

NEW YORK CITY TAXI AND LIMOUSINE COMMISSION

Request For Information Regarding Anti-Speeding and Driver Alert Vehicle Technologies

In coordination with the NYPD, DOT, other City agencies and members of the for-hire industries, the New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission (“TLC”) is exploring initiatives to work toward the City’s “Vision Zero” goal of zero traffic fatalities. One initiative TLC is currently exploring is the usefulness and feasibility of anti-speeding vehicle technologies, such as speed governors (sometimes called “mandatory” or “intervention” systems) and systems that alert drivers when they are exceeding the speed limit, are driving fatigued, or are otherwise driving recklessly (sometimes called “advisory” systems), as tools to reduce driving behaviors that lead to collisions.

For more information on New York City’s Vision Zero initiatives, visit www.nyc.gov/VisionZero.

TLC invites interested parties to submit information regarding one, several, or all of the below topics. Each section of a submission should begin by referencing which of the numbered topics it is addressing.

All information or suggestions should be submitted by April 25, 2014.

This Request for Information (“RFI”) seeks to obtain information regarding:

General Information:

TLC welcomes input from interested parties including the public, safety experts, individuals with legislative or legal expertise, entities that participate in the NYC for-hire industries, hardware/software makers, automakers, anti-speeding or driver alert equipment users, and other individuals who are knowledgeable about this technology.

- 1. Current Uses of Speed Governors and Speed Advisory / Other Behavioral Correction Systems.** Which entities, such as public or private fleets, currently use these devices.
- 2. Effectiveness of Speed Governors and Speed Advisory / Other Behavioral Correction Systems.** Evidence of the efficacy (or lack of efficacy) of these technologies in reducing collision rates/severity and reducing speeding.
- 3. Incentives to Use Speed Governors and Speed Advisory / Other Behavioral Correction Systems.** Information on financial or non-financial incentives, such as insurance premium reductions, fuel cost savings, vehicle maintenance cost savings, or reduced collision incidence associated with using these types of technologies.
- 4. Parties Interested in Working with Speed Governors or Speed Advisory / Other Behavioral Correction Systems in TLC-Regulated Industries.** Existing or potential partnerships between TLC-regulated vehicle owners and other entities, such as equipment providers, insurance companies, or banks/lenders, which could facilitate implementation of a potential pilot program.
- 5. Challenges Associated with Using Speed Governors and Speed Advisory / Other Behavioral Correction Systems.** Common challenges that speed governors and speed advisory / other behavioral correction systems, and related equipment face, such as opportunities for tampering, difficulties in configuring out-of-the-box hardware and software for use with a variety of makes and models of vehicles, limitations to measurement accuracy, regulatory or legal hurdles, etc.

6. **Privacy Concerns.** Any privacy concerns raised by the collection, storage, and monitoring of relevant data in order to perform speed / other driver behavior detection and alerting or governance.

Specific Information:

TLC welcomes information about specific equipment capabilities.

7. **Description of Device.** Description of the hardware and/or software used to detect and correct the vehicle's speed and other driver behaviors, such as:
 - a. What functions the device offers, such as in-vehicle speed or other behavioral alerts and/or speed governance. For behavioral alerts, the nature of visual, audio, and/or other sensory alerts that take place. For active speed governance, the method by which speed is controlled.
 - b. What device (e.g., GPS, accelerometer, the vehicle's computer network etc.) is the source of information on the vehicle's speed or other detected behavior, the frequency over which the behavior is sampled, and the real-time availability for corrective action / alerting.
 - c. For speed alerting and governance, whether the device can adjust its behavior and speed event / duration detection thresholds depending on the vehicle's location, the weather, manual configuration, or other factors. Please indicate what data source/factors dictate the threshold speed at a given time (e.g., electronic file of block-by-block speed limits and GPS, cameras reading speed limit traffic signs, weather services' data streams, etc.).
 - d. Additional data reporting capabilities, if any, and manner of data reporting (e.g., wireless network, SD card, Wi-Fi hotspots).
 - e. Description and location of physical equipment, including supporting or complementary devices such as cameras or sensors, which are added to the vehicle. Photos and diagrams communicating installation and operation are encouraged.
8. **Costs of Speed Governors and Speed / Other Behavioral Alerting Systems.** Information on the costs associated with equipping a vehicle with these devices, such as:
 - a. Whether equipment is installed by the automaker pre-market or by a third party after-market.
 - b. Up-front equipment costs per component.
 - c. Installation costs and time to complete installation.
 - d. Ongoing/recurring costs, such as maintenance or data/service fees.

Please provide specifics on estimated costs. Include assumptions used to determine these estimated costs such as the size of a fleet, estimated data transmission requirements, features included in the specific technology, installation method, etc.

9. **Data Reliability and Accuracy.**
 - a. Reliability and accuracy of measures of vehicle speed and location and other driving behaviors. For devices that cross-reference vehicle speed with speed limit on each street, reliability of correctly identifying what road the driver is on and its legal speed limit.
 - b. Additional reliability concerns, if any, associated with operation in dense urban high-rise environments and techniques to mitigate these concerns.
 - c. Rates of "false positive" and "false negative" behavioral-detection events.
 - d. Examples, if any, of information from the device being used as evidence in a legal proceeding.

10. **Integration with Existing In-Vehicle Technologies.** The technical feasibility, costs, and advantages/disadvantages of integrating anti-speeding devices or other behavior detection devices with existing in-vehicle technologies (e.g., meters, TPEP/LPEP, black boxes, and/or cameras already installed in a vehicle), or leveraging these types of existing devices for detection and /or alerting / governance.
11. **Case Studies.** Case studies describing implementation of anti-speeding technologies and other driver behavior modification technologies and their resulting impact on driver behavior, specifically in the realm of safety.

All information or suggestions should be submitted by April 25, 2014 to:

Research@tlc.nyc.gov

Or

Dawn Miller
Director of Research and Evaluation
New York City Taxi and Limousine Commission
33 Beaver St., 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10004

Please provide your contact information if you may be interested in meeting with TLC staff to discuss your submission. To facilitate review, we welcome and encourage early submissions. Thank you for your interest in helping the City of New York and TLC-regulated industries in our efforts to eliminate traffic fatalities.

Disclaimer

It should be understood that this RFI will not result in any type of procurement for any system or for any goods and services at this time. This RFI does not represent a commitment on the part of the City to enter into any type of agreement with the companies, groups, or individuals that choose to respond. The information provided by respondents will not be used by the City to pre-qualify respondents or in any other way determine eligibility for the purposes of any procurement that may be undertaken in the future.

Vendors should note that no contract will be awarded pursuant to this RFI. Likewise, submission of a response to this RFI will not enhance any vendor's chances to be included in any preferred vendor's list. **No responses to this RFI will be confidential, proprietary, or non-disclosable pursuant to the New York State Freedom of Information Law, Public Officers Law Article 6 Sections 84-90, and TLC may share the responses received publicly.**