# Cheap Solutions to the Transport Problem 

We could use the transport network we have, to make journeys quicker for everyone!

The AMSI Workshop on Mathematics of Transportation Networks

## Rush Hour



Morning rush hour traffic


Early morning rush hour traffic

The term "rush hour" is out-of-date: morning traffic congestion in Melbourne lasts from 6:30 until 9:30am

The Age April 2012

## They say it's getting worse!



Estimates suggest that the cost of congestion to Victoria will rise from \$3 billion to \$6 billion by 2020.

## One Way to Relieve Congestion



## The Planned Solution



The Victorian Government has committed to funding the first stage of the 18 kilometre road, which has an estimated capital cost of between $\$ 6$ billion and $\$ 8$ billion.

## ...but which problem?



Traffic flowing in from the Eastern Freeway


Traffic flowing in from the Princes Freeway
"There's more votes in moving voters' cars than moving trucks,"

A new road will not solve the congestion problem

## Transport Demand based on BITRE Data

Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics (BITRE)

Australian major cities:
estimate of total annual vehicle kms


## Transport Demand based on BITRE Data

Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics (BITRE)
Total vehicle kms per capita


## The impact of new roads

- A new road can increase traffic
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## The impact of new roads

- A new road can increase traffic
- A new road can shift the congestion from one place to another

- It is even possible that without any increase in traffic a new road can make every single journey slower!


## Different Types of Roads

Most roads take longer when there is more traffic
Example:

| Cars per hour | 60 | 600 | 1200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Travel time | 10 | 15 | 30 |

Some roads are wide (or narrow) enough that the amount of traffic doesn't make much difference

Example:

| Cars per hour | 60 | 600 | 1200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Travel time | 10 | 10 | 10 |

## Braess' Paradox - How adding a road can make every journey slower

Imagine this road network:

Type 1

| Cars per <br> hour | 200 | 400 | Cars |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Travel <br> time | 20 | 40 | Cars <br> $/ 10$ |

## How long does it take to get from Start to End

Assume there are 400 cars per hour.
The journey time depends on how many drivers choose
Start $\rightarrow \mathrm{A} \rightarrow$ End and how many choose Start $\rightarrow \mathrm{B} \rightarrow$ End

| Scenario 1 | Cars |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start $\rightarrow A \rightarrow$ End | 400 |
| Start $\rightarrow B \rightarrow$ End | 0 |


| Scenario 1 | Cars | Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Start $\rightarrow A$ | 400 | 40 |
| $A \rightarrow$ End | $(400)$ | 45 |

## How long does it take to get from Start to End

Assume there are 400 cars per hour.
The journey time depends on how many drivers choose
Start $\rightarrow \mathrm{A} \rightarrow$ End and how many choose Start $\rightarrow \mathrm{B} \rightarrow$ End

| Scenario 1 | Cars | Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Start $\rightarrow A \rightarrow$ End | 400 | 85 |
| Start $\rightarrow B \rightarrow$ End | 0 | $(45)$ |


| Scenario 1 | Cars | Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Start $\rightarrow$ A | 400 | 40 |
| $A \rightarrow$ End | $(400)$ | 45 |

# How long does it take to get from Start to End 

Assume there are 400 cars per hour.

| Scenario 2 | Cars |
| :--- | :--- |
| Start $\rightarrow A \rightarrow$ End | 200 |
| Start $\rightarrow$ B $\rightarrow$ End | 200 |


| Scenario 2 | Cars | Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Start $\rightarrow$ A | 200 | 20 |
| A $\rightarrow$ End | $(200)$ | 45 |
| Start $\rightarrow$ B | $(200)$ | 45 |
| $B \rightarrow$ End | 200 | 20 |

# How long does it take to get from Start to End 

Assume there are 400 cars per hour.

| Scenario 2 | Cars | Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Start $\rightarrow$ A $\rightarrow$ End | 200 | 65 |
| Start $\rightarrow$ B $\rightarrow$ End | 200 | 65 |


| Scenario 2 | Cars | Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Start $\rightarrow$ A | 200 | 20 |
| A $\rightarrow$ End | $(200)$ | 45 |
| Start $\rightarrow$ B | $(200)$ | 45 |
| B $\rightarrow$ End | 200 | 20 |

## Driver Preference



Scenario1
Drivers can save time by switching:

|  | Route | Cars | Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Start $\rightarrow A \rightarrow$ End | 400 | 85 |
| 2 | Start $\rightarrow B \rightarrow$ End | 0 | $(45)$ |
|  | Change from route <br> 1 to route 2 | Time saved $=$ <br> $85-45=40$ |  |

Scenario2
No drivers can save time by switching:

|  | Route | Cars | Time |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Start $\rightarrow A \rightarrow$ End | 200 | 65 |
| 2 | Start $\rightarrow$ B $\rightarrow$ End | 200 | 65 |
|  | Change from <br> route 1 to route 2 | Time saved $=$ <br> $65-65=0$ |  |

## User Equilibrium

The long term traffic pattern is when all driver preferences are satisfied.

In this case, no car can reduce its journey time by switching to an alternative route


This holds in Scenario 2

## The New Road



## The New Road



Route1

## The New Road



Route2

## The New Road



## Route3

## Journey Times in Scenario 1



|  | Cars | Road | Cost | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route 1 | 400 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}$ | 40 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~A} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 45 | 85 |
| Route 2 | 0 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}$ | 45 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 0 |  |
| Route 3 | 0 | $\mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}$ | 40 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~A} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}$ | 1 | 41 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 0 |  |

## Journey Times in Scenario 1



|  | Cars | Road | Cost | Total | Switch | Saved | Choose |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route 1 | 400 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}$ | 40 |  | $\mathrm{R} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 2$ | 40 | Yes |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 45 | 85 | $\mathrm{R} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 3$ | 44 | Yes |  |
| Route 2 | 0 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}$ | 45 |  | $\mathrm{R} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 1$ | -40 | (No) | Not |
|  |  | $\mathrm{B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 0 | 45 | $\mathrm{R} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 3$ | 4 | (Yes) | User |
| Route 3 | 0 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}$ | 40 |  | $\mathrm{R} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 1$ | -44 | (No) | Equilibrium |
|  |  | $\mathrm{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{B}$ | 1 | 41 |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 0 |  | $\mathrm{R} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 2$ | -4 | (No) |  |  |

## Journey Times in Scenario 2



|  | Cars | Road | Cost | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route 1 | 200 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}$ | 20 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~A} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 45 | 65 |
| Route 2 | 200 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}$ | 45 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 20 | 65 |
| Route 3 | 0 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}$ | 20 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~A} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}$ | 1 | 41 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 20 |  |

## Journey Times in Scenario 2



|  | Cars | Road | Cost | Total | Switch | Saved | Choose |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 1 | 200 | $\mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}$ | 20 | 65 | $\mathrm{R} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 2$ | 0 | No | Not |
|  |  | $A \rightarrow E$ | 45 |  | $\mathrm{R} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 3$ | 24 | Yes |  |
| Route 2 | 200 | $S \rightarrow B$ | 45 | 65 | $\mathrm{R} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 1$ | 0 | No | User |
|  |  | $B \rightarrow E$ | 20 |  | $\mathrm{R} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 3$ | 24 | Yes | Equilibrium |
| Route 3 | 0 | $\mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}$ | 20 | 41 | R3 $\rightarrow$ R1 | -24 | (No) |  |
|  |  | $A \rightarrow B$ | 1 |  | $\mathrm{R} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 2$ | -24 | (No) |  |
|  |  | $B \rightarrow E$ | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Journey Times in Scenario 3



|  | Cars | Road | Cost | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route 1 | 100 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}$ | 30 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~A} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 45 | 75 |
| Route 2 | 100 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}$ | 45 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 30 | 75 |
| Route 3 | 200 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}$ | 30 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~A} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}$ | 1 | 61 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 30 |  |

## Journey Times in Scenario 3



|  | Cars | Road | Cost | Total | Switch | Saved | Choose |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 1 | 100 | $\mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}$ | 30 | 75 | $\mathrm{R} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 2$ | 0 | (No) |  |
|  |  | $A \rightarrow E$ | 45 |  | $\mathrm{R} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 3$ | 14 | (Yes) |  |
| Route 2 | 100 | $S \rightarrow B$ | 45 | 75 | $\mathrm{R} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 1$ | 0 | (No) | Equilibrium |
|  |  | $B \rightarrow E$ | 30 |  | $\mathrm{R} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 3$ | 14 | (Yes) |  |
| Route 3 | 200 | $S \rightarrow A$ | 30 | 61 | $\mathrm{R} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 1$ | -4 | No |  |
|  |  | $A \rightarrow B$ | 1 |  | $\mathrm{R} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 2$ | -4 | No |  |
|  |  | $B \rightarrow E$ | 30 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Journey Times in Scenario 3



|  | Cars | Road | Cost | Total |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Route 1 | 0 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}$ | 40 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~A} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 45 | 85 |
| Route 2 | 0 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}$ | 45 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 40 | 85 |
| Route 3 | 400 | $\mathrm{~S} \rightarrow \mathrm{~A}$ | 40 |  |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~A} \rightarrow \mathrm{~B}$ | 1 | 81 |
|  |  | $\mathrm{~B} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 40 |  |

## Journey Times in Scenario 3



|  | Cars | Road | Cost | Total | Switch | Saved | Choose |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 1 | 0 | $\mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}$ | 40 | 85 | $\mathrm{R} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 2$ | 0 | (No) |
|  |  | $\mathrm{A} \rightarrow \mathrm{E}$ | 45 |  | $\mathrm{R} 1 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 3$ | 4 | (Yes) |
| Route 2 | 0 | $S \rightarrow B$ | 45 | 85 | $\mathrm{R} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 1$ | 0 | (No) |
|  |  | $B \rightarrow E$ | 40 |  | $\mathrm{R} 2 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 3$ | 4 | (Yes) |
| Route 3 | 400 | $\mathrm{S} \rightarrow \mathrm{A}$ | 40 | 81 | $\mathrm{R} 3 \rightarrow \mathrm{R} 1$ | -4 | No |
|  |  | $A \rightarrow B$ | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $B \rightarrow E$ | 40 |  |  | -4 |  |

> User
> Equilibrium

## Braess' Paradox

- Without New Road


Long Term Traffic Pattern User Equilibrium
Every journey has time 65

- With New Road


Long Term Traffic Pattern User Equilibrium
Every journey has time 81

## Lesson for non-mathematical decision makers

Adding new infrastructure doesn't necessarily relieve congestion -
sometimes it can make things worse!


## We could use the transport network we have, to make journeys quicker for everyone.

- Improved signals at traffic junctions
- Coordinated vehicle routing
- Improved public transport
- Communication
- vehicle to vehicle
- vehicle to roadside
- Integrated Freight Transport
- Automated vehicle control


## Improving Signals at Traffic Lights

## Impact of Monash Ramp Signals



## Impact of Monash Ramp Signals



Monash Freeway October 2007


Monash Freeway October 2008

Crashes reduced by 30\%
Average travel speeds increased by $25.9 \%$ from 48.9 km to $66 \mathrm{~km} / \mathrm{h}$ in peak hour traffic

Veh/hr/lane capacity increased from 1500 towards 2000

## We could use the transport network we have, to make journeys quicker for everyone.

- Improved signals at traffic junctions
- Coordinated vehicle routing
- Improved public transport
- Communication
- vehicle to vehicle
- vehicle to roadside
- Integrated Freight Transport
- Automated vehicle control


## Coordinated Vehicle Routing



Ordinary Navigatio

## Coordinated Vehicle Routing

- Notify the coordinated navigation system when you start a journey
- The system knows where it has sent others cars and sends yours a different route
- Claimed results show that, on average, cars taking Greenway routes make it to their destination twice as fast and use up to 20 percent less fuel.
- About $10 \%$ of drivers in a city would need to have it running for it to work optimally.



## We could use the transport network we have, to make journeys quicker for everyone.

- Improved signals at traffic junctions
- Coordinated vehicle routing
- Improved public transport
- Communication
- vehicle to vehicle
- vehicle to roadside
- Automated vehicle control
- Integrated Freight Transport


## Improved Public Transport

- Two big reasons for public transport
- Reduce congestion
- Reduce pollution
- Curitiba, Brazil
- The Bus Rapid Transport System plays a large part in making this a livable city.
- The buses run frequently-some every 90 seconds-and reliably
- the stations are convenient, comfortable, and attractive.
- Consequently, Curitiba has one
 of the most heavily used, yet low-cost, transit systems in the world.


## Improved Public Transport

## The problem

## The Pollution Cost of Congestion

## Improved Public Transport Estimates for Melbourne from BZE

- BZE has outlined a coherent bus network covering Melbourne
- Buses come every 10 minutes at every stop
- This would only need a doubling of the current bus fleet
- If public transport increased from $10 \%$ to $20 \%$ of trips in Melbourne
- This would save 200,000,000 litres of fuel per year
- This translates to $\mathbf{5 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ tons of CO2 per year


## Improved Public Transport

- If all users specified when and where they wanted to go
- trains and buses could be delayed when passengers need a connection
- when a connection is missed, bus and train schedules could be adapted to minimise passenger disruption
- each passenger would be advised of their new route


## Minimising Passenger Disruption on the Sandringham Line



## Minimising Passenger Disruption on the Sandringham Line



## Improved Public Transport

- If all users specified when and where they wanted to go
- currently - bus request stops
- instead some bus routes could require passengers to communicate their request



## Improved Public Transport

- If all users specified when and where they wanted to go
- currently - bus request stops
- instead some bus routes could require passengers to communicate their request



## We could use the transport network we have, to make journeys quicker for everyone.

- Improved signals at traffic junctions
- Coordinated vehicle routing
- Improved public transport
- Communication
- vehicle to vehicle
- vehicle to roadside
- Automated vehicle control
- Integrated Freight Transport


## Vehicle Communication

- Vehicle Communication Supports Safety
- "Vehicles that don't crash" (University of Michigan)
- Address approximately $80 \%$ of the crash scenarios
- Vehicle to Vehicle Warnings
- merging trucks,
- cars in the driver's blind side,
- a vehicle ahead brakes suddenly.

- Vehicle to Roadside
- entering school zone
- workers are on the side of the road
- upcoming traffic light is about to change.



## Vehicle Communication



## We could use the transport network we have, to make journeys quicker for everyone.

- Improved signals at traffic junctions
- Coordinated vehicle routing
- Improved public transport
- Communication
- vehicle to vehicle
- vehicle to roadside
- Automated vehicle control
- Integrated Freight Transport


## Automated Vehicle Control

- Platooning



## Automated Vehicle Control

- Individual



## We could use the transport network we have, to make journeys quicker for everyone.

- Improved signals at traffic junctions
- Coordinated vehicle routing
- Improved public transport
- Communication
- vehicle to vehicle
- vehicle to roadside
- Automated vehicle control
- Integrated Freight Transport


## Integrated Freight Transport

## Travelling Salesman Solution



## Integrated Freight Transport

## Another Travelling Salesman Solution

## Integrated Freight Transport

Two Travelling Salesman Solutions

## Integrated Freight Transport

City Logistics Solution

## Cheap Solutions to the Transport Problem

- Improved signals at traffic junctions - 20\%
- Coordinated vehicle routing -20\%
- Improved public transport -10\%
- Communication -50\%
- Automated vehicle control -30\%
- Integrated Freight Transport -30\%


## Cheap Solutions to the Transport Problem

- Improved signals at traffic junctions - 20\% on freeways
- Coordinated vehicle routing - 20\% cars on urban roads
- Improved public transport
- Communication
- Automated vehicle control
- Integrated Freight Transport
-10\% cars on urban roads
- $50 \%$ at traffic junctions
- $30 \%$ on multi-lane roads
- $30 \%$ freight on urban roads


## Cheap Solutions to the Transport Problem

- Improved signals at traffic junctions - $20 \%$ on freeways
- Coordinated vehicle routing
- Improved public transport
- Communication
- Automated vehicle control
- Integrated Freight Transport
- 20\% cars on urban roads
-10\% cars on urban roads
- 50\% at traffic junctions
- $30 \%$ on multi-lane roads
- 30\% freight on urban roads

Total potential reduction on urban roads:
(Freight*0.7 + Cars*0.8*0.9) / (Freight+Cars) $=0.7$
Congestion could be reduced to $2 / 3$ of its current level

