signal offsets control (green waving) for arterial bandwidth maximization and energy consumption reduction.

"Selfish" optimization that focuses on eco-driving of a single vehicle could be disruptive to the flow of following vehicles. In [83], while still a vehicle centric optimization is solved, a more "considerate" cost function takes into account the preceding as well as the interest of the following vehicle. More specifically a "safety" term is introduced in the cost function of the host vehicle that penalizes sudden slow downs with respect to the velocity of the following vehicle.

Because this technology is unlikely to be implemented in every vehicle in the near future, it is important to evaluate the influence of equipped vehicles on other vehicles in mixed traffic flow. It is currently prohibitively difficult to do field experiments of a large number of CAVs in mixed traffic. Therefore traffic simulation tools have been used in most studies. The impact of traffic signal advisory on mixed traffic is studied, via microsimulations, in [81], [82], [72]. In [82] and in [81] the authors evaluate the influence of eco-driving or eco-speed control on the immediate neighboring vehicles. In [72] the impact of CAVs on mixed traffic near signalized intersections is studied in traffic microsimulations. The CAVs receive the timing of signals in advance and adjust their speed for a timely arrival at green. It is shown that CAVs not only improve their energy efficiency but as their penetration increases they reduce the energy consumption of conventional vehicles as well. With the increment of CAVs, other conventional vehicles are more likely to follow a smoother moving CAV. By their simple car following strategy, such conventional vehicles may reduce the chance of stopping at intersections as well.

Potential impact on energy efficiency is summarized in Table III.

C. Anticipative Car Following

Human drivers are often reactive when following other cars as their view is often blocked by the preceding car and therefore their event horizon is very limited. In sudden slowdowns, they often fail to consider the vehicles approaching

[1]The solution for hybrid and electric cars [69] is different and could be more complex

TABLE III: Summary of selected published results on energy efficiency gain enabled by SPaT anticipation with respect to conventional vehicles without SPaT information.

Ref.	Methods and Conditions	Efficiency gain* (%)
[53] [54]	S†, lone vehicle, 10 fixed time lights real SPaT: Greenville, SC timing cards 1.7 L 4-cylinder gasoline engine, high fidelity vehicle model in PSAT [52]	+24-29
[55]	S, 10 fixed time lights, stochastic parameter variation passenger car and SUV, CMEM models [78]	+12-14
[73]	S, 1 fixed time light varying road conditions, random initialization Virginia Tech fuel consumption model [79]	+20
[57]	S, 3 fixed and variable timing lights probabilistic SPaT, probabilistic planning Monte Carlo Evaluation (3000 scenarios)	+16
[58]	E††, no traffic 1 fixed time signal, 4G cellular comm. 2011 BMW 535i	+13
[60] [62]	E, real city traffic, real-time TMC data, 4G cellular comm. Mix of 10 fixed time and actuated signals 2011 BMW 535i, 4 complying drivers	+9
[61]	E, real city traffic coordinated actuated signals, DSRC comm. 2008 Nissan Altima, 2 complying drivers	+2-6
[63]	E, real city traffic 2 fixed time lights camera SPaT estimation- V2V comm. 2001 2.4L PT Cruiser, 1 complying driver	+25
[72]	S, network wide effect 4 fixed time signals, multi lane Paramics [80] microsimulations, mixed traffic 50% CAVpenetration, 900 veh/hour/lane polynomial fuel consumption model	+25 (CAV) +6 (surronding traffic)
[81]	S, network wide effect 11 fixed time signals, one lane Paramics microsimulations, mixed traffic 50% CAVpenetration, 300 veh/hour/lane CMEM [78] fuel consumption model	+12.5 (CAV) +7.5 (all traffic)
[82]	S, network wide effect 1 fixed time signals, single lane at grade INTEGRATION microsimulation package varied CAVpenetration VT-micro fuel consumption model	+26 (100% CAV) none ($\leq$50% CAV)

* in simulated vicinity of signalized intersections and not an entire trip gain.
†S: Simulation ††E: Experimental

from behind. This is not only disruptive to traffic flow and is unsafe, but it can result in inefficient slow-down of multiple vehicles. Balancing the position dynamically with respect to the cars in the front and back is cognitively demanding for humans. Most autonomous cars without connectivity do not necessarily do better. Many are designed to behave like human-driven vehicles and could be reactive to the perception of their immediate surrounding which results in similar short-sighted decisions. In [84] a simulation scenario depicts an automated vehicle that uses 3% more energy than a conventional vehicle baseline due to its aggressive car following strategy.

The challenge is anticipation of road events, although experienced drivers do exercise anticipation to some extent in driving [85] [31]. We pay attention to clues and drive accordingly. For example, if we observe that a lead vehicle is accelerating and decelerating erratically we increase our following distance or change lanes. If we observe that a following vehicle is tail-gating us we try to induce a larger gap or allow that vehicle to pass. But most of these precautions are practiced in an adhoc manner, are constrained by our limited sensory and cognitive limits [86], and are inconsistent across different drivers [87] and traffic scenarios. These cause poor local judgments that could lead to shock waves that slow us down to inefficient crawls. Today much more can be done: thanks to better sensing capabilities, CAVs have the potential to anticipate the motion of their preceding vehicle and finely adjust their speeds for a more steady and smooth motion. Additional information of the intent of preceding vehicles via V2V communication can enhance such anticipative car following.

While the main goal should be to robustly maintain a safe following distance to the preceding vehicle (imposed as position constraints); the inter-vehicle gap can be judiciously used as a degree of freedom to filter abrupt slow-downs and application of brakes [88] and increase energy efficiency of the host vehicle. Smoother velocity transitions of the host vehicles are expected to positively influence the motion of upstream traffic, reduce the chance of a phantom jam, caused by small disturbance, [89], [90], [91] and lower fuel used by the entire queue of vehicles as experimentally shown in [92].

Because of shorter relevant time scales in car-following, a moving horizon optimization is a natural choice (as opposed to full trip optimization). One can penalize fuel used over a moving horizon or simplify the cost function by penalizing the vehicle deceleration in order to reduce braking events. For a vehicle with a combustion engine the fuel optimal car following strategy could be pulse and glide as shown in [26], [27], [70]; but a pulse and glide strategy is uncomfortable, and could be disruptive to traffic as alluded to in [93]. Therefore it may be best to penalize acceleration and deceleration or use of brakes. Safety can be guaranteed by enforcing a speed dependent lower bound on inter-vehicle gap over the horizon [94]. Terminal constraints can also be enforced to prevent myopic decisions [95], [96]. The main challenge that arises here is dependence of the inter-vehicle constraint on the position of the preceding vehicle which is typically unknown. Therefore despite a relatively simple control problem formulation, we are faced with a difficult prediction problem.

In absence of any information and when only instantaneous velocity or acceleration of the preceding vehicle is known, the position of the preceding vehicle can be projected over the horizon assuming that it travels with constant speed [97] or constant acceleration [29]. Or perhaps it is reasonable to assume that acceleration of the preceding vehicle decays over the horizon to zero with some time constant [35]. When information from the road and infrastructure is available as discussed in Sections III-A and III-B one can construct a deterministic profile that the preceding vehicle is expected to follow.

But often the main source of uncertainty is driving style of the preceding vehicle which induces reactive transitions by the host vehicles. In this context and in the broader context of driver modeling different modeling approaches have been used. For instance [98] proposes fitting a nonlinear autoregressive model to historical data to predict the motion of preceding vehicle. In [88] the future motion of a group of preceding vehicles is estimated via traffic microsimulations. Many have used Markov chain models to capture the statistics of velocity transitions. In essence, historical driving data from a particular driver is used to count transitions from a certain velocity (acceleration) to another and to then calculate the probability of such a transition [99]. One can then sample many potential velocity trajectories with associated probabilities and integrate them to obtain a probability distribution for the position of the preceding vehicle over a prediction horizon [100]. The inter-vehicle gap constraint can be enforced probabilistically (chance constraint) and then converted to a deterministic constraint as shown in [100], [34]. Alternatively one can solve a stochastic moving horizon optimization as shown in [101], [102], [97], [103]. For instance, in [102] the host vehicle speed is adjusted, using stochastic Model Predictive Control (MPC), based on Markov chain predictions of traffic speed and road grade.

In an ideal scenario when all vehicles communicate, each vehicle can solve its own optimization problem and pass on its intended action to the vehicles that follow it [95], [104]. This allows a host vehicle to know, with more certainty, the position of the preceding vehicle(s) over the optimization horizon and is believed to result in smoother flow and improved overall energy efficiency. Note that in this scenario, the vehicles are just sharing intentions and do not necessarily cooperate toward a common goal. Later in section IV-A we discuss a cooperative cruise control scenario where the vehicles could cooperate toward a "social" optimum.

With a queue of communicating vehicles, this becomes a distributed MPC problem [104] that is solved sequentially from the front to the back of the queue. Alternatively, a centralized optimization problem can be solved on a central server for all participating vehicles and its decisions communicated to each vehicle [105]; however a central coordination scheme is complex to implement, except maybe for freight transport, and is less likely to prevail in the authors' opinion.

A different approach is proposed in [88] where it is assumed that all vehicles in a queue communicate their immediate state (position, velocity, acceleration) but not their intentions. The host vehicle assumes a standard car following model for the preceding vehicles to anticipate their positions over its optimization horizon. A similar approach is discussed in [106] and [107]. In a less than ideal scenario, when only a portion of the vehicles in a queue communicate, the position of non-communicating vehicles is inferred in [108] at signalized intersections. Communication delay make the problem even more complex and is discussed in [109], [106]. Packet drops resulting in stochastic delays in connected cruise control and the impact on string stability are discussed in [110].

Table IV highlights selected results that show the impact of anticipative car following on energy efficiency. As can be seen the reported gains vary significantly even for vehicles of the same size. This could be due to design and parameters of the car-following algorithms and scenario setups.

TABLE IV: Summary of selected published results on energy efficiency gain enabled by anticipative car following.

Ref.	Methods and Conditions	Efficiency gain (%)
[12]	S† 1.6 ton vehicle 3 standard driving cycles for phantom lead vehicle rule-based preview car following, horizon=50 sec	+13-35 w.r.t. no preview
[100]	S, 2 ton vehicle recorded real-data for lead vehicle winding road from Clemson, SC to Highland NC chance constrained MPC, horizon=15 sec. Markov chain prediction of lead vehicle velocity fuel economy evaluated in Argonne PSAT [52]	+15 w.r.t. lead vehicle
[29]	S, 1.4 ton electric vehicle, no regeneration loss 3 real city driving profiles for lead vehicle MPC, horizon=100 sec Assumes constant acceleration for lead vehicle physical polynomial model for energy use	+12-44 w.r.t. lead vehicle
[111]	S, 1.8 ton simulated vehicle with combustion engine following lead car with constant speed optimal control yields pulse and glide strategy efficiency gain is speed dependent	+0-32 w.r.t lead vehicle
[98]	E††, engine-in-the-loop simulations, microsimulation + engine test bench measurement driver prediction: nonlinear autoregressive model prediction horizon=15 sec results depend on allowable inter-vehicle gap	+6.5-22
[103]	E, real ego vehicle, 2007 Ford Edge 12 rounds city/highway driving on Michigan-39 following phantom vehicle with constant speed stochastic DP policy calculated offline restricted to $\pm$ 2 mph speed difference w.r.t. lead resulting strategy is pulse and glide	+3.6 w.r.t. lead vehicle
[96]	E, real ego vehicle, 3.8L V6 engine, 8 speed trans. Hyundai-Kia proving grounds, California simulated lead vehicle with sinusoidal velocity MPC tracking, perfect preview, horizon=6 sec.	+39-50 w.r.t. imperfect preview

†S: Simulation ††E: Experimental

D. Anticipative Lane Selection and Merging

Most existing literature on eco-driving assume the vehicle maintains a single lane, reducing optimization of the vehicle motion to the choice of its velocity. In multi-lane roads, the freedom to choose a different lane provides a new dimension and many more possibilities for optimizing the motion (velocity) of the vehicle to safely improve its energy efficiency and even harmonize traffic. But every day driving experience indicates that choice of lane is a complex decision making problem, perhaps due to its combinatorial nature and typical lack of information about the average speed (or efficiency) of adjacent lanes. The same is true when merging into a highway from an on-ramp or exiting to an off-ramp. Lane selection can be a dilemma point for average drivers; aggressive lane change on the other hand can be unsafe and disruptive to the flow and efficiency of upstream traffic. Even "considerate" drivers who merge early, out of an ending lane reduce the road capacity and slow down traffic [112].

In a connected and automated vehicle environment, more information about the intention of neighboring vehicles can become available via V2V communication, speed of each lane could be broadcast from roadside sensors, and therefore automated vehicles can change lanes more judiciously and smoothly. A rather comprehensive survey of lane change/merge for CAVs can be found in [113], [114]. One of the original formulations in this area can be found in [115],

[116] where choice of lane is an additional integer decision variable in the energy cost of the vehicle. Each CAV runs a microsimulation initialized by the current state of neighboring vehicles to determine the traffic scene over its optimization horizon. Lane and velocity of the vehicle are optimized accordingly. A hybrid optimization approach is presented in [117]. A scenario-based model predictive approach in [118] is intended for safe automated lane changing but also benefit energy efficiency.

TABLE V: Summary of selected published results on energy efficiency gain enabled by anticipative lane selection.

Ref.	Methods and Conditions	Efficiency gain (%)
[116]	S†, microscopic simulations MPC velocity & lane selection, horizon=15 sec tested 2 cases, 2 km road, varying CAV levels at 50% penetration, w.r.t. conventional vehicles: at 50% penetration, w.r.t. CACC vehicles:	 +14.3(12.9)* +7.8(5.1)*
[119]	S, micro-simulation in merging zone, 30 vehicles optimal coordinated merging into a highway fuel economy via polynomial metamodel in [74] reported gain for merging period only	+48 w.r.t. yield &merge

†S: Simulation *equipped vehicles (all traffic)

Merging from ramps often causes breakdown and a phantom traffic jam in a highway. Today, solutions such as ramp metering are being used to remedy the situation [120], [121] which requires infrastructure investment and maintenance. With CAV technology the merge can be coordinated much more safely as experimentally shown in [122] resulting in smoother traffic [123], [124] and higher energy efficiency [119]. The impact could go beyond individual vehicles; by reducing the chance of a phantom jam, the overall energy efficiency of traffic will improve. Table V the limited results that authors could find on the impact of lane selection on energy efficiency.

IV. Increased Opportunities for Cooperative Driving

In a connected vehicle world, deliberate exchange of intentions by vehicles and infrastructure reduces the need for guesstimating the surrounding traffic patterns and therefore enables better coordination. automated vehicles can cooperate rather than compete for right of way in urban areas and highways, thus contributing to harmony in motion and improved mobility and efficiency of a group of vehicles. Therefore "cooperation" in what follows, refers to sharing information and coordinating movements for a "common" good. Even with the best intentions of human drivers, cooperation among conventional vehicles is rather challenging due to often unknown plan of neighboring vehicles and complexity of coordination at speed. For instance, merging from a ramp into a highway lacks a clear protocol and is often done in "adhoc" manner in the hope that fast approaching vehicles act with "consideration". This is not only unsafe, but the need for frequent braking in dilemma zones increases energy use and could negatively impact traffic flow. Information sharing via connectivity allows establishing more systematic coordination protocols that increase safety and efficiency. Automated vehicles can be programmed to take full advantage of such protocols that may require precise movement coordination. We describe below cooperation in car following, merging, lane changing, and intersection crossing and also discuss their potential impact on efficiency of cooperating vehicles as well as benefits to mixed traffic.

A. Cooperative Car Following

Cooperative car following in which vehicles coordinate in longitudinal formations is perhaps the most researched topic in cooperative driving, under the contexts of platooning and cooperative adaptive cruise control. Tight platooning gained popularity in the 1990s for its potential to increase highway throughput. In a platoon of communicating and partially automated vehicles, the gap between a group following vehicles can be safely reduced to increase road capacity. Moreover at short following distances, the aerodynamic drag coefficient is smaller resulting in significant energy savings, in particular for heavy duty vehicles. Recognized research programs in the USA [125], [126], Europe [127], [128], [129], and Japan [130] have demonstrated the feasibility of the technology in well documented road experiments as discussed in [131] showing potential for 5-15% energy saving. Experimental results in [128], [129] show between 4 to 7 percent energy saving potential for a heavy truck. Over the years, important technical challenges such as platoon string stability [132], communication needs [133], [134], control design [135]. [136], and formation scheduling [137] have been addressed. Today the technology has matured to the extent that major manufacturers and startup companies plan on delivering truck platooning solutions to the market in the near future with the goal of reducing energy and personnel cost [138].

Over the past few years and with increased prospects for vehicle connectivity, Cooperative Adaptive Cruise Control (CACC), has gained popularity in the research community. CACC is essentially an enhanced Adaptive Cruise Control (ACC) system that, in addition to range sensor feedback, relies on wireless communication of the acceleration of the preceding vehicle(s) for feedforward control. V2V communication is intended to increase safety and allows string-stable reduction of the inter-vehicle gap for improved road utilization [139]. With a correct design, velocity variations are much better attenuated than in ACC car following, as shown in road experiments with six equipped vehicles in [140]. Experimental results in [141] showed string stable operation of a CACC design at a short time headway of 0.6 seconds in scenarios where a production ACC design failed to maintain stability even though it was operating at larger 1.1 second headway. The 2011 Driving Challenge in Netherlands was a successful showcase of CACC technology by multiple teams. An overview of this competition is presented in [142], [143] and the details of each team's technical contribution is well documented in separate papers [144], [145], [146], [147], [148], [149]. CACC formations could positively or negatively impact surrounding traffic as demonstrated in a simulation study [150], for instance long formations may prevent those that intend to merge into a highway. But overall, CACC is expected to have a harmonizing impact on participating vehicles and on surrounding traffic, reducing braking events and lowering energy consumption. Despite these benefits there are few papers documenting the energy efficiency impact of CACC, for instance [98]. It appears that reducing energy efficiency has been mostly the focus of truck platooning projects.

While the platoon and CACC terminologies are sometimes interchangeably used in the literature, there are some differentiating features. The original concept of a platoon relied on a designated lead vehicle and a hierarchical control structure from the lead to the following vehicles. This hierarchy is not needed in CACC car following and each vehicle can individually switch to its CACC mode as long as it receives messages communicated by its preceding vehicles. The information flow between vehicles can vary from one implementation to the other. A vehicle can receive information from the lead vehicle only, from its preceding vehicle only, or from multiple preceding vehicle as schematically shown in [106] and [151]. Depending on the information flow and content shared between vehicles, we can envision enhanced versions of current platooning and CACC practices. Ideally each vehicle will share its intended acceleration profile over a future horizon, rather than its instant acceleration, with all its following vehicles [95], [104]. This reduces the uncertainty about the movement of preceding vehicles as was discussed in Section III-C aiding each vehicle to better plan its motion and reduce braking events. Note that in this scenario, cooperation is only via information sharing, and each vehicle optimizes its "selfish" cost function. In a true collaborative environment, a group of CAVs not only share information but look for the "social optimum" by optimizing a common cost function [104] or by formation consensus rules [152]. The common goal for instance could be reducing the fuel consumption of the entire fleet [105], [153], [83], string stability [154], or collision mitigation [155]. A common cost can still be optimized in a distributed fashion onboard each vehicle based on information communicated by neighboring vehicles to reach a consensus [154], [153]. In a centralized control framework described in[153], the common fuel cost is optimized on a central cloud server for a group of freight trucks and the decision is issued to low-level controllers of individual trucks. Table VI summarizes some of the limited results on energy efficiency impact of cooperative car following, including platooning.

TABLE VI: Summary of selected published results on energy efficiency gain enabled by cooperative car following.

Ref.	Methods and Conditions	Efficiency gain (%)
[153]	S†, group of five 1.2 ton electric vehicles eco-platooning for reduced group consumption considered drag reduction nonlinear MPC, prediction horizon=120 sec studied centralized and distributed solutions	+10.5
[95]	S, microsimulation, combustion engine vehicles 10 CAVs follow lead vehicle, share partial info drag reduction is not considered each CAV solves MPC, horizon=12 to 20 sec fuel use evaluated using an engine map compared against IDM car following	+50 for FTP cycle following
[125]	E††, truck platooning 2.4 km unused runway, Crows Landing two identical Freightliner tractors, 16 m trailers 90 km/h constant speed, 3-10 meter spacing	+8-11
[129]	E, truck platooning, 45 km Swedish highway Three 18 m, 37-39 ton Scania tractor-trailers wirelessly communicate vel., accel., parameters time headway=1 second	+4-6.5
[130]	E, truck platooning on a test track 3 fully-automated 25 ton trucks & 1 light truck communicate vel,, accel., brake via DSRC 80 km/h constant speed, 4.7 meter gap	+15
[126]	E, truck platooning on test track 2 Peterbilt tractors, full aerodynamic packages 16 m trailers weighing 30 ton high-speed oval track, banked turns 105 km/h and 10 m following distance	+7.0

†S: Simulation ††E: Experimental

B. Cooperative Lane Change and Merge

In Section III-D we discussed that individual CAVs can benefit from connectivity and autonomy and more safely and efficiently merge and change lanes. Additional gains are expected if CAVs cooperate, not only by sharing intentions but also by being "considerate" of neighboring vehicles. In such a cooperative scenario, each vehicle includes in its objective function, the impact of its decision on neighboring vehicles. Lane change and merge decisions can then be made in a distributed manner with each vehicle deciding (optimizing) its motion and sharing its intentions [156]. Alternatively, in a centralized framework, a single decision-making (optimization) problem is solved for a group of cooperative vehicles [157]. Cooperative lane selection and merge not only contributes to efficiency of the cooperating fleet but can also have a positive harmonizing effect on surrounding traffic.

There is a large body of literature on lane change models for traffic microsimulations, such as the widely used MOBIL lane change model introduced in [158]. However cooperative lane selection and merging for CAVs has only been recently discussed. In [159] a cooperative lane-changing algorithm is simulated that considers follower vehicles in current and target lanes when making a lane change decision. The simulations in [159] showsimprovement with respect to MOBIL, in terms of merge time and rate, wait time, fuel consumption, average velocity, and flow at the cost of slightly increased travel time for main road vehicles. In [160] a merging assistant system that relies on vehicle cooperation, reduces the number of "late-merging" vehicles and subsequent likelihood of flow breakdowns. Different algorithms for cooperative merging have been proposed, for instance [161] proposes a decentralized control method and [157] formulates it in a model predictive control framework. A cooperative V2V "negotiation" process for lane changing is described in [162] and [163] proposes interaction protocols for cooperative lane changing. Experiments with 3 CAVs performing a semi-automated cooperative lane change maneuver are described in[164] and show the potential for smoother velocity trajectories. The focus of the above results has not been energy efficiency and only [159] reports energy efficiency gains. However, we expect considerable energy saving from wide deployment of cooperative lane changing and merging system due to reduced braking events and harmonizing effect on traffic flow.

C. Cooperative Intersection Control

The coordination and optimal timing of traffic signals are by nature complex problems and backed by years of research in traffic engineering and operations research. Current signal timings are mostly scheduled offline, the optimized timings are then deployed as fix timetables for different times of the day. Many signals are actuated by traffic and have rules to override their pre-optimized timetables based on the state of their loop-detectors to reduce idling at intersections. While these traffic responsive control strategies calculate their timing in real-time [165], they act based on the immediate state of loop-detectors. On the other hand, smart traffic signal controllers in connected vehicle environments will do more than just signaling right of ways and act intelligently as hubs that sense, route, and harmonize the flow of arterial traffic. The research on uni-directional signal to vehicle communication for improving efficiency by providing speed advisory to individual vehicles was discussed in Section III-B. Another research direction has focused on improving intersection flow by optimizing timing of traditional traffic signals informed by uni-directional communication from connected vehicles [166], [167]. In addition, bi-directional vehicle-signal communication allows the geographical data of the connected vehicles to be also wirelessly transmitted in real-time to smart traffic signal controllers [168]. This increases energy efficiency and intersection flow as signals adjust their timings and vehicles their speeds [77].

Automated vehicles can further benefit from the communicated traffic signal information because they not only process the incoming information rather effortlessly but also can precisely control their speed and arrival time at a green light. The situation can get even better with 100% penetration of automated vehicles since a physical traffic light is not needed anymore as shown in concept papers by [169], [170], [171]. Also because automated cars have much faster reaction times than human driven vehicles, the intersection controller can rapidly switch between phases [172]. Some of the benefits of eliminating traffic signals in an all automated vehicle environment is discussed in [169] and demonstrated by interesting simulation results in a recent publication [173]. In [174] show the potential for 50% energy efficiency gain via such reservation-based intersection control systems. In recent papers by Fayazi et al. [175] increasing the intersection throughput is formalized as an Mixed Integer Linear Programming optimization problem. They show significant reduction in number of stops and fuel use compared to traditional intersection control schemes. In a one hour microsimulation case study it is shown that the number of stops can be reduced 100 times [176]. Via a vehicle-in-the-loop experiment [177] they measure 20 % improvement in energy efficiency of a real-vehicle that interacts with the intersection controller and hundreds of simulated vehicles. The proposed MILP-based controller resides on a computational server and creates a live picture of evolving traffic conditions by tracking all subscribing vehicles. Based on the location and speed of all the vehicles, the controller optimally and regularly schedules the intersection access time for each vehicle. In addition to minimizing intersection delay and ensuring intersection safety, the desired arrival time of the vehicles is incorporated into the optimization problem in such a way that vehicles would not face extreme delay or expedition compared to their desired arrival times. Simulations indicate benefits of such systems greatly increase if vehicles move in platoons, in certain cases doubling the arterial network capacity with the coordination of platoons and intersections [178]. In [179] a platoon-based approach shows up to 20% energy efficiency benefit with respect to signalized intersections, but under simulation conditions of [179] energy efficiency was a little sacrificed to form platoons. Table VII highlights some of the key results on energy benefits of cooperative intersection control.

TABLE VII: Summary of selected published results on energy efficiency gain enabled by cooperative intersection control.

Ref.	Methods and Conditions	Efficiency gain (%)
[174]	S†, microsiumlations in Paramics [80] real-world road network, 3 intersections CMEM [78] fuel efficiency evaluation	+50%
[179]	S, microsimulation in Sumo 1 intersection with 2 single lane approaches vehicles form platoons to pass intersection CMEM fuel efficiency evaluation	+11-21
[171]	S, Microsimulation in DIVERT [180] simulated entire network of Porto, Portugal EMIT [181] fuel consumption and emission model 1.3 ton combustion engine vehicle mostly studied emissions reduction	+25 (fuel) +1-18 (CO_2 emissions)
[177]	E††, real vehicle interacting with microsimulation real vehicle: 2011 Honda Accord 2.4 L engine custom microsimulation written in JAVA 12 laps, 1.6 km track, single virtual intersection scheduling via Mixed Integer Linear Programming	+20 for real vehicle

†S: Simulation ††E: Experimental

D. Indirect Benefits Through Traffic Harmonization

Coordinated and smoother motion of CAVs could harmonize the surrounding traffic and contribute to energy efficiency of conventional vehicles, even at low penetration levels. While it is difficult to establish the network wide benefits experimentally, there are microsimulation case studies and isolated experiments that show such positive impacts. For instance in Section III-B we explained that according to [72] traffic signal speed advisory can reduce the energy consumption of conventional vehicles at moderate penetration rates. Several papers have shown the harmonizing effect of automated cruise control on the upstream traffic [88], [182] which is expected to positively influence energy efficiency of upstream traffic. CACC not only increases road utilization due to smaller gaps [150], [139], [183], but is shown to attenuate velocity variations as shown in road experiments in [140], [141]. These findings are corroborated by microsimulation studies, reported in [184], that show reduction of shock waves with increased penetration of connected and automated vehicles. In [185] a “theory for jam-absorption driving” is presented which is a method for driving a single car to attenuate a traffic shockwave, followed by experiments in [186]. An interesting experiment with a group of 22 vehicles moving on circle, showed that a single automated vehicle using relatively simple control rules, could dissipates the phantom jam waves formed by the 21 human driven vehicles. This contributed to between 20 and 40 % improvement in average fuel economy of the fleet across the 3 experiments as measured using each vehicle's OBD-II port [92]. Harmonizing impact of CAVs in an open highway is demonstrated via interesting experiments in [187]. Three CAVs were driven side-by-side in real shock-wave traffic near Washington DC and their influence was measured by three probe vehicles that were deployed downstream and upstream. It was observed that CAVs reduced the oscillation induced by the shock-waves and harmonized the traffic and is expected to have network-wide energy efficiency impact. Secondary effects due to reduced number of accidents, could further lower delays and loss of energy which is difficult to quantify.

V. Conclusions

This paper presented an overview of energy-efficient driving opportunities provided by connected and automated vehicles through first-principle analysis and a survey of eco-driving literature. Unprecedented access to information via advanced sensors and V2X communication, increased processing power, and precision positioning and control, enables connected and automated vehicles to plan and execute eco-driving maneuvers much better than a human driver. While there are limited previous studies on energy impact of CAVs, review of the eco-driving literature promises considerable benefits. In particular our conservative evaluation based on published *experimental* results indicates 3% energy saving from preview of static road information such as road grade in highway driving. Information from traffic signals via V2I, could lead to 10% energy saving in arterial driving. With full penetration of CAVs reservation based intersections could yield up to 20% savings. Anticipative car following has a more uncertain impact but could at least yield 3% gain or much higher depending on the driving scenario. Platooning for trucks could yield 7-10% gain due to drag reduction. Cooperative car following and lane selection for passenger cars could boost energy efficiency but there is a lack of experimental results to report. And the harmonizing impact of CAVs on traffic, even at low penetration levels, could result in 20% savings in stop and go driving.

Most of the benefits can be achieved without additional hardware costs and relying mainly on software and information. Higher energy efficiency is an attractive added feature of CAVs, beyond safety and comfort, that could accelerate their market adoption. With higher penetration, there will be system wide influences by such "eco-CAV"'s, potentially lowering global energy use and contributing positively to the environment. Energy efficient driving of CAVs could be encouraged by proactive policy making countering alternative scenarios in which higher CAV-miles traveled at higher speeds increase global energy use.

Appendix

We want to find the velocity profile that minimizes the "wheel-to-distance" energy losses, going from velocity of v_0 to v_f over a specified time of t_f and distance of s_f.
Here we break down the wheel force F_w to tractive force F_t and braking force F_b. Considering the tractive acceleration, $u_t = \frac{F_t}{m}$, and braking deceleration $u_b = \frac{F_b}{m}$ as the two inputs, and choosing position as the independent variable, the equations of motion can be written in the following state-space form:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{dt}{ds} = \dfrac{1}{v} \\ \dfrac{dv}{ds} = \dfrac{u_t - u_b - \beta v^2 - h(s)}{v} \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where $\beta = \frac{1}{m} 0.5 \rho_a A C_D$ and $h(s) = g(sin\theta + C_{rr} cos\theta)$. The boundary conditions are:

$$v(s_0) = v_0, \quad v(s_f) = v_f, \quad t(s_0) = 0, \quad t(s_f) = t_f$$

To keep the derivation applicable across a wide range of vehicles, we assume that a fraction η of the braking energy can be recuperated ($\eta = 0$ for conventional vehicles and $\eta = 1$ for vehicles with ideal regeneration). Therefore to optimize the "wheel-to-distance" energy expenditure, we minimize the following cost function, which is energy spent normalized by vehicle mass:

$$\min_{u_t, u_b} J = \int_0^{s_f} (u_t - \eta u_b) ds \tag{6}$$

subject to the equations of motion and their imposed boundary conditions. It is assumed that there are no bounds on the states over the control interval but $0 \leqslant u_t \leqslant \bar{u}_t$ and $0 \leqslant u_b \leqslant \bar{u}_b$. Replacing for u_t from Equation (5), we obtain:

$$J = \frac{1}{2}(v_f^2 - v_0^2) + \int_0^{s_f} h(s) ds + \int_0^{s_f} (\beta v^2 + (1-\eta) u_b) ds \tag{7}$$

The first two terms do not depend on the control input. Therefore we solve the following problem:

$$\min_{u_t, u_b} \int_0^{s_f} (\beta v^2 + \gamma u_b) ds \tag{8}$$

where $\gamma = 1 - \eta$, so in absence of regeneration $\gamma = 1$.

Following Pontryagin's Minimum Principle [188], the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$ is formed as follows:

$$\mathcal{H} = \beta v^2 + \gamma u_b + \lambda \frac{1}{v} + \mu \frac{u_t - u_b - \beta v^2 - h(s)}{v} \tag{9}$$

where λ and μ are the costates with the following dynamics:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{d\lambda}{ds} = -\dfrac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial t} = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda = constant \\ \dfrac{d\mu}{ds} = -\dfrac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial v} = -2\beta v + \lambda \dfrac{1}{v^2} + \mu \dfrac{u_t - u_b - h(s)}{v^2} + \beta\mu \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

where boundary conditions for both λ and μ are free, since both states, t and v, are fixed at initial and final positions. We also note that λ is a constant over position, since its rate of change is zero while dynamics of μ is more complex. The optimal inputs should minimize the Hamiltonian. Since $\mathcal{H}$ is an affine function of u_t and u_b and therefore

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial u_t} = \frac{\mu}{v}, \quad \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial u_b} = \gamma - \frac{\mu}{v}$$

are independent of the inputs, the Hamiltonian is minimized at extreme values of the inputs, except for when the partial derivative of $\mathcal{H}$ with respect to the inputs is zero, in which a so-called singular interval may exist. Over a singular interval the inputs could assume a value within their constraints. The optimal traction force, denoted by u_t^* is:

$$u_t^* = \begin{cases} \bar{u}_t & \mu/v < 0 \\ u_t^s & \mu/v = 0 \\ 0 & \mu/v > 0 \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

where u_t^s denotes the wheel traction during a possible singular interval. For a singular interval to exist, the condition $\frac{\mu}{v} = 0$ must be valid for a position interval rather than just at one point. Therefore over a singular interval we must have

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left(\frac{\mu}{v}\right) = \frac{1}{v}\frac{d\mu}{ds} - \frac{\mu}{v^2}\frac{dv}{ds} = 0 \tag{12}$$

upon substitution from (5) and (10), the condition for existence of a singular interval simplifies to:

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left(\frac{\mu}{v}\right) = -2\beta + \frac{\lambda}{v^3} + \beta\frac{\mu}{v} = 0 \tag{13}$$

but since on a singular interval during traction $\frac{\mu}{v} = 0$, we conclude:

$$v_s = \left(\frac{\lambda}{2\beta}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \tag{14}$$

which is a constant since optimal λ was shown to be a constant. As a result the traction force is $u_t^s = \beta v_s^2 + h(s)$. The optimal braking force, denoted by u_b^* is:

$$u_b^* = \begin{cases} 0 & \mu/v < \gamma \\ \bar{u}_b & \mu/v > \gamma \end{cases} \tag{15}$$

In other words there is no singular interval during braking: For a singular interval to exist during braking, the condition $\frac{\mu}{v} = \gamma$ must be valid for a position interval rather than just at one point. Equation (13) indicates that during a braking singular interval the velocity has to be a constant. But we know that during braking the velocity cannot remain constant, hence there is no singular interval during a braking phase.

In summary Eq. (11) states that to minimize "wheel-to-distance" energy expenditure, the vehicle should decelerate or accelerate, as quickly as possible, to the constant speed of v_{sing} and maintain that speed till close to destination. Optimal deceleration strategy starts by coasting but could end with a period of maximal braking even in absence of regeneration ($\gamma = 1$). With ideal regenerative brakes ($\gamma = 0$) the optimal strategy does not include a coasting phase. Values of v_{sing} and λ will be smaller for longer trip times t_f; its value can be obtained after solving the two-point boundary value problem described by (5) and (10).

Acknowledgement

The first author was a scientific visitor at IFP Energies Nouvelles, Rueil-Malmaison, France for the duration of this collaborative work and thankfully acknowledges the support and sponsorship provided by IFPEN. The authors thank, Dr. Jihun Han, for his suggestions on the organization of the paper.

References

[1] N. McCarthy, "Connected cars by the numbers," *Forbes*, January, 27 2015.

[2] "Gartner says by 2020, a quarter billion connected vehicles will enable new in-vehicle services and automated driving capabilities," http://www.gartner.com/newsroom/id/2970017, January 26 2015.

[3] "Federal motor vehicle safety standards; V2V communications," US Department of Transportation National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Tech. Rep. NHTSA-2016-0126, 2016.

[4] "FHWA vehicle-to-infrastructure deployment guidance and products," US Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration, Tech. Rep. FHWA-HOP-15-015, 2015.

[5] "Autonomous vehicles factsheet," Center for Sustainable Systems, University of Michigan, Tech. Rep. Pub. No. CSS16-18, August 2016.

[6] M. Alexander-Kearns, M. Peterson, and A. Cassady, "The impact of vehicle automation on carbon emissions," Center for American Progress, Tech. Rep., November 2016.

[7] T. Litman, "Autonomous vehicle implementation predictions," *Victoria Transport Policy Institute*, 2017.

[8] A. Brown, J. Gonder, and B. Repac, "An analysis of possible energy impacts of automated vehicle," in *Road Vehicle Automation*. Springer, 2014, pp. 137–153.

[9] Z. Wadud, D. MacKenzie, and P. Leiby, "Help or hindrance? the travel, energy and carbon impacts of highly automated vehicles," *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, vol. 86, pp. 1–18, 2016.

[10] K. Simon, J. Alson, L. Snapp, and A. Hula, "Can transportation emission reductions be achieved autonomously?" 2015.

[11] J. B. Greenblatt and S. Shaheen, "Automated vehicles, on-demand mobility, and environmental impacts," *Current sustainable/renewable energy reports*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 74–81, 2015.

[12] C. Manzie, H. Watson, and S. Halgamuge, "Fuel economy improvements for urban driving: Hybrid vs. intelligent vehicles," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–16, 2007.

[13] F. Mensing, E. Bideaux, R. Trigui, J. Ribet, and B. Jeanneret, "Eco-driving: An economic or ecologic driving style?" *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 38, pp. 110–121, 2014.

[14] A. Sciarretta, G. De Nunzio, and L. L. Ojeda, "Optimal ecodriving control: Energy-efficient driving of road vehicles as an optimal control problem," *IEEE Control Systems*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 71–90, 2015.

[15] B. Saerens, "Optimal control based eco-driving," Ph.D. dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2012.

[16] K. Boriboonsomsin and M. Barth, "Impacts of road grade on fuel consumption and carbon dioxide emissions evidenced by use of advanced navigation systems," *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, no. 2139, pp. 21–30, 2009.

[17] K. Boriboonsomsin, M. J. Barth, W. Zhu, and A. Vu, "Eco-routing navigation system based on multisource historical and real-time traffic information," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1694–1704, Dec 2012.

[18] M. Kubička, J. Klusáček, A. Sciarretta, A. Cela, H. Mounier, L. Thibault, and S.-I. Niculescu, "Performance of current eco-routing methods," in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2016 IEEE*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 472–477.

[19] G. De Nunzio, L. Thibault, and A. Sciarretta, "A model-based eco-routing strategy for electric vehicles in large urban networks," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), 2016 IEEE 19th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 2301–2306.

[20] V. Monastyrsky and I. Golownykh, "Rapid computation of optimal control for vehicles," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 219–227, 1993.

[21] L. Hickman, "Get the most from your car with these top 12 "hypermiling" tips," *The Guardian*, March 25 2011.

[22] J. N. Barkenbus, "Eco-driving: An overlooked climate change initiative," *Energy Policy*, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 762–769, 2010.

[23] I. Asnis, A. Dmitruk, and N. Osmolovskii, "Solution of the problem of the energetically optimal control of the motion of a train by the maximum principle," *USSR Computational Mathematics and Mathematical Physics*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 37–44, 1985.

[24] P. Howlett, "The optimal control of a train," *Annals of Operations Research*, vol. 98, no. 1, pp. 65–87, 2000.

[25] E. G. Gilbert, "Vehicle cruise: Improved fuel economy by periodic control," *Automatica*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 159–166, 1976.

[26] A. Sciarretta and L. Guzzella, "Fuel-optimal control of rendezvous maneuvers for passenger cars (treibstoffoptimale annäherung von straßenfahrzeugen)," *at-Automatisierungstechnik*, vol. 53, no. 6/2005, pp. 244–250, 2005.

[27] S. Li and H. Peng, "Strategies to minimize fuel consumption of passenger cars during car-following scenarios," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2011*, June 2011, pp. 2107–2112.

[28] J. Lee, "Vehicle inertia impact on fuel consumption of conventional and hybrid electric vehicles using acceleration and coast driving strategy," Ph.D. dissertation, VirginiaTech, 2009.

[29] J. Han, A. Sciarretta, L. Leon Ojeda, G. De Nunzio, and L. Thibault, "Safe- and eco-driving control for connected and automated electric vehicles using analytical state-constrained optimal solution," *in preparation for IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2017.

[30] M. Barth and K. Boriboonsomsin, "Energy and emissions impacts of a freeway-based dynamic eco-driving system," *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, vol. 14, no. 6, pp. 400–410, 2009.

[31] P. Stahl, B. Donmez, and G. A. Jamieson, "Supporting anticipation in driving through attentional and interpretational in-vehicle displays," *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, vol. 91, pp. 103–113, 2016.

[32] B. Asadi, C. Zhang, and A. Vahidi, "The role of traffic flow preview for planning fuel optimal vehicle velocity," in *ASME 2010 Dynamic Systems and Control Conference*. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2010, pp. 813–819.

[33] N. Wan, G. Gomes, A. Vahidi, and R. Horowitz, "Prediction on travel-time distribution for freeways using online expectation maximization algorithm," in *Transportation Research Board 93rd Annual Meeting*, no. 14-3221, 2014.

[34] N. Wan, c. Zhang, and A. Vahidi, "Probabilistic anticipation and control in autonomous car following," *accepted, IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 2017.

[35] S. Schepmann and A. Vahidi, "Heavy vehicle fuel economy improvement using ultracapacitor power assist and preview-based MPC energy management," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2011*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 2707–2712.

[36] M. Back, S. Terwen, and V. Krebs, "Predictive powertrain control for hybrid electric vehicles," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 37, no. 22, pp. 439–444, 2004.

[37] C. Zhang, A. Vahidi, P. Pisu, X. Li, and K. Tennant, "Role of terrain preview in energy management of hybrid electric vehicles," *IEEE transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 1139–1147, 2010.

[38] S. Terwen, M. Back, and V. Krebs, "Predictive powertrain control for heavy duty trucks," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 37, no. 22, pp. 105–110, 2004.

[39] A. Fröberg, E. Hellström, and L. Nielsen, "Explicit fuel optimal speed profiles for heavy trucks on a set of topographic road profiles," SAE Technical Paper, Tech. Rep., 2006.

[40] W. Huang, D. M. Bevly, S. Schnick, and X. Li, "Using 3D road geometry to optimize heavy truck fuel efficiency," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems, 2008. ITSC 2008. 11th International IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2008, pp. 334–339.

[41] E. Hellström, M. Ivarsson, J. Åslund, and L. Nielsen, "Look-ahead control for heavy trucks to minimize trip time and fuel consumption," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 245–254, 2009.

[42] E. Hellström, J. Åslund, and L. Nielsen, "Design of an efficient algorithm for fuel-optimal look-ahead control," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 18, no. 11, pp. 1318–1327, 2010.

[43] M. Kamal, M. Mukai, J. Murata, and T. Kawabe, "Ecological driving based on preceding vehicle prediction using MPC," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 3843–3848, 2011.

[44] J. Lu, S. Hong, J. Sullivan, G. Hu, E. Dai, D. Reed, and R. Baker, "Predictive transmission shift schedule for improving fuel economy and drivability using electronic horizon," *SAE International Journal of Engines*, vol. 10, no. 2017-01-1092, pp. 680–688, 2017.

[45] C. He, H. Maurer, and G. Orosz, "Fuel consumption optimization of heavy-duty vehicles with grade, wind, and traffic information," *Journal of Computational and Nonlinear Dynamics*, vol. 11, no. 6, p. 061011, 2016.

[46] "Freightliner trucks launches RunSmart predictve cruise for Cascadia," https://daimler-trucksnorthamerica.com/influence/press-releases/ #freightliner-trucks-launches-runsmart-predictive-cruise-2009-03-019, March 19 2009.

[47] K. Barry, "Trucks use GPS to anticipate hills, save fuel," *Wired Magazine*, May 21 2012.

[48] C. Sun, X. Hu, S. J. Moura, and F. Sun, "Velocity predictors for predictive energy management in hybrid electric vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1197–1204, 2015.

[49] B. Dornieden, L. Junge, and P. Pascheka, "Anticipatory energy-efficient longitudinal vehicle control," *ATZ worldwide*, vol. 114, no. 3, pp. 24–29, 2012.

[50] V. Sujan, T. Frazier, K. Follen, and S. Moon, "System and method of cylinder deactivation for optimal engine torque-speed map operation," Nov. 11 2014, uS Patent 8,886,422. [Online]. Available: https://www.google.ch/patents/US8886422

[51] M. Braun, M. Linde, A. Eder, and E. Kozlov, "Looking forward: Predictive thermal management optimizes efficiency and dynamics," *dSPACE Magazine*, February 2010.

[52] A. N. Laboratory, "Powertrain System Analysis Toolkit," commercial software, http://www.transportation.anl.gov/software/PSAT/index.html.

[53] B. Asadi and A. Vahidi, "Predictive use of traffic signal state for fuel saving," *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, vol. 42, no. 15, pp. 484–489, 2009.

[54] ——, "Predictive cruise control: Utilizing upcoming traffic signal information for improving fuel economy and reducing trip time," *IEEE transactions on control systems technology*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 707–714, 2011.

[55] S. Mandava, K. Boriboonsomsin, and M. Barth, "Arterial velocity planning based on traffic signal information under light traffic conditions," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems, 2009. ITSC'09. 12th International IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2009, pp. 1–6.

[56] H. Rakha and R. K. Kamalanathsharma, "Eco-driving at signalized intersections using V2I communication," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), 2011 14th International IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 341–346.

[57] G. Mahler and A. Vahidi, "An optimal velocity-planning scheme for vehicle energy efficiency through probabilistic prediction of traffic-signal timing," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 15, no. 6, pp. 2516–2523, 2014.

[58] H. Xia, K. Boriboonsomsin, F. Schweizer, A. Winckler, K. Zhou, W.-B. Zhang, and M. Barth, "Field operational testing of eco-approach technology at a fixed-time signalized intersection," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), 2012 15th International IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 188–193.

[59] Q. Jin, G. Wu, K. Boriboonsomsin, and M. J. Barth, "Power-based optimal longitudinal control for a connected eco-driving system," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 2900–2910, 2016.

[60] G. Mahler, "Enhancing energy efficiency in connected vehicles via access to traffic signal information," Ph.D. dissertation, Clemson University, 2013.

[61] P. Hao, G. Wu, K. Boriboonsomsin, and M. Barth, "Eco-approach and departure (EAD) application for actuated signals in real-world traffic," Tech. Rep., 2017.

[62] G. Mahler, A. Winckler, S. A. Fayazi, A. Vahidi, and M. Filusch, "Cellular communication of traffic signal state to connected vehicles for eco-driving on arterial roads: system architecture and experimental results," in *IEEE Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference*, 2017.

[63] E. Koukoumidis, L.-S. Peh, and M. R. Martonosi, "SignalGuru: leveraging mobile phones for collaborative traffic signal schedule advisory," in *Proceedings of the 9th international conference on Mobile systems, applications, and services*. ACM, 2011, pp. 127–140.

[64] S. A. Fayazi, A. Vahidi, G. Mahler, and A. Winckler, "Traffic signal phase and timing estimation from low-frequency transit bus data," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 19–28, 2015.

[65] S. A. Fayazi and A. Vahidi, "Crowdsourcing phase and timing of pre-timed traffic signals in the presence of queues: algorithms and back-end system architecture," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 870–881, 2016.

[66] "Connected signals," https://connectedsignals.com/.

[67] A. Marshall, "Enlighten app uses AI to predict when lights will turn green," *Wired Magazine*, October 30 2016.

[68] R. Bodenheimer, A. Brauer, D. Eckhoff, and R. German, "Enabling GLOSA for adaptive traffic lights," in *Vehicular Networking Conference (VNC), 2014 IEEE*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 167–174.

[69] W. Dib, A. Chasse, P. Moulin, A. Sciarretta, and G. Corde, "Optimal energy management for an electric vehicle in eco-driving applications," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 29, pp. 299–307, 2014.

[70] S. E. Li, H. Peng, K. Li, and J. Wang, "Minimum fuel control strategy in automated car-following scenarios," *Vehicular Technology, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 998–1007, 2012.

[71] E. Ozatay, U. Ozguner, S. Onori, and G. Rizzoni, "Analytical solution to the minimum fuel consumption optimization problem with the existence of a traffic light," in *ASME 2012 5th Annual Dynamic Systems and Control Conference joint with the JSME 2012 11th Motion and Vibration Conference*. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2012, pp. 837–846.

[72] N. Wan, A. Vahidi, and A. Luckow, "Optimal speed advisory for connected vehicles in arterial roads and the impact on mixed traffic," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 69, pp. 548–563, 2016.

[73] R. Kamalanathsharma and H. Rakha, "Multi-stage dynamic programming algorithm for eco-speed control at traffic signalized intersections," in *16th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC)*, 2013, pp. 2094–2099.

[74] M. Kamal, M. Mukai, J. Murata, and T. Kawabe, "Model predictive control of vehicles on urban roads for improved fuel economy," *Control Systems Technology, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 831–841, May 2013.

[75] X. He, H. X. Liu, and X. Liu, "Optimal vehicle speed trajectory on a signalized arterial with consideration of queue," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 61, pp. 106–120, 2015.

[76] S. E. Li, S. Xu, X. Huang, B. Cheng, and H. Peng, "Eco-departure of connected vehicles with V2X communication at signalized intersections," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 64, no. 12, pp. 5439–5449, 2015.

[77] G. De Nunzio, G. Gomes, C. Canudas-de Wit, R. Horowitz, and P. Moulin, "Speed advisory and signal offsets control for arterial bandwidth maximization and energy consumption reduction," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 875–887, 2017.

[78] G. Scora and M. Barth, "Comprehensive modal emissions model (CMEM), version 3.01," *User guide. Centre for Environmental Research and Technology. University of California, Riverside*, 2006.

[79] H. A. Rakha, K. Ahn, K. Moran, B. Saerens, and E. Van den Bulck, "Virginia tech comprehensive power-based fuel consumption model: Model development and testing," *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 492–503, 2011.

[80] Q. Paramics, "The paramics manuals, version 6.6. 1," *Quastone Paramics LTD, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK*, 2009.

[81] H. Xia, K. Boriboonsomsin, and M. Barth, "Dynamic eco-driving for signalized arterial corridors and its indirect network-wide energy/emissions benefits," *Journal of Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 31–41, 2013.

[82] R. K. Kamalanathsharma, H. A. Rakha, and H. Yang, "Network-wide impacts of vehicle eco-speed control in the vicinity of traffic signalized intersections," in *Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting*, no. 15-4290, 2015.

[83] B. HomChaudhuri, A. Vahidi, and P. Pisu, "Fast model predictive control-based fuel efficient control strategy for a group of connected vehicles in urban road conditions," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 760–767, 2017.

[84] A. C. Mersky and C. Samaras, "Fuel economy testing of autonomous vehicles," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 65, pp. 31–48, 2016.

[85] S. Hoogendoorn, S. Ossen, and M. Schreuder, "Empirics of multi-anticipative car-following behavior," *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, no. 1965, pp. 112–120, 2006.

[86] T. Vanderbilt, *Traffic: Why We Drive the Way We Do*, 1st ed. Vintage, 2009.

[87] S. Ossen and S. P. Hoogendoorn, "Heterogeneity in car-following behavior: Theory and empirics," *Transportation research part C: emerging technologies*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 182–195, 2011.

[88] M. A. S. Kamal, J.-i. Imura, T. Hayakawa, A. Ohata, and K. Aihara, "Smart driving of a vehicle using model predictive control for improving traffic flow," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 878–888, 2014.

[89] D. Helbing, "Traffic and related self-driven many-particle systems," *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, vol. 73, pp. 1067–1141, Dec 2001. [Online]. Available: https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.73.1067

[90] Y. Sugiyama, M. Fukui, M. Kikuchi, K. Hasebe, A. Nakayama, K. Nishinari, S.-i. Tadaki, and S. Yukawa, "Traffic jams without bottlenecks—experimental evidence for the physical mechanism of the formation of a jam," *New journal of physics*, vol. 10, no. 3, p. 033001, 2008.

[91] M. R. Flynn, A. R. Kasimov, J.-C. Nave, R. R. Rosales, and B. Seibold, "Self-sustained nonlinear waves in traffic flow," *Physical Review E*, vol. 79, no. 5, p. 056113, 2009.

[92] R. E. Stern, S. Cui, M. L. D. Monache, R. Bhadani, M. Bunting, M. Churchill, N. Hamilton, R. Haulcy, H. Pohlmann, F. Wu, B. Piccoli, B. Seibold, J. Sprinkle, and D. B. Work, "Dissipation of stop-and-go waves via control of autonomous vehicles: Field experiments," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1705.01693, 2017. [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1705.01693

[93] S. E. Li, K. Deng, Y. Zheng, and H. Peng, "Effect of pulse-and-glide strategy on traffic flow for a platoon of mixed automated and manually driven vehicles," *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, vol. 30, no. 11, pp. 892–905, 2015.

[94] S. Li, K. Li, R. Rajamani, and J. Wang, "Model predictive multi-objective vehicular adaptive cruise control," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 556–566, 2011.

[95] R. A. Dollar and A. Vahidi, "Quantifying the impact of limited information and control robustness on connected automated platoons," in *Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2017.

[96] V. Turri, Y. Kim, J. Guanetti, K. H. Johansson, and F. Borrelli, "A model predictive controller for non-cooperative eco-platooning," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2017*, 2017.

[97] K. McDonough, I. Kolmanovsky, D. Filev, D. Yanakiev, S. Szwabowski, and J. Michelini, "Stochastic dynamic programming control policies for fuel efficient vehicle following," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2013*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1350–1355.

[98] D. Lang, R. Schmied, and L. Del Re, "Prediction of preceding driver behavior for fuel efficient cooperative adaptive cruise control," *SAE International Journal of Engines*, vol. 7, no. 2014-01-0298, pp. 14–20, 2014.

[99] K. McDonough, I. Kolmanovsky, D. Filev, D. Yanakiev, S. Szwabowski, J. Michelini, and M. Abou-Nasr, "Modeling of vehicle driving conditions using transition probability models," in *Control Applications (CCA), 2011 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 544–549.

[100] C. Zhang and A. Vahidi, "Predictive cruise control with probabilistic constraints for eco driving," in *ASME 2011 Dynamic Systems and Control Conference and Bath/ASME Symposium on Fluid Power and Motion Control*. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2011, pp. 233–238.

[101] M. Bichi, G. Ripaccioli, S. Di Cairano, D. Bernardini, A. Bemporad, and I. V. Kolmanovsky, "Stochastic model predictive control with driver behavior learning for improved powertrain control," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2010 49th IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 6077–6082.

[102] K. McDonough, I. Kolmanovsky, D. Filev, D. Yanakiev, S. Szwabowski, and J. Michelini, "Stochastic dynamic programming control policies for fuel efficient in-traffic driving," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2012*. IEEE, 2012, pp. 3986–3991.

[103] K. McDonough, I. Kolmanovsky, D. Filev, S. Szwabowski, D. Yanakiev, and J. Michelini, "Stochastic fuel efficient optimal control of vehicle speed," in *Optimization and Optimal Control in Automotive Systems*. Springer, 2014, pp. 147–162.

[104] Y. Zheng, S. E. Li, K. Li, F. Borrelli, and J. K. Hedrick, "Distributed model predictive control for heterogeneous vehicle platoons under unidirectional topologies," *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 899–910, May 2017.

[105] B. Besselink, V. Turri, S. H. van de Hoef, K.-Y. Liang, A. Alam, J. Mårtensson, and K. H. Johansson, "Cyber–physical control of road freight transport," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 104, no. 5, pp. 1128–1141, 2016.

[106] G. Orosz, "Connected cruise control: modelling, delay effects, and nonlinear behaviour," *Vehicle System Dynamics*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1147–1176, 2016.

[107] N. I. Li, C. R. He, and G. Orosz, "Sequential parametric optimization for connected cruise control with application to fuel economy optimization," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2016 IEEE 55th Conference on*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 227–232.

[108] N. J. Goodall, B. Park, and B. L. Smith, "Microscopic estimation of arterial vehicle positions in a low-penetration-rate connected vehicle environment," *Journal of Transportation Engineering*, vol. 140, no. 10, p. 04014047, 2014.

[109] J. I. Ge and G. Orosz, "Dynamics of connected vehicle systems with delayed acceleration feedback," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 46, pp. 46–64, 2014.

[110] W. B. Qin, M. M. Gomez, and G. Orosz, "Stability and frequency response under stochastic communication delays with applications to connected cruise control design," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 388–403, 2017.

[111] S. E. Li and H. Peng, "Strategies to minimize the fuel consumption of passenger cars during car-following scenarios," *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part D: Journal of Automobile Engineering*, vol. 226, no. 3, pp. 419–429, 2012.

[112] C. Mele, "Why last-second lane mergers are good for traffic," *New York Times*, October 12 2016.

[113] J. Rios-Torres and A. A. Malikopoulos, "A survey on the coordination of connected and automated vehicles at intersections and merging at highway on-ramps," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 1066–1077, 2017.

[114] D. Bevly, X. Cao, M. Gordon, G. Ozbilgin, D. Kari, B. Nelson, J. Woodruff, M. Barth, C. Murray, A. Kurt *et al.*, "Lane change and merge maneuvers for connected and automated vehicles: A survey," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 105–120, 2016.

[115] M. A. S. Kamal, S. Taguchi, and T. Yoshimura, "Efficient vehicle driving on multi-lane roads using model predictive control under a connected vehicle environment," in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2015 IEEE*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 736–741.

[116] ——, "Efficient driving on multilane roads under a connected vehicle environment," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 17, no. 9, pp. 2541–2551, 2016.

[117] Q. Wang, T. Weiskircher, and B. Ayalew, "Hierarchical hybrid predictive control of an autonomous road vehicle," in *ASME 2015 Dynamic Systems and Control Conference*. American Society of Mechanical Engineers, 2015, pp. V003T50A006–V003T50A006.

[118] G. Schildbach and F. Borrelli, "Scenario model predictive control for lane change assistance on highways," in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2015 IEEE*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 611–616.

[119] J. Rios-Torres and A. A. Malikopoulos, "Automated and cooperative vehicle merging at highway on-ramps," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 780–789, 2017.

[120] M. Papageorgiou and A. Kotsialos, "Freeway ramp metering: An overview," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems, 2000. Proceedings. 2000 IEEE*. IEEE, 2000, pp. 228–239.

[121] A. Hegyi, B. De Schutter, and H. Hellendoorn, "Model predictive control for optimal coordination of ramp metering and variable speed limits," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 185–209, 2005.

[122] M. R. Hafner, D. Cunningham, L. Caminiti, and D. Del Vecchio, "Cooperative collision avoidance at intersections: Algorithms and experiments," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1162–1175, 2013.

[123] C. Letter and L. Elefteriadou, "Efficient control of fully automated connected vehicles at freeway merge segments," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 80, pp. 190–205, 2017.

[124] M. Zhou, X. Qu, and S. Jin, "On the impact of cooperative autonomous vehicles in improving freeway merging: A modified intelligent driver model-based approach," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2016.

[125] F. Browand, J. McArthur, and C. Radovich, "Fuel saving achieved in the field test of two tandem trucks," *California Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways (PATH)*, 2004.

[126] R. Bishop, D. Bevly, L. Humphreys, S. Boyd, and D. Murray, "Evaluation and testing of driver-assistive truck platooning: phase 2 final results," *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, no. 2615, pp. 11–18, 2017.

[127] R. Kunze, R. Ramakers, K. Henning, and S. Jeschke, "Organization and operation of electronically coupled truck platoons on german motorways," in *Automation, Communication and Cybernetics in Science and Engineering 2009/2010*. Springer, 2011, pp. 427–439.

[128] A. Al Alam, A. Gattami, and K. H. Johansson, "An experimental study on the fuel reduction potential of heavy duty vehicle platooning," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), 2010 13th International IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 306–311.

[129] A. Alam, "Fuel-efficient heavy-duty vehicle platooning," Ph.D. dissertation, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2014.

[130] S. Tsugawa, "Results and issues of an automated truck platoon within the energy its project," in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium Proceedings, 2014 IEEE*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 642–647.

[131] S. Tsugawa, S. Jeschke, and S. E. Shladover, "A review of truck platooning projects for energy savings," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 68–77, 2016.

[132] D. Swaroop and J. K. Hedrick, "String stability of interconnected systems," *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 349–357, 1996.

[133] M. Segata, B. Bloessl, S. Joerer, C. Sommer, M. Gerla, R. L. Cigno, and F. Dressler, "Toward communication strategies for platooning: simulative and experimental evaluation," *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 64, no. 12, pp. 5411–5423, 2015.

[134] T. L. Willke, P. Tientrakool, and N. F. Maxemchuk, "A survey of inter-vehicle communication protocols and their applications," *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2009.

[135] D. Swaroop and J. Hedrick, "Constant spacing strategies for platooning in automated highway systems," *Journal of dynamic systems, measurement, and control*, vol. 121, no. 3, pp. 462–470, 1999.

[136] R. Horowitz and P. Varaiya, "Control design of an automated highway system," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 88, no. 7, pp. 913–925, 2000.

[137] J. Larson, K.-Y. Liang, and K. H. Johansson, "A distributed framework for coordinated heavy-duty vehicle platooning," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 419–429, 2015.

[138] D. Muoio, "Here's how Tesla, Uber, and Google are trying to revolutionize the trucking industry," *Business Insider*, June 20 2017.

[139] G. J. Naus, R. P. Vugts, J. Ploeg, M. J. van de Molengraft, and M. Steinbuch, "String-stable CACC design and experimental validation: A frequency-domain approach," *IEEE Transactions on vehicular technology*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 4268–4279, 2010.

[140] J. Ploeg, B. T. Scheepers, E. Van Nunen, N. Van de Wouw, and H. Nijmeijer, "Design and experimental evaluation of cooperative adaptive cruise control," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), 2011 14th International IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 260–265.

[141] V. Milanés, S. E. Shladover, J. Spring, C. Nowakowski, H. Kawazoe, and M. Nakamura, "Cooperative adaptive cruise control in real traffic situations," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 296–305, 2014.

[142] J. Ploeg, S. Shladover, H. Nijmeijer, and N. van de Wouw, "Introduction to the special issue on the 2011 grand cooperative driving challenge," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 989–993, 2012.

[143] E. van Nunen, R. Kwakkernaat, J. Ploeg, and B. D. Netten, "Cooperative competition for future mobility," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1018–1025, 2012.

[144] A. Geiger, M. Lauer, F. Moosmann, B. Ranft, H. Rapp, C. Stiller, and J. Ziegler, "Team AnnieWAY's entry to the 2011 grand cooperative driving challenge," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1008–1017, 2012.

[145] K. Lidström, K. Sjoberg, U. Holmberg, J. Andersson, F. Bergh, M. Bjade, and S. Mak, "A modular CACC system integration and design," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1050–1061, 2012.

[146] R. Kianfar, B. Augusto, A. Ebadighajari, U. Hakeem, J. Nilsson, A. Raza, R. S. Tabar, N. V. Irukulapati, C. Englund, P. Falcone *et al.*, "Design and experimental validation of a cooperative driving system in the grand cooperative driving challenge," *IEEE transactions on intelligent transportation systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 994–1007, 2012.

[147] J. Mårtensson, A. Alam, S. Behere, M. A. A. Khan, J. Kjellberg, K.-Y. Liang, H. Pettersson, and D. Sundman, "The development of a cooperative heavy-duty vehicle for the gcdc 2011: Team Scoop," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1033–1049, 2012.

[148] M. R. Nieuwenhuijze, T. van Keulen, S. Öncü, B. Bonsen, and H. Nijmeijer, "Cooperative driving with a heavy-duty truck in mixed traffic: Experimental results," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1026–1032, 2012.

[149] L. Guvenc, I. M. C. Uygan, K. Kahraman, R. Karaahmetoglu, I. Altay, M. Senturk, M. T. Emirler, A. E. H. Karci, B. A. Guvenc, E. Altug *et al.*, "Cooperative adaptive cruise control implementation of team Mekar at the grand cooperative driving challenge," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1062–1074, 2012.

[150] B. Van Arem, C. J. Van Driel, and R. Visser, "The impact of cooperative adaptive cruise control on traffic-flow characteristics," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 429–436, 2006.

[151] Y. Zheng, S. E. Li, J. Wang, L. Y. Wang, and K. Li, "Influence of information flow topology on closed-loop stability of vehicle platoon with rigid formation," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), 2014 IEEE 17th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 2094–2100.

[152] M. di Bernardo, A. Salvi, and S. Santini, "Distributed consensus strategy for platooning of vehicles in the presence of time-varying heterogeneous communication delays," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 102–112, 2015.

[153] A. Lelouvier, J. Guanetti, and F. Borrelli, "Eco-platooning of autonomous electrical vehicles using distributed model predictive control," in *Submitted, Proceedings of IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 2017.

[154] W. B. Dunbar and D. S. Caveney, "Distributed receding horizon control of vehicle platoons: Stability and string stability," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 57, no. 3, pp. 620–633, 2012.

[155] J.-Q. Wang, S. E. Li, Y. Zheng, and X.-Y. Lu, "Longitudinal collision mitigation via coordinated braking of multiple vehicles using model predictive control," *Integrated Computer-Aided Engineering*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp. 171–185, 2015.

[156] J. Nie, J. Zhang, W. Ding, X. Wan, X. Chen, and B. Ran, "Decentralized cooperative lane-changing decision-making for connected autonomous vehicles," *IEEE Access*, vol. 4, pp. 9413–9420, 2016.

[157] W. Cao, M. Mukai, T. Kawabe, H. Nishira, and N. Fujiki, "Cooperative vehicle path generation during merging using model predictive control with real-time optimization," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 34, pp. 98–105, 2015.

[158] A. Kesting, M. Treiber, and D. Helbing, "General lane-changing model mobil for car-following models," *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, no. 1999, pp. 86–94, 2007.

[159] T. Awal, M. Murshed, and M. Ali, "An efficient cooperative lane-changing algorithm for sensor-and communication-enabled automated vehicles," in *Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV), 2015 IEEE*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1328–1333.

[160] R. Scarinci, B. Heydecker, and A. Hegyi, "Analysis of traffic performance of a merging assistant strategy using cooperative vehicles," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 2094–2103, 2015.

[161] A. Mosebach, S. Röchner, and J. Lunze, "Merging control of cooperative vehicles," *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, vol. 49, no. 11, pp. 168–174, 2016.

[162] A. Lombard, F. Perronnet, A. Abbas-Turki, and A. El Moudni, "On the cooperative automatic lane change: Speed synchronization and automatic "courtesy"," in *2017 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 1655–1658.

[163] E. S. Kazerooni and J. Ploeg, "Interaction protocols for cooperative merging and lane reduction scenarios," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC), 2015 IEEE 18th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1964–1970.

[164] K. Raboy, J. Ma, J. Stark, F. Zhou, K. Rush, and E. Leslie, "Cooperative control for lane change maneuvers with connected automated vehicles: A field experiment," Tech. Rep., 2017.

[165] C. Diakaki, M. Papageorgiou, and K. Aboudolas, "A multivariable regulator approach to traffic-responsive network-wide signal control," *Control Engineering Practice*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 183–195, 2002.

[166] Q. He, K. L. Head, and J. Ding, "PAMSCOD: Platoon-based arterial multi-modal signal control with online data," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 164–184, 2012.

[167] M. A. S. Kamal, J.-i. Imura, T. Hayakawa, A. Ohata, and K. Aihara, "Traffic signal control of a road network using MILP in the MPC framework," *International journal of intelligent transportation systems research*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 107–118, 2015.

[168] N. Goodall, B. Smith, and B. Park, "Traffic signal control with connected vehicles," *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, no. 2381, pp. 65–72, 2013.

[169] K. Dresner and P. Stone, "A multiagent approach to autonomous intersection management," *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, pp. 591–656, 2008.

[170] M. Ferreira, R. Fernandes, H. Conceição, W. Viriyasitavat, and O. K. Tonguz, "Self-organized traffic control," in *Proceedings of the seventh ACM international workshop on VehicularAr InterNETworking*. ACM, 2010, pp. 85–90.

[171] M. Ferreira and P. M. d'Orey, "On the impact of virtual traffic lights on carbon emissions mitigation," *Intelligent Transportation Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 284–295, 2012.

[172] S. I. Guler, M. Menendez, and L. Meier, "Using connected vehicle technology to improve the efficiency of intersections," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 46, pp. 121–131, 2014.

[173] R. Tachet, P. Santi, S. Sobolevsky, L. I. Reyes-Castro, E. Frazzoli, D. Helbing, and C. Ratti, "Revisiting street intersections using slot-based systems," *PloS one*, vol. 11, no. 3, p. e0149607, 2016.

[174] S. Huang, A. W. Sadek, and Y. Zhao, "Assessing the mobility and environmental benefits of reservation-based intelligent intersections using an integrated simulator," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 1201–1214, 2012.

[175] S. A. Fayazi, A. Vahidi, and A. Luckow, "Optimal scheduling of autonomous vehicle arrivals at intelligent intersections via MILP," in *American Control Conference (ACC), 2017*. IEEE, 2017.

[176] S. A. Fayazi and A. Vahidi, "Mixed integer linear programming for optimal scheduling of autonomous vehicle passage through intelligent intersections," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles (in review)*, 2017.

[177] ——, "Vehicle-In-the-Loop (VIL) verification of a smart city intersection control scheme for autonomous vehicles," in *Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA)*. IEEE, 2017.

[178] J. Lioris, R. Pedarsani, F. Y. Tascikaraoglu, and P. Varaiya, "Doubling throughput in urban roads by platooning," *accepted in the IFAC Symposium on Control in Transportation Systems*, 2015.

[179] Q. Jin, G. Wu, K. Boriboonsomsin, and M. Barth, "Platoon-based multi-agent intersection management for connected vehicle," in *16th International IEEE Conference on Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITSC 2013)*, Oct 2013, pp. 1462–1467.

[180] R. Fernandes, P. M. d'Orey, and M. Ferreira, "Divert for realistic simulation of heterogeneous vehicular networks," in *Mobile Adhoc and Sensor Systems (MASS), 2010 IEEE 7th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 721–726.

[181] A. Cappiello, I. Chabini, E. K. Nam, A. Lue, and M. A. Zeid, "A statistical model of vehicle emissions and fuel consumption," in *Intelligent Transportation Systems, 2002. Proceedings. The IEEE 5th International Conference on*. IEEE, 2002, pp. 801–809.

[182] T. Koshizen, M. Kamal, and H. Koike, "Traffic congestion mitigation using intelligent driver model (IDM) combined with lane changes-why congestion detection is so needed?" SAE Technical Paper, Tech. Rep., 2015.

[183] S. Shladover, D. Su, and X.-Y. Lu, "Impacts of cooperative adaptive cruise control on freeway traffic flow," *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, no. 2324, pp. 63–70, 2012.

[184] A. Talebpour and H. S. Mahmassani, "Influence of connected and autonomous vehicles on traffic flow stability and throughput," *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, vol. 71, pp. 143–163, 2016.

[185] R. Nishi, A. Tomoeda, K. Shimura, and K. Nishinari, "Theory of jam-absorption driving," *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological*, vol. 50, pp. 116–129, 2013.

[186] Y. Taniguchi, R. Nishi, A. Tomoeda, K. Shimura, T. Ezaki, and K. Nishinari, "A demonstration experiment of a theory of jam-absorption driving," in *Traffic and Granular Flow'13*. Springer, 2015, pp. 479–483.

[187] J. Ma, X. Li, S. Shladover, H. A. Rakha, X.-Y. Lu, R. Jagannathan, and D. J. Dailey, "Freeway speed harmonization," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 78–89, 2016.

[188] D. E. Kirk, *Optimal control theory: an introduction*. Courier Corporation, 2012.

Ardalan Vahidi is a Professor with the Department of Mechanical Engineering, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina. He received the Ph.D. degree in mechanical engineering from the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, in 2005. the M.Sc. degree in transportation safety from George Washington University, Washington, DC, in 2002, and B.S. and M.Sc. degrees in civil engineering from Sharif University, Tehran, Iran, in 1996 and 1998, respectively. He has been a visiting scholar at the University of California, Berkeley and a visiting researcher at the BMW Group Technology Office USA in 2012-2013 and a scientific visitor at IFP Energies Nouvelles, France in 2017. His current research interests include control of vehicular and energy systems, and connected and automated vehicle technologies.

Antonio Sciarretta is an expert researcher with IFP Energies Nouvelles, Rueil Malmaison, France, since 2006. He received a M.Sc. (Mech. Eng.) degree in 1995, and a Doctorate degree (Thermal machines) in 1999, both from the University of LAquila, Italy. He earned a Habilitation (Control Eng.) in 2009 from the Grenoble Institute of Technology, France. Before joining IFPEN he has hold various teaching and research positions at the University of LAquila and at the ETH Zurich. From 2009 to 2016 he has hold the Tuck foundation Chair on Hybrid vehicles and energy management at IFP School. He has actively contributed to the development of hybrid-vehicle activities at IFPEN and he is currently managing research projects on the control and optimization for connected and automated vehicles. He has coauthored the Springer book Vehicle Propulsion Systems (three editions) and contributes to the scientific and professional community as a journal associate editor, conference organizer, and project evaluator.