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Abstract—As the demand for connected and automated vehicles emerges, so to does the need for quality testing environments to support their development. In this paper, we introduce a Unity-based virtual simulation environment for emerging mobility systems, called Information and Decision Science Lab’s Scaled Smart Digital City (IDS 3D City), intended to operate alongside its physical peer and its existing control framework. By utilizing the Robot Operation System, AirSim, and Unity, we have constructed a simulation environment capable of iteratively designing experiments significantly faster than is possible in a physical testbed. This provides us with an intermediate step to validate the effectiveness of our control framework prior to testing them in the physical testbed. Another benefit provided by the IDS 3D City is demonstrating that our control algorithms work independent of the physical environment, and Unity, we have constructed a simulation environment capable of iteratively designing experiments significantly faster than is possible in a physical testbed. This provides us with an intermediate step to validate the effectiveness of our control framework prior to testing them in the physical testbed. Another benefit provided by the IDS 3D City is demonstrating that our control algorithms work independent of the physical environment, and ultimately selected Gazebo, as opposed to a game engine, from concerns about game engines’ ability to replicate the complex dynamics of a full-scale vehicle. However, several researchers have developed their own simulation framework for CAVs by linking robot operating system (ROS) and the game-engine platform Unity [14]–[16]. Tsai et al. [15] demonstrated the validity of hardware-in-theloop simulation utilizing the ROS Unity link. Mizuchi et al. [16] introduced virtual reality for multiple users into the environment using Unity, and Yang et al. [17] modeled an existing environment within Unity to validate simulated sensors in a variety of weather and lighting conditions.

In this paper, describe the Information and Decision Science Laboratory’s Scaled Smart Digital City (IDS 3D City), a digital environment that corresponds to a full-scale digital recreation of the Information and Decision Science Lab’s Scaled Smart City (IDS3C) in Unity. The IDS3C is a 1:25 scaled testbed spanning over 400 square feet, and it is capable of replicating real-world traffic scenarios using up to 50 ground and 10 aerial vehicles. Fig. 3 displays a photograph of the IDS3C and the central mainframe computer, and for an overview of the IDS3C and its capabilities, see [18]. Our digital replica can communicate with the central mainframe computer using the user datagram protocol (UDP), allowing users to evaluate the performance of their algorithms before running a physical experiment in IDS3C. With our simulation program, we are also able to rapidly iterate the design of our experiments before running it on the physical city. In contrast, the IDS3C requires an operator to calibrate the VICON camera system, charge and maintain the batteries in each vehicle, maintain the vehicles’ mechanical parts, and physically move and manipulate the vehicles at the start of each experiment. Within the digital environment, we are able to do the equivalent processes instantly.

We have structured the rest of the paper as follows. In Section II, we introduce the digital environment of IDS3C and elaborate on its different components and their interactions. In Section III, we present a roundabout coordination problem and compare the results behavior of a simulated and physical experiment. Finally, we draw concluding remarks along with a discussion for future research directions in Section IV.
II. DIGITAL SIMULATION ENVIRONMENT

We have designed the IDS 3D City to integrate seamlessly with the current control code used in the physical testbed. During a physical experiment, the mainframe computer runs a custom C++ software that create a separate thread for each CAV in the experiment. Each physical CAV in the city receives a desired trajectory from the mainframe computer over WiFi, and the position and orientation of each CAV is fed back to the mainframe computer through a VICON motion capture system. To mimic the behavior of the physical city in our simulation, we receive trajectory data over a local UDP socket, which contains the desired state of each CAV. The position and orientation of each CAV in the digital environment are broadcast through ROS to a node designed to mimic VICON measurements. These information can be accessed by the mainframe computer, which executes the control framework and sends new commands over UDP. A schematic of our communication structure is presented in Fig. 1. The end result of this design means that we can seamlessly switch between running any individual car in the physical or virtual environment with minimal changes to our input files. The IDS 3D City is also capable of replaying experimental data, allowing users to directly control a vehicle, and streaming a live feed of the virtual cameras. In the following subsections, we review the three major aspects of our simulation environment, the Unity game engine, Microsoft AirSim, and ROS#.

A. Unity Game Engine

A majority of the IDS 3D City is built in the Unity game engine, which is a free and highly-customizable game engine with a built-in physics engine and C# scripting framework; for a brief history of the Unity game engine, see [14]. We selected Unity over existing simulation packages, such as Gazebo, as it is easily deployable and performs well on a variety of platforms. Unlike Zhang and Masoud [13], our interest lies in the coordination of CAVs, rather than the particular dynamics of any individual CAV. Unity also relies heavily on the entity-component paradigm of software design, which grants us incredible flexibility in the design and control of vehicles in the virtual environment. The built-in Nvidia PhysX engine enables access to modify the physics of the experiment, and Unity is capable of building an executable program for Windows, Mac, Linux, and mobile devices. This ensures that the simulation will run natively on any available hardware. Unity’s graphical settings are also configurable per device, allowing weaker hardware access to full functionality and more powerful hardware the ability to produce high-fidelity videos and screenshots. Furthermore, Unity allows us to explore more accurate human driver scenarios with built-in virtual reality support in the future.

As a first step, we reconstructed the IDS³C’s road network and key environmental features within Unity. We recreated the road network from the original CAD files used to construct IDS³C. Each road segment is categorized into a straight line or arc segment, which are described by a CSV file. Our simulation environment relies on two manager scripts to handle the simulation logic. The Experiment Manager is the primary manager, which controls the experiment clock used for data collection. It also stores the initial conditions of all vehicles, this ensures that an experiment can be repeated without restarting the simulation software. The secondary manager script is the Vehicle Manager, which handles all of the vehicles. The vehicle manager spawns each vehicle at its initial position, and if two vehicles would overlap, the vehicle manager places the second one behind the first to avoid collisions. The vehicle manager also passes information about the vehicles to the UI and data logging tools.

We also take advantage of Unity’s prefab system to initialize vehicles into the environment. We are able to further configure each vehicle based on the initialization data sent by the mainframe computer. This may include controller type, controller parameters, initial state, vehicle appearance, etc. We have implemented the vehicles as an abstract class, thus the vehicle manager is flexible enough to initialize and coordinate any additional vehicle types added in the future. A schematic of the key components in our vehicle prefab is presented in Fig. 2, and the behavior of the AirSim and ROS# components are explained in the relevant sections that follow.

The main vehicle used in our simulation is a passenger car, which is controlled by a custom car script (a child of the abstract vehicle class). The car script takes in timestamped waypoints, which consist of a 2D position, orientation, and a desired speed. This information is passed to a low-level tracking controller to generate a steering angle and throttle command. The steering angle is computed using a modified Stanley controller [19],

\[
\delta(t) = \begin{cases} 
\psi(t) - k_v \cdot v(t) \cdot \psi(t) \\
+ \arctan \left\{ \frac{k_s y_e}{k_v + \nu(t)} \right\} - k_y \left( \psi(t) - \psi_d \right),
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \delta(t) \) is the steering angle, \( \psi(t) \) current yaw angle, \( \psi_d(t) \) is the desired yaw angle, \( v(t) \) is the current velocity, \( y_e \) is the lateral tracking error, \( k_v, k_s, k_y \) are proportional tracking constant, and \( k_s \) is a small constant that ensures the controller operates at low speeds. The throttle command is generated through a feedforward-feedback controller, i.e., the desired position is tracked using PID control, and we compensate for the vehicle’s velocity at that point with a feedforward term in the control loop [20]. This throttle command is sent through a second layer of the controller, which we explain in the following section, where it is translated into gas, brake, and handbrake inputs. Finally, these inputs are sent to the AirSim controller, which updates the state of the vehicle using its own dynamic model.

The final major component of the Unity environment is the user interface, which combines all of these components to an easily human-readable format. The UI includes all of the important information for each vehicle, including the vehicle’s ID, status, current position, and speed. We have also included buttons that allow the user to open a preview panel and view the camera feed for a particular CAV. The
Fig. 1: Comparison of the physical and virtual city environments. The mainframe computer can switch between physical and virtual experiment seamlessly.

Fig. 2: A diagram showing the different components that make up a single vehicle in the Unity simulation.

Fig. 3: The digital simulation UI during one run of the experiment. The vehicle UI nodes are on the left, the experiment controls on top, and the preview panel on the right.

B. AirSim

To model the dynamics and sensors of each vehicle, we have included Microsoft AirSim’s work-in-progress Unity module\(^1\). This is accomplished by using the AirLib wrapper plugin, which allows us access to AirSim’s C++ API while maintaining the Unity code base in C#. Our vehicle prefabs are based on the prefabs developed in AirSim. AirSim provides convenient packages of code for CAVs and drones that model physically accurate behavior while being fully configurable. Configurable variables include motor torque, steering angle limits, weight, and aerodynamic drag. This allows us to validate our approaches to CAV coordination on a variety of vehicles, and helps demonstrate that our algorithms are independent of the underlying vehicle dynamics. Another major feature of AirSim is its sensor suite. Namely, each vehicle is equipped with an RGB camera to collect qualitative data and to give visual feedback for human operation.

We made several modifications to the AirSim source code, both to fix undesirable behaviors and to customize the vehicles for our use case. First, we modified the handbrake

\(^1\)AirSim: https://microsoft.github.io/AirSim/Unity/
to affect all four wheels, as opposed to only the two front wheels. We also fixed bugs in the braking behavior, one where extreme braking would occur, and another where the brakes would lock and were unable to be released. Finally, we adjusted the default parameters of each vehicle for use in our virtual city. The default parameters in AirSim also resulted in significant understeer with our line-tracking controller. We resolved this by increasing the wheel friction in Unity’s physics engine, which resulted in a higher effective controller.

Finally, our low-level tracking controller outputs a normalized throttle command $u_g$ and handbrake. We mapped the desired throttle to these variables using an intermediate layer, $h(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } u_d(t) \leq -0.5, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$ $b(t) = \min \{0, u_d(t)\} \cdot (1 - h(t)),$ $g(t) = \max \{0, u_d(t)\} \cdot (1 - h(t)),$

where $h(t) \in \{0, 1\}$ is the handbrake, $b(t) \in [0, 1]$ is the brake command, and $g(t) \in [0, 1]$ is the gas command. This results in the AirSim controller tracking the desired speed, and the vehicle will only trigger the handbrake when a sufficiently large deceleration is requested. It also guarantees that the vehicle will stop, rather than shifting into reverse, if it overshoots the desired state waypoint.

### C. ROS Framework

ROS provides a flexible framework for robot software in the form of standardized communication protocols. These protocols separate software components the ability to exchange information reliably with a wide suite of debugging tools. To introduce ROS functionality into Unity, we integrated Siemen’s open-source ‘ROS#’ package.

In the IDS3C, ROS is used to access VICON motion capture data and determine the state of each vehicle in real time. In the IDS 3D City we use ROS# to mimic the VICON ROS topic, which we achieve by attaching two ROS-specific components called publisher and client to our vehicle prefab.

The publisher component captures the position and orientation data of the attached vehicle. This information is composed into ROS messages to be published as a time-stamped transform message. Client component connects to a ROS server running on the mainframe computer, which it uses a configurable IP address to locate. The client then streams the state data of each vehicle, which is broadcast by the remote server and mimics the messages and topics sent by the VICON system. This setup also enables us to run some vehicles virtually and others in the physical city while still having access to their state information in real time.

### III. VIRTUAL AND PHYSICAL EXPERIMENT

To demonstrate the performance of the IDS 3D City, we consider a scenario of homogeneous human-driven vehicles at a roundabout (see Fig. 4). We consider $N = 6$ vehicles entering the roundabout in two groups of 3, one from the north entry and one from the east entry. Our approach for each vehicle $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ considers double integrator dynamics,

$$
\dot{p}_i(t) = v_i(t),
\dot{v}_i(t) = u_i(t),(2)
$$

where $p_i(t)$ and $v_i(t)$ are the longitudinal position and velocity of vehicle $i$, and $u_i(t)$ is the control input. We also impose the state and control constraints,

$$
0 \leq v_{\min} \leq v_i(t) \leq v_{\max},
\quad u_{\min} \leq u_i(t) \leq u_{\max},
$$

where $u_{\min}, u_{\max}$ are the minimum and maximum control inputs and $v_{\min}, v_{\max}$ are the minimum and maximum speed limit, respectively.

To model each vehicle as human-driven, we employ the Intelligent Driver Model [21] to determine the control action of each vehicle. This model outputs the acceleration for a vehicle $i$ based on the relative state of a preceding vehicle, $k \in \{1, 2, \ldots, N\} \setminus \{i\}$,

$$
u_i = u_{\max} \left[1 - \left(\frac{v_i}{v_{\max}}\right)^\delta - \left(\frac{s^*(v_i, \Delta v_i)}{s_i}\right)^2\right]
$$

where $s^*$ is the desired headway of the vehicle,

$$
s^*(v_i, \Delta v_i) = s_0 + \max \left(0, v_i T + \frac{v_i \Delta v_i}{2 \sqrt{u_{\min} u_{\max}}}\right)
$$

where $s_i(t)$ is the bumper-to-bumper distance at $i$ and $k$, and $\Delta v_i(t) = v_i(t) - v_k(t)$. The constants $s_0, T, \delta$ are parameters that correspond to the standstill stopping distance, time headway, and an exponential factor that determine the acceleration and braking behavior. Typical values for each of these parameters can be found in [21].

We design the roundabout scenario in Fig. 4 such that vehicles approaching the roundabout from either direction will clash at the merging point. To ensure safety, vehicles at the northern entry (Path 1) must yield to roundabout traffic (Path 2). We achieve this by placing a virtual stopped vehicle at the position of the yield sign whenever a vehicle from Path 2 is near the merging point. When the area in front of the merging point is clear, the virtual vehicle is removed and vehicles on Path 1 are allowed to enter the roundabout. Otherwise, the vehicles traveling along Path 1 will form a queue and wait the vehicles along Path 2 to pass through the merging zone.

The velocity of each car following Path 1 (see Fig. 4) is plotted against its position in Figs. 5 and 6 for the simulation and experiment, respectively. The effect of the yield sign can be seen around 3.3 m in both cases, where yielding vehicles must merge to oncoming traffic. In the simulation (Fig. 5), the first vehicle on Path 1 is able to merge before the vehicles on Path 2 reach the merging zone. This is a result of the different dynamics, noise, and disturbances between the simulation and experiment.
The position vs time trajectory for all vehicles in the simulation and experiment are presented in Figs. 7 and 8. This figure shows that in the simulation, the first vehicle on Path 1 is able to pass through the merging zone without yielding, while the second and third vehicles must come to a stop for some time. In comparison, all vehicles in the experiment came to a complete stop at the merging zone entrance. The horizontal black lines around 2.1 m in Figs. 7 and 8 marks one car length (approx. 0.2 m) upstream from the point where both paths meet. Therefore, two crossing lines at a distance beyond 2.1 m corresponds to a collision. Despite the different vehicle dynamics in the simulation and experiment, Figs. 5 - 8 demonstrate that both environments result in appropriate IDM behavior, and neither case leads to a collision between vehicles. Videos of the experiment and simulation, as well as supplemental material on the capabilities of the virtual city, can be found on our website: https://sites.google.com/view/ud-ids-lab/sim.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work we presented an overview of our virtual copy of the IDS³C. This simulation environment leverages the Unity game engine, AirSim, and ROS# to deploy full-scale virtual vehicles to verify the control algorithms before we deploy them in our physical testing environment. We have shown how the simulated environment hooks into the control code for the physical city, and how this enables us to quickly iterate the design of experiments before testing them in our physical city. In particular, we have shown that the intelligent driver model in a roundabout behaves properly, and we have demonstrated that our control code is independent of the underlying dynamics of individual vehicles.

The most immediate future work is to perform additional experiments for our optimal control framework [22] and
Fig. 8: Position vs Time trajectory for the path 1 (red) and Path 2 (blue) vehicles in simulation (left) and experiment (right). The horizontal black line corresponds to the first point where collisions between two vehicles can occur.

mixed traffic input [23]. Another compelling direction is to fully integrate the virtual vehicles with a physical experiment, resulting in an augmented-reality cyber-physical system. Finally, including the virtual AirSim drones to capture air-vehicle interactions is another direction of future research.
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