Cell Transmission Model and Calibrating LWR models

CE 391F

February 12, 2013

CTM, comparison, and calibration

REVIEW

• Cell transmission model

CELL TRANSMISSION MODEL: FORMULAS

Remember, in CTM we iterate between calculating all of the y values using current n values, then updating the n values using the y values. Because these computations are separable, CTM is readly parallelized.



For the trapezoidal fundamental diagram, we derived the formula

$$y = \min\{n, q_{max}\Delta t, (w/v)(N-n)\}$$

But y is measured *between* the cells and n and N are measured at a cell. Which cells do we pick?

The *n* term corresponds to uncongested flow; so it should depend on the *upstream* cell.

The *n* term corresponds to uncongested flow; so it should depend on the *upstream* cell.

The (w/v)(N - n) term corresponds to congested flow; so it should depend on the *downstream* cell.

The *n* term corresponds to uncongested flow; so it should depend on the *upstream* cell.

The (w/v)(N - n) term corresponds to congested flow; so it should depend on the *downstream* cell.

The q_{max} term is a bit odd, since it corresponds to stationary characteristics. However, the capacity values of both the upstream and downstream cells will limit the flow at their boundary.

The *n* term corresponds to uncongested flow; so it should depend on the *upstream* cell.

The (w/v)(N - n) term corresponds to congested flow; so it should depend on the *downstream* cell.

The q_{max} term is a bit odd, since it corresponds to stationary characteristics. However, the capacity values of both the upstream and downstream cells will limit the flow at their boundary.

Thus

$$y_{ij} = \min\{n_i, q_{max}^i \Delta t, q_{max}^j \Delta t, (w/v)(N_j - n_j)\}$$

When dealing with fancier fundamental diagrams, we use the same approach: the increasing portion of the fundamental diagram is taken from the upstream cell, the decreasing portion of the fundamental diagram is taken from the downstream cell. When dealing with fancier fundamental diagrams, we use the same approach: the increasing portion of the fundamental diagram is taken from the upstream cell, the decreasing portion of the fundamental diagram is taken from the downstream cell.

This idea is often cast in terms of "sending flow" and "receiving flow." The sending flow represents what the upstream cell can send, the receiving flow what the downstream cell can receive. When dealing with fancier fundamental diagrams, we use the same approach: the increasing portion of the fundamental diagram is taken from the upstream cell, the decreasing portion of the fundamental diagram is taken from the downstream cell.

This idea is often cast in terms of "sending flow" and "receiving flow." The sending flow represents what the upstream cell can send, the receiving flow what the downstream cell can receive.

The *actual* flow is the minimum of the two.

The *sending flow* of a cell is the number of vehicles that would *leave* the cell if connected to an infinite reservoir downstream:

$$S_i(t) = \min\{n_i(t), q_{max}^i\}\Delta t$$

for a trapezoidal fundamental diagram

The *sending flow* of a cell is the number of vehicles that would *leave* the cell if connected to an infinite reservoir downstream:

$$S_i(t) = \min\{n_i(t), q_{max}^i\}\Delta t$$

for a trapezoidal fundamental diagram

$$S_i(t) = egin{cases} Q_i(n_i(t)/\Delta x)\Delta t & n_i(t) \leq k_c\Delta x \ q^i_{max} & k_c > \Delta x \end{cases}$$

more generally, where k_c is the critical density.

The *receiving flow* of a cell is the number of vehicles that would *enter* the cell if connected to an infinite reservoir upstream:

$$R_i(t) = \min\{(w/v)(N_j - n_j(t), q_{max}^j\}\Delta t\}$$

for a trapezoidal fundamnetal diagram

The *receiving flow* of a cell is the number of vehicles that would *enter* the cell if connected to an infinite reservoir upstream:

$$R_i(t) = \min\{(w/v)(N_j - n_j(t), q_{max}^j\}\Delta t\}$$

for a trapezoidal fundamnetal diagram

$$R_i(t) = egin{cases} Q_i(n_i(t)/\Delta x)\Delta t & n_i(t) \geq k_c\Delta x \ q^i_{max} & k_c < \Delta x \end{cases}$$

more generally.

The *receiving flow* of a cell is the number of vehicles that would *enter* the cell if connected to an infinite reservoir upstream:

$$R_i(t) = \min\{(w/v)(N_j - n_j(t), q_{max}^j\}\Delta t\}$$

for a trapezoidal fundamnetal diagram

$$R_i(t) = egin{cases} Q_i(n_i(t)/\Delta x)\Delta t & n_i(t) \geq k_c\Delta x \ q^i_{max} & k_c < \Delta x \end{cases}$$

more generally.

Thus, $y_{ij}(t) = \min\{S_i(t), R_j(t)\}$

EXAMPLE

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES

Some major advantage of the cell transmission model:

- It is very easy to have nonhomogeneous fundamental diagrams, and many types of boundary conditions orf lows
- It works very well as part of a simulator
- It is relatively simple and transparent

One disadvantage is *shock spreading*.

COMPARISON OF LWR-BASED METHODS

- Works well when there are large regions of constant density (steady inflow rates, homogeneous fundamental diagram, etc.)
- Can be tricky when there are multiple or complex boundary conditions.

- Works well when you only need output data at selected points, and when the fundamental diagram is triangular
- Can be tricky when the fundamnetal diagram is nonhomogeneous, and tedious if you need output data at many points

Daganzo's method

- Works well when you need output data at many points, and when the fundamental diagram is piecewise linear
- Can be harder to incorporate into a simulation model; graphical methods may be harder to automate

Cell transmission model

- Simple and transparent, can handle complex fundamental diagrams or boundary conditions
- "Shock spreading," no general conditions for sufficiency, can be difficult to model moving bottlenecks

CALIBRATING LWR MODELS

How would you measure speed, flow, and density?

Be cautious where you collect data!





The (in)famous Greenshields relationship



This data was collected by Greenshields on Labor Day in 1934, and was the basis of practice (and HCM) for roughly five decades.

This data was collected by Greenshields on Labor Day in 1934, and was the basis of practice (and HCM) for roughly five decades.

This work is seminal, but infamous. Why infamous?

- Data collected on a one-lane road, not a freeway
- Vehicles were counted in "overlapping" groups of 100
- Some averaging occurred prior to regression
- The lone congested point was collected on a different roadway on a different day
- Model based on holiday traffic rather than regular commuters

The Greenberg model



Collected in the (one-lane!) Lincoln Tunnel in 1959, based on a logarithmic fit to data

CTM, comparison, and calibration

Highway Capacity Manual



Notice constant speeds for low flow rates, and that the "congested" piece isn't shown.

CTM, comparison, and calibration