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So far, during this school...

• Most talks dealt with small things, and how they move
• This session deals with larger things (vehicles), moving in a yet larger structures: networks (this talk).
• I will only mention the modelling vehicles
• A network (links & nodes) needs simple vehicle objects:
  • TASEP has been mentioned several times, a good candidate for the dynamics of cars on a link
  • One may do it even simpler, by just counting: queue-models
  • Or more complicated, by doing a real vehicle dynamics $v_i(t + \Delta t) = \cdots$
Real networks...

- Have something that we haven’t meet this far: the objects follow real routes
- ➔ creates spatio-temporal correlations
- Which are important if it comes to the co-ordination of traffic signals in such a system.

- Apart from this, most of the presentation will be simple; I assume that there are also many experts in this room.
- Vehicle drivers.
This talk

1. Introduction
2. Local control
3. Networks
4. Conclusions

Revolves around:
• What can be gained in traffic signal networks?
• There is an important distinction between ideal and real networks/ objects.
• Simulation models catch some of this difference. Hopefully.
Question to the experts

• Any idea how real traffic signals in cities are organized?
• Physicists are good observers: If walking through a city, can you tell apart well organized from a badly organized signals?
Introduction for the audience not in traffic engineering

• V2X: Communication between vehicles (V) and anything else (X), especially traffic signals (TLS)

• Announced at least since 2005 (when I first became aware of it), still no large-scale implementation (to my knowledge)

• Traffic signals (TLS) are an important part of infra-structure in city traffic. Why TLS?

• TLS produce delay (delay: difference between real and ideal travel times)

• Finally: simulation. Will use here our own tool named SUMO; open source, and can simulate most traffic objects microscopically.

• See https://sumo.dlr.de
SUMO – a step towards (more) reproducible traffic science?

Figure removed: If you want reproducible science, the software needs to be open source.
V2X-based signal control – Why?

- Why is it interesting?
- Simple: this is the input needed to do it optimally.
  - (Or close to optimal.)

- Vehicles communicate with the TLS controller via (4G), 5G, G5,…
  ⇒ TLS can compute the best possible plan.

- One intersection; does it work with many?
- That is what we want to find out…

Source: DLR
Well – this did not work as planned

• There is always a danger with field experiments: they took longer.
  ➔ So, I can only report on simulations, and on older (sets of) field experiments that had just one intersection
• But: I use this opportunity to talk about the general framework
• Big question: what can we reach with traffic signal optimization in real networks?
  • By what means?
  • And, is it worth the effort?

• (My boss thinks not…)
Single intersections and small nets
Controlling TLS

- Very old: fixed cycle (1927)
Fixed cycle

• There is a well-known theory from 1958 (Webster, a physicist) that tells how to organize a traffic signal optimally in a fixed cycle manner
• He derived two approximations:
• Optimum cycle time $c$, it depends on demand $q_i$, more precisely on the ratio between demand and saturation $s_i$ of all phases $y_i = \frac{q_i}{s_i}$, and the loss time $L$:

$$ c = \frac{1.5L + 5}{1 - \sum_i y_i} = \frac{1.5L + 5}{1 - Y} $$

• The green times $g_i$ are then given by $g_i = (c - L) \frac{y_i}{Y}$
• Optimal (fixed cycle) for one intersection, constant demand, Poisson arrivals
Controlling TLS

- Very old: fixed cycle (1927)
- Old: traffic controls TLS (1928 based on horn, 1952 like today)
- Actuated control: if the time since the last passing vehicle has grown too large, end this green phase
- Delay-based: communicating vehicles can tell TLS their speed
  \[ d_i = \Delta t \left( 1 - \frac{v_i}{v_{\text{max}}} \right) : \text{when} \sum_i d_i = 0, \text{end green} \]
- Make optimum plan based on communicated arrival times (dynamic programing) for the next ~60+ seconds. AGLOSA
- Update plan moving horizon (event-based, or any ~15 seconds)
- This last one is arguably the best, should be close to optimal.

Robustness?
Tested in simulation and field

- At one intersection, these two methods gain up to 20% in delay time
- In simulation, as well as in reality
- But: in one example, AGLOSA outperformed in simulation any other method
- In the field, the two methods (Delay-based and AGLOSA) have been about equal

- Preliminary results: With three intersections, simulations do not indicate large gains – but this is a very special “network”
- (And a lot of politics…)
Larger networks
Traffic signals in a network

- Car-drivers: traffic signals do always display red when I arrive there
- To remedy this, traffic signal co-ordination (progression) is attempted
- Most famous: the green wave
- Easy to understood: in a space-time diagram, a platoon of vehicles progresses from one traffic light to the next
A green wave 2019

- Note the variable offset $\phi$; the phase difference between each two “oscillators” (traffic lights) that run with phases $\varphi_i$, $\varphi_j$
  - $\phi_{ij} = \varphi_i - \varphi_j$
- Clearly, in the best of all worlds $\phi = T = \frac{L}{v}$
- $T$ is travel time
1929:

By City of San Francisco - Public domain (via Eric Fischer), https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/index.php?curid=34715929
Introduction: Traffic signals in a network

- Car-drivers: traffic signals do always display red when I arrive there
- To remedy this, traffic signal co-ordination is attempted
- Most famous: the green wave
- Easy to understood: in a space-time diagram, a platoon of vehicles progresses from one traffic light to the next
- And: you may achieve the optimum: delay = 0 😊 (makes a fine test case, will resort to this several times)
- Unfortunately easy to understood: one may think that doing the same in networks is simple, too.
- Not true, of course
Extension to a network…

• Is complicated, only in rare special cases (regular grid networks, other preliminaries) this can be done in a simple manner
• (Even a green wave in both directions is generally not possible)
• In real networks, this runs into a fairly complicated optimization problem which is, as far as I have understood, NP-complete to solve (Little, 1966), (Gartner, Little, & Gabbay 1977)
• In 2004, Carlos Gershenson started a hype with the idea of a self-organized traffic signal system (SOTL)
• There is a lot of additional work on this
• Idea is: let these signals alone, together with the appropriate control mechanism they will find some self-organized optimum
Some kind of irony

- Carlos used one of those theory-things that especially physicists love: grid city, traffic flows in two directions only
- System can be open or closed (periodic boundary)
- SOTL is in essence:
  - When red, do cumulative count $n$ of vehicles on link
  - If $n > \theta$ then switch (and reset $n = 0$) (provided minGreen has been reached)
- Funny: has an exact optimum solution! Not sure that he was aware of this, at least the paper does not mention it, but:
- Directions are independent; even inhomogeneous grids always have a set of offsets so that a perfect green wave can be established in both directions.
• Except at the input edges, where delays are unavoidable, vehicles can run unimpeded through this net.

• SOTL is similar to a method invented by Dunne & Potts in 1964

• D & P counted delayed cars, and were concerned with single intersection only
The Great Plan

• SOTL draw criticism. Nicely put by Bernhard Friedrich where he challenged
• The “jungle principle” with “The Great Plan”
• A Great Plan is charming, too: such a plan (similar to a bus schedule) forces traffic flow into a pattern of platoons for which down-stream traffic signals can be timed optimally
• Traffic is organized by the plan laid out by the traffic management center

From: https://www.athenstransit.org/lines-5-6/
The Big Question

• What is better?
• Or, once more: what can be achieved?
• And under which conditions/ circumstances?
Do you know Essam Almasri’s PhD?

- To find the optimal solution in a network one needs to find the optimal set of offsets $\phi_i$
- This is a nasty optimization problem
- For small networks, brute-force is a temptation:
- System with 6 intersections has 5 offsets; a cycle time $c = 90$ s and test with 5 s granularity:
  \[
  \left(\frac{90}{5}\right)^5 \approx 2M \text{ simulations}
  \]
- That he did, with a CTM
Slightly less brute force

- Bad: this was for one demand only 😞
- In n-D this type of brute-force is not the best to integrate higher dimensional functions
  ➔ Quasi-random numbers are a better way to do it
- Cover n-D spaces with minimal holes (discrepancy), and therefore, one has a better level of control
- Are scalable: if you have computer time to run 1,000 simulations, then you just compute 1,000 quasi-random n-D-tupels for your problem.
- That is what we have done
Quasi-random numbers: normal vs Halton
Simulation speed

- What is the fastest way to compute such a scenario? I.e., a small network with a
  - Given demand pattern
  - Cycle time
  - Set of offsets; green-times are computed from demand, they are not variables
- Almasri did it with the CTM; there is a believe that this is the fastest possibility
- But: no OD and trips, CTM has to run with $\Delta t = 1s$ to use traffic signal control

Also fast:
- Queue-model,
- A real microscopic model,
- Truly hard-core: single-bit coding of TASEP
Simulation speed

- SUMO with Almasri’s network:
  3h real time = 1 s sim time, about 1,000 trips/s
- This is the metric for comparison: trips/s
- A microscopic implementation tweaked for speed tops at 1 M trips/s
- Queue-models can do 20M trips/s; a serious implementation is close to 6M trips/s and is on par with the CTM
- Finally, the single-bit coding is still faster, but a pain to work with

- (Even programming Almasri’s network is stupid monkey work)
- Cannot be generalized…
More systematically, less thorough
Simulated Worlds (Parts of Cities)

- Real networks have both directions
- Have cars, and not green-bands
- These cars have different speeds \(\rightarrow\) platoon dispersion
- And: they have real routes, which interfere with Great Plan
The most important things last

- The networks have two lanes in each direction, that was done intentionally
- Cars are identical, but their preferred speed is drawn from a distribution with \( \text{speedDev} = 0.1 \)
- Vehicles drive stochastically, parameter sigma of the SK model is at SUMO’s default value (0.5)

⇒ Strong platoon dispersion, not unrealistic:

Taken from Gartner, Little, & Gabbay
Real-life speed distribution (Ernst-Ruska-Ufer, 2015)

- Data between 20…80 km/h (138 max!)
- Mean = median = 59 km/h (50 km/h SL)
- $\text{Sd} = 6 \text{ km/h} \implies \text{speedDev} = 0.1$
- Interquartile: 55…63 km/h

Next upstream signal: ~ 600 m

Sources: openstreetmap.org, own plot
Simulated Worlds (Parts of Cities) II

• All intersections have traffic lights
• All scenarios are grid-based, but with inhomogeneous grids
• Three main methods:
  • The Great Plan (in three versions)
  • Local control only (two versions, delay and actuated)
  • Local control with prediction (AGLOSA)
  • None

• Metrics for demand and delay in networks with different sizes:
  • Demand is inserted vehicles / network size (usually a.u.)
  • Delay is in seconds per vehicle per kilometer
Great Plan

• All TL are fixed cycles:
• SC: compute optimal splits (green times) and cycle times for each intersection
• (based on Webster’s theory)
• This depends on the demand at each intersection
• SCO: add co-ordination to this

• Sometimes: use SUMO’s default as comparison (it is a worse solution, since it does not know anything about demand)
Results
Example of a network (disturbed grids, 400 m)

- $4 \times 2$, $5 \times 3$, $6 \times 4$, $7 \times 5$, $10 \times 6$, $14 \times 8$
- with 5 repetitions and 19 different demands
Most general

- All networks, all demands, all repetitions
- Too much information
- Pick largest net only
Most general

- Actuated (actd) and delay are single intersection policies “SOTL light”
- fixX are Great Plans, with or without co-ordination
- General: SC is a good idea
- Co-ordination give slight improvements
- SOTL methods better, for all demands
Digging deeper, 5 x 3 network, details

• Fix: SUMO’s default (as worse as it gets)
• AGLOSA: is truly dealing with networks, too
• None: switch off all lights! ➔ a safety nightmare; a simulation deals with that easily.

• The rest
More real-world
Berlin Center

- Real-life network
- 120 traffic signals
- 242 km network length
- 190,000 trips,
- Real demand computed by an external tool
- Network is at the border of capacity
- 24 hour simulation, time-dependent demand
Results are similar…

• But not the same.
• Difference between fixed and Webster larger
• Small gains with co-ordination
• Small gains with actuation
Conclusion & Outlook

• Real world: the Great Plan seems to be underperforming (3% gain for co-ordination)
• Ideal case: w/o platoon dispersion, and highly idealized demand, it may have an edge
• If results apply to real life, then running all signals actuated yields smooth traffic in a city (18% / 25% with large dispersion)
• Can gain even more when using network-ready TLS like AGLOSA…
• Needs short-term prediction & planning & communication
Limitations / Remarks

• Each single scenario has one constant demand ➔ favors Great Plans
• The networks are topologically similar to real networks, but they lack their hierarchical structure
• There are better methods to optimize co-ordination, but most of them rely on the idealizations mentioned already
• Large networks are yet different, since they have to divided first in smaller ones

• Relation to this school: something in common with confined diffusion / diffusion in complex environments? Intersections are inhomogeneities. However, most examples I have seen here have a preferred direction; not exactly true for traffic.
Transportation planner’s curse

• But, you know: if you improve traffic signals, what will happen?
• You get even more traffic!

• Thank you for listening!