

Public Transit Routing with Unrestricted Walking

Dorothea Wagner and Tobias Zündorf

ATMOS · September 7th, 2017

INSTITUTE OF THEORETICAL INFORMATICS · ALGORITHMICS GROUP



www.kit.edu

Overview



Introduction:

- Problem Statement
- State of the Art

Our Contribution:

- Our Profile Algorithm
- Direct Walking

Evaluation:

- Instances & Experimental Setup
- Runtime Performance
- Travel Time Comparison





Public Transit Routing:

Given:

- Stops (where vehicles can be entered or alighted)
- The timetable (routes, trips, connections)
- Footpaths (possible transfers between stops)
 Goal:
 - Optimal journey between two stops
 - With respect to travel time, number of transfers, ...





Public Transit Routing:

Given:

- Stops (where vehicles can be entered or alighted)
- The timetable (routes, trips, connections)
- Footpaths (possible transfers between stops)
 Goal:
 - Optimal journey between two stops
 - With respect to travel time, number of transfers, ...







Public Transit Routing:

Given:

- Stops (where vehicles can be entered or alighted)
- The timetable (routes, trips, connections)
- Footpaths (possible transfers between stops)
 Goal:
 - Optimal journey between two stops
 - With respect to travel time, number of transfers, ...

Question:

- How many footpaths are needed?
- How are travel times affected by different footpaths?





Public Transit Routing:

Given:

- Stops (where vehicles can be entered or alighted)
- The timetable (routes, trips, connections)
- Footpaths (possible transfers between stops)
 Goal:
 - Optimal journey between two stops
 - With respect to travel time, number of transfers, ...

Question:

- How many footpaths are needed?
- How are travel times affected by different footpaths?





Public Transit Routing:

Given:

- Stops (where vehicles can be entered or alighted)
- The timetable (routes, trips, connections)
- Footpaths (possible transfers between stops)
 Goal:
 - Optimal journey between two stops
 - With respect to travel time, number of transfers, ...

Question:

- How many footpaths are needed?
- How are travel times affected by different footpaths?





Related Work



State of the Art:

- Many different footpath models
- Often require restrictions

Common Restrictions:

Algorithm	Footpaths
RAPTOR [Delling et al. '12/'14]	Transitively closed
CSA [Dibbelt et al. '13/'14]	Transitively closed
Trip-Based Routing [Witt '15]	Transitively closed
Transfer Patterns [Bast et al. '10/'16]	Max. 400 meters
Frequency-Based [Bast, Storandt '14]	Max. 15 minutes
Public Transit Labeling [Delling et al. '15]	As specified by the timetable



Reasons for Restricted Walking



Common Arguments:

- Passengers do not want to walk far
- Restricted walking is sufficient for optimal solutions



Reasons for Restricted Walking



Common Arguments:

- Passengers do not want to walk far
- Restricted walking is sufficient for optimal solutions

But:

- Some passengers might want to walk far
- Decision is made without knowing how much walking is required
- I has not been proven how much walking is required



How to Evaluate the Importance of Walking



Important Aspect:

- Departure time (day vs. night)
- Query distance (short range vs. long range)
- Source and target location (rural vs. urban)



How to Evaluate the Importance of Walking



Important Aspect:

- Departure time (day vs. night)
- Query distance (short range vs. long range)
- Source and target location (rural vs. urban)

Thus, we need:

- Profile algorithms (analyze travel times for a whole day)
- Realistic queries for several source to target distances
- Instances with different amounts of footpaths



Profiles & Profile Algorithms



Definition:

• Function mapping departure time to either travel time or arrival time







Profiles & Profile Algorithms



Definition:

• Function mapping departure time to either travel time or arrival time



Profile Algorithms for Unrestricted Walking:

- Most algorithms are not suitable for unrestricted walking
- Multimodal Multicriteria RAPTOR (MCR) [Delling et al. '13]
 - Can handle arbitrary walking
 - Only earliest arrival queries



Profiles – RAPTOR & MCR



MCR Profile Algorithm?:

- MCR is based on RAPTOR
- RAPTOR can be used to compute profiles (rRAPTOR)
- Why does this not work for MCR?



Profiles – RAPTOR & MCR



MCR Profile Algorithm?:

- MCR is based on RAPTOR
- RAPTOR can be used to compute profiles (rRAPTOR)
- Why does this not work for MCR?

rRAPTOR Profile Query: (rough outline)

- Profile entires are limited by number of trips departing from source
- Collect all departure times at the source
- Run RAPTOR once for every departure time



Profiles – RAPTOR & MCR



MCR Profile Algorithm?:

- MCR is based on RAPTOR
- RAPTOR can be used to compute profiles (rRAPTOR)
- Why does this not work for MCR?

rRAPTOR Profile Query: (rough outline)

- Profile entires are limited by number of trips departing from source
- Collect all departure times at the source
- Run RAPTOR once for every departure time

Problem with direct walking / MCR:

- Passenger can walk to arbitrary stop before boarding the first trip
- Every departure time needs to be considered
 - \Rightarrow To many calls of RAPTOR



Our Algorithm



Goal:

- Use earliest arrival algorithm as black box (MCR)
- Earliest arrival algorithm computes single profile entry
- Number of algorithm calls pprox number of profile entries



Our Algorithm



Goal:

- Use earliest arrival algorithm as black box (MCR)
- Earliest arrival algorithm computes single profile entry
- Number of algorithm calls pprox number of profile entries

Overview:

- Establish profile one entry at a time
- Use two black box calls per entry (forward + backward)
 - Start with earliest possible departure
 - Forward query \Rightarrow earliest possible arrival
 - Backward query \Rightarrow latest possible departure for that arrival
 - Continue with latest possible departure $+ \epsilon$





Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval [0:00, 24:00]







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval [0:00, 24:00]

Step 1: Run a forward query from the earliest departure time (0:00)







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval [0:00, 24:00]

Step 2: Run a backward query from the resulting arrival time (8:00)







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval [0:00, 24:00]

Step 3: Both results define one point of the profile







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval [0:00, 24:00]

Step 4: The profile is correct for the interval [0:00, 4:00]







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (4:00, 24:00]

Step 1: Run a forward query from the earliest departure time $(4:00 + \varepsilon)$







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (4:00, 24:00]

Step 2: Run a backward query from the resulting arrival time (11:00)







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (4:00, 24:00]

Step 3: Both results define one point of the profile







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (4:00, 24:00]

Step 4: The profile is correct for the interval [0:00, 7:00]







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (7:00, 24:00]

Step 1: Run a forward query from the earliest departure time $(7:00 + \varepsilon)$







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (7:00, 24:00]

End: The algorithm terminates when the profile is complete







Problem:

Direct walking prevents progress







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (4:00, 24:00]

Step 1: Run a forward query from the earliest departure time $(4:00 + \varepsilon)$







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (4:00, 24:00]

Step 2: Run a backward query from the resulting arrival time (10:00)







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (4:00, 24:00]

Step 3: Both results define one point of the profile







Goal:

Compute a profile for the interval (4:00, 24:00]

Step 4: The profile is still only correct for the interval [0:00, 4:00]







Problem:

Direct walking prevents progress

Solution: Compute profile in network without direct walking & Add direct Walking path to the solution afterwards





Evaluation

Instances:

- Germany (from bahn.de)
- Switzerland (GTFS feed)
- Footpath graph from
 OpenStreetMap (OSM)



PT network	Footpaths	Stops	Vertices	Edges	Connections	Max. deg.
Germany	original	244 245	244 245	95 036	46 119 896	18
	partial	244 245	244 245	26 193 136	46 119 896	2622
	complete	244 245	6 876 758	21 382 408	46 119 896	21
Switzerland	original	25 427	25 427	5 604	4 373 268	25
	partial	25 427	25 427	3 104 974	4 373 268	1 246
	complete	25 427	604 230	1 844 286	4 373 268	25



Evaluation – Partial Instances



Goal:

- Preserve paths between stops up to a certain walking time
- Obtain a transitively closed graph of reasonable size





Evaluation – Partial Instances



Goal:

- Preserve paths between stops up to a certain walking time
- Obtain a transitively closed graph of reasonable size
- Reasonable size pprox average vertex degree \leq 100
 - \Rightarrow Switzerland 15 min walking
 - \Rightarrow Germany 8 min walking





Evaluation – Queries



Problem:

- Random queries do not reflect reality
- Could result in an overestimation of the importance of walking
- Real queries are not available



Evaluation – Queries



Problem:

- Random queries do not reflect reality
- Could result in an overestimation of the importance of walking
- Real queries are not available

Assumption:

■ Stop is often used as source/target ⇔ Stop is part of many trips

Our Queries:

- Choose source at random
- Probability is proportional to number of trips containing the stop
- Choose target at random from stops with certain distance rank



Evaluation – Running Time



Run time comparison:

- Switzerland public transit network
- Computation of Pareto-profiles (travel time, number of transfers)
- CSA for the transitively closed instances
- Our algorithm for the complete instance







- Switzerland complete vs. Switzerland original (Distance rank 16)
- ----- Average travel time (complete)







- Switzerland complete vs. Switzerland original (Distance rank 16)
- ---- Average travel time (complete) ---- Average travel time (original)







Travel time comparison:

- Switzerland complete vs. Switzerland original (Distance rank 16)
- ---- Average travel time (complete) ---- Average travel time (original)

----- Median of travel time difference







- Switzerland complete vs. Switzerland original (Distance rank 16)
- Average travel time (complete)
- ----- Median of travel time difference
- Average travel time (original)
- Interquartile range of travel time diff.







- Switzerland complete vs. Switzerland original (Distance rank 16)
- Average travel time (complete)
- ----- Median of travel time difference
- ----- Percentage of differing travel times
- Average travel time (original)
- Interquartile range of travel time diff.







- Switzerland complete vs. Switzerland original (Distance rank 16)
- Average travel time (complete)
- ----- Median of travel time difference
- ••••• Percentage of differing travel times
- Average travel time (original)
- Interquartile range of travel time diff.
- ----- Percentage with difference > 1h







- Switzerland complete vs. Switzerland partial (Distance rank 16)
- Average travel time (complete)
- ----- Median of travel time difference
- ••••• Percentage of differing travel times
- ----- Average travel time (original)
- Interquartile range of travel time diff.
- •••••• Percentage with difference > 1h





Conclusion



Results:

- New public transit profile algorithm for unrestricted walking
- Detailed comparison of common footpath graphs
- Walking has a strong influence on the travel time
- Footpaths specified in the timetable are not sufficient

Future work:

- Initial and final walking vs. walking between trips
- More efficient algorithms for unrestricted walking



Conclusion



Results:

- New public transit profile algorithm for unrestricted walking
- Detailed comparison of common footpath graphs
- Walking has a strong influence on the travel time
- Footpaths specified in the timetable are not sufficient

Future work:

- Initial and final walking vs. walking between trips
- More efficient algorithms for unrestricted walking

Thank you for your attention!

