Modeling Strategic Route Choice and Real-Time Information Impacts in Stochastic and Time-Dependent Networks

Song Gao

Abstract—This paper establishes a general framework to study the impacts of real-time information on the users' routing decisions and the system cost in a stochastic time-dependent traffic network under a generalized equilibrium condition. Users are assumed to make strategic routing decisions, and the rule that maps a user's current state, including node, time, and information, to a decision on the next node to take, is defined as a routing policy. This definition allows for a wide variety of information accessibility situations, thus excluding the usually simplified assumptions, such as either no information or full information. A user's choice set contains routing policies rather than simple paths. A fixed–point problem formulation of the user equilibrium is given, and a method of successive average heuristic is designed. Computational tests are carried out in a hypothetical network, where random incidents are the source of stochasticity. System costs derived from three models with different information accessibility situations are compared. The strategic route choices lead to shorter expected travel times at equilibrium. Smaller travel time variances are obtained as a byproduct. The value of real-time information is an increasing function of the incident probability. However, it is not a monotonic function of the market penetration of information, which suggests that in designing a traveler information system or route guidance system, the information penetration needs to be chosen carefully to maximize benefits.

Index Terms—Advanced traveler information system (ATIS), dynamic traffic assignment (DTA), routing policy, stochastic time-dependent (STD) network, strategic route choice.

I. INTRODUCTION

TRAFFIC networks are inherently uncertain with random disturbances such as incidents, bad weather, work zone, and fluctuating demand, which create significant congestion and unreliability. According to the 2009 Urban Mobility Report of the Texas Transportation Institute [1], such random disturbances account for more than 50% of all delays on roads and the associated wasted fuel and emissions. Meanwhile, with the fast development of sensor and telecommunication technologies, real-time information is increasingly available for travelers to make potentially better decisions in such an uncertain system. There are various mechanisms for providing real-time infor-

mation differing in the spatial and temporal availabilities, the quality, and the format of information provided, e.g., variable message signs (VMS), websites, radio, traveler information call centers, and in-vehicle communication systems connected to traffic management centers and/or other vehicles. It follows that in formulating traveler information related research problems, information should be an explicit part so that traditional simplified assumptions such as full or no information can be avoided.

The travelers' route choices in a stochastic network with real-time information are conceivably different from those in a deterministic network. It is generally believed that flexible route choices that adapt to network conditions will save travel time and enhance travel time reliability. For example, in a network with random incidents, if one simply sticks to his/her habitual route, s/he could be stuck in the incident link for a very long time. However, if adequate information is available about the incident and the traveler makes use of it and takes a detour, s/he can save travel time. The detour also helps reduce the prohibitively high travel time in an incident situation and thus provides more reliable travel time.

We distinguish between two types of responses to real-time information: 1) reactive and 2) strategic. The literature saw a large body of studies on diversion or compliance under information (e.g., at a VMS), yet the modeled adaptation behavior is basically reactive, meaning that the travelers' decisions before arriving at a VMS do not consider the fact that the VMS will provide updated traffic conditions in the future. In reality, travelers might decide to acquire information as long as there is a reasonable prospect of reward from it [2]. Therefore, the fact that a branch of the network has a VMS installed could make it more attractive even before the traveler arrives at the VMS location. A strategic traveler, in this case, is one that considers the availability of information in all later decision stages and not just the current one. Recent empirical studies with computer-based or driving simulator-based experiments show that travelers can make strategic route choices [3], [4].

The problem of optimal strategic routing decision making for an individual traveler has been studied by various researchers [5]–[13], and a recent literature review can be found in [12]. A general conclusion from the foregoing studies is that in a flow-independent stochastic time-dependent (STD) network, an individual user's travel objective function value (e.g., expected time, expected schedule delay, and variance) from following optimal strategic routing decisions is no higher than that from following an optimal fixed path.

After understanding how an individual traveler makes strategic routing decisions, another research question arises: What will be the network-level impact if many travelers make strategic routing decisions? The demand–supply interaction in a stochastic dynamic network needs to be captured to answer the question. This interaction in a deterministic network (with possible perception errors from the demand side) is captured by a conventional dynamic traffic assignment (DTA) model. A comprehensive literature review on DTA can be found in [14].

We give a brief overview of the development of user equilibrium traffic assignment models regarding the modeling of stochasticity. Early developments addressed stochasticity in static traffic assignment methods. In [15] the concept of stochastic user equilibrium (SUE) is established; in a SUE network, no user believes that he can improve his travel time by unilaterally changing routes. In other words, users have random perception errors of the true travel times. A "large sample" approximation is used such that the proportion of travelers that take a given path is equal to its probability to be chosen by an individual traveler. In a later paper [16], the SUE problem with flow-dependent link costs is studied with a proof of convergence. These early works are extended later in two directions of modeling stochasticity. The first direction is to abandon the "large sample" assumption and treat the flows (path or link) as random variables, either in an equilibrium or day-to-day stochastic process context [17]–[23]. The other direction is to add more sources of stochasticity by treating the underlying travel times, capacities, and/or origin–destination (OD) trips as random [24]–[29].

This paper establishes a DTA model where users make strategic route choices in response to real-time information in a STD network with correlated link travel times. A routing policy is defined as a decision rule that specifies what node to take next out of the current node based on the current time and real-time information, essentially a mapping from network states to decisions on the next nodes. A routing policy can manifest itself as different paths, depending on the underlying stochastic process that drives a traffic network. A path is purely topological and is a special case of a routing policy, where any decision on the next node is not dependent on the current time or real-time information. A detailed description of the routing policy is provided in Section III-A.

A similar concept is called "strategy" in the literature of transit assignment. A strategy consists of a rule that assigns to each decision node a set of outgoing arcs, probably sorted in preference order (the so-called "attractive lines"). A traveler follows the first available arc from the preference set. Early studies assume flow-independent probabilities in accessing attractive lines [30]–[32].

In [33], a strategic model for DTA as an extension to the static model studied by [34] in proposed. The models assume hard arc capacity constraints and holding of traffic, which is suitable for transit networks, but might not be for a traffic network. The randomness in travel times comes from the fact that if the demand for a given arc exceeds its hard capacity, then a given traveler might not be able to access the arc and has to use another arc. No external random events such as incidents or demand fluctuations are modeled. This could limit

the model's ability to assess an advanced traveler information system (ATIS), which usually plays an important role when random events happen.

Strategic assignment studies in a traffic network, to the best of our knowledge, have been restricted in static networks, e.g., [35] and [36]. Both studies assume limited spatial stochastic dependency, and that users learn the realized conditions of outgoing links upon reaching a node. Reference [35] assumes that the revealed information is on link travel times and uses a sequential Logit model similar to [37] to do the loading, and a method of successive average (MSA) is used to solve the equilibrium problem. In [36], it is assumed that the revealed information is on link capacities, formulates a mathematical programming problem, and uses an adapted Frank–Wolfe solution algorithm.

The routing policy-based DTA model in this paper is the first research endeavor on assigning strategic travelers onto congested, stochastic, and time-dependent traffic networks by integrating three major components: 1) optimal routing policy generation [12]; 2) routing policy choice model [38]; and 3) routing policy loading model. It contributes to the state of the art through the following novel features of the integrated DTA model.

1) Users' choice sets comprise routing policies rather than paths to model the travelers' strategic route choices. The strategic choices are dependent on the time of day and information on realized flow-dependent link travel times, with possible spatial and temporal limitations (e.g., the travel time information on a congested bridge provided by a VMS has spatial limitations as it covers the bridge, and not the whole network, and it also has temporal limitations in the sense that it is not up to date). The usual simplified assumptions of no information or full information are avoided. The encapsulation of real-time information in the definition of a routing policy makes the general framework naturally suitable to handle heterogeneous information access situations over users.
2) Link- and time-wise stochastic dependencies of link travel times (which are prominent in reality) are modeled by treating the link travel times as jointly distributed time-dependent random variables.
3) The equilibrium is in terms of probabilistic distributions of time-dependent link travel times and path flows. In other words, the traveler's route choices are stable under equilibrium in the sense of a stable distribution, rather than stable fixed values.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we give an illustrative example to motivate the development of a routing policy-based DTA model. In Section III, the strategic user equilibrium problem is defined, and a conceptual framework is introduced with a fixed-point formulation of the equilibrium problem. Section IV presents MSA as a solution heuristic to the equilibrium problem. In Section V, computational tests are set up to study the behavior of the proposed model and compare it with models that do not consider strategic route choices.

Throughout this paper, a symbol with a $\sim$ over it is a random variable, whereas the same symbol without the $\sim$ is one specific

Fig. 1.   Illustrative example.

realization of the random variable. A "support point" is defined as a distinct value (vector of values) that a discrete random variable (vector) can take. A probability mass function (PMF) of a random variable (vector) is thus a combination of support points and the associated probabilities.

II. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

We use an illustrative example to explain some of the key concepts, give the motivation for the research, and provide some insights into the routing policy-based assignment problem. The example is simplified in the following aspects: 1) The network is static; 2) a link performance function is used to describe the congestion effect rather than a more realistic network loading model, such as that used in the computational tests; and 3) the information available to travelers is not expressed as link travel time realizations as later formally defined, but the occurrence of an incident for the sake of convenience. Note that an equivalent representation of the information in terms of realized link travel times is available. We use the following notation:

a index for link;
i index for routing policy (including path);
x_a flow on link a;
f_i flow on routing policy (path) i;
$C_a(x_a)$ link travel time as a function of flow on link a;
e_i expected travel time of routing policy i.

The network is shown in Fig. 1 with four links and one OD pair with a demand of 16. We can view link 1 as an arterial road, link 2 a connector to the highway link 3, and link 4 a detour to the highway. Three paths are available: 1) path 1 composed of link 1; 2) path 2 composed of links 2 and 3; and 3) path 3 composed of links 2 and 4.

Link 3 has a random travel time function, whose coefficient is normally 0.2, but can be 27.4 one out of four times due to, for example, an incident. Real-time information is provided at the source node of link 3 to indicate whether an incident has occurred and allows travelers opportunities to divert to link 4.

Evaluation of the impacts of such an information system requires modeling of the travelers' route choices and the resulting network-wide performance under the incident with the real-time information. A common approach in the literature and practice is to do an equilibrium traffic assignment from the origin based on the three paths, and for travelers who reach the intermediate information node, a route switching model is then applied to redistribute the flows based on the incident and information. An implicit assumption of this approach is

that travelers simply react to the information on the spot and cannot plan ahead. We will label this type of traffic assignment as reactive in the following discussion.

Depending on whether the potential incident is accounted for when the traffic assignment is performed at the origin, the predicted flow distributions from the reactive traffic assignment will be different. For the sake of illustration simplicity, we assume travelers are risk neutral and minimize their own mean travel times; thus, at a user equilibrium, all used paths have the same and minimum mean travel times. If the incident is ignored at the origin, $f_1 = 0$, $f_2 = 16$, and $f_3 = 0$ with $e_2 = 31.2$ that is no larger than the free-flow travel time on path 1 or 3. Note that the actual mean travel time should be higher than 31.2, since later on part of the 16 units of flow could experience an incident and part of them will divert to a longer route. If the incident is accounted for at the origin, $f_1 = 9$, $f_2 = 4$, and $f_3 = 3$ with an equal mean travel time of 51.5 on all three paths.

Some travelers, however, could make strategic route choices by taking link 2 first and then link 3 if there is no incident and link 4 if there is one. They do not commit themselves to a particular path at the origin as the aforementioned reactive assignment model assumes. Such a strategic choice is termed as a routing policy in this paper. A path is a special routing policy where the decision of taking link 3 or 4 is not affected by the information. We generalize the path-based user equilibrium condition to the routing policy-based condition such that all used routing policies have the same and minimum mean travel times. There are five routing policies in the network. Routing policies 1–3 are paths 1–3, and routing policy 4 is the one discussed before. Routing policy 5 is the opposite of routing policy 4. First, take link 2, and if there is an incident, take the incident link; otherwise, take the detour. Routing policy 5 is conceivably not efficient. The equilibrium assignment result is $f_1 = 4$, $f_2 = 2$, $f_3 = 0$, $f_4 = 10$, and $f_5 = 0$ with a mean travel time of 41.5 on all three used routing policies, among which two are fixed paths.

On the one hand, the reactive model overestimates flows on the highway and its detour if the incident is not accounted for at the origin (the network is treated as deterministic), as the potential degradation of the highway link is ignored. On the other hand, the reactive model underestimates flows on the highway and its detour if the incident is accounted for at the origin, as the potential travel time savings from being strategic are not considered. This example demonstrates the necessity to develop a traffic assignment model that explicitly considers the travelers' strategic route choices in a stochastic network.

III. MODELING FRAMEWORK AND FIXED-POINT FORMULATION

A. Network and Routing Policy

Let $G = (N, A, T, \widetilde{C})$ be an STD network. N is the set of nodes, and A is the set of directional links. A directional link is uniquely defined by a node pair (j, k), where j is the source node, and k is the sink node. T is the set of time periods $\{0, 1, \ldots, K - 1\}$. The travel time on each link (j, k) during each time period t is a random variable $\widetilde{C}_{jk,t}$; the vector of all link travel time random variables at all time periods is denoted

$\widetilde{C}$. Let $\{C^1, C^2, \ldots, C^R\}$ be the set of finite number of discrete support points of the link travel time joint distribution. The rth support point has a probability p^r, and $\sum_{r=1}^{R} p^r = 1$. $C^r_{jk,t}$ is the travel time on link (j,k) at time t for the rth support point. Beyond time period $K-1$, travel times are static, i.e., the travel time on link (j,k) at any time $t \geq K-1$ is equal to $C^r_{jk,K-1}, \forall r$.

We assume that the traveler knows *a priori* the link travel time joint distribution. The decision is what node k to take next based on the state $x = \{j, t, I\}$, where j is the node, t is the time, and I is the information. Information I is defined as a set of realized link travel times at a given time and node that are useful for making inferences about future link travel times. It represents the traveler's knowledge about the network conditions. This knowledge could be dependent on the time and location of the traveler, and therefore, I should be regarded as $I(j,t)$. We omit the arguments of I because in this paper information is always associated with a state where j and t are well defined. An ideal case is when travelers have perfect information about the whole network, but generally, the information is local, e.g., one learns the travel time realization of a link when s/he arrives at the node from which the link emanates.

The traveler continues the trip after making the choice. The next state is denoted as $\widetilde{y} = \{k, \tilde{t}', \tilde{I}'\}$. The arrival time $\tilde{t}'$ at node k is, in general, a random variable, because the travel time on link (j,k) at time t conditional on I is generally random. The next current information $\tilde{I}'$ is also generally random and includes realizations of link travel time random variables between time t and $\tilde{t}'$, in addition to those already in I.

For a given state and decision, the probabilities of all possible next states can be evaluated from the link travel time joint distribution.

A trip can be characterized by a series of states that a traveler experiences, defined as a state chain. One can experience multiple possible state chains in the STD network, and we have the following definition.

Definition III.1 (Routing Policy): A routing policy $\mu : x \mapsto k$ is a mapping from network states $x = \{j, t, I\}$ to decisions on the next nodes k.

An illustrative example is provided in the Appendix. This definition indicates that route choices in an STD network are not set *a priori*. Rather, they are closely related to network conditions, and this notion is critical in applications involving traveler information systems. For a given set of realizations of all link travel times (a deterministic network), a routing policy from a given origin at a given departure time manifests itself as a path. That is, a traveler always ends up taking a path every day, although this path is not known until the end of the trip, and s/he could end up taking different paths on different days.

Let $e_\mu(x)$ denote the expected travel time to the destination node d when the initial state is x and the routing policy μ is applied. Define $A(j)$ as the set of downstream nodes of node j, $\tilde{C}_{jk,t}|I$ as the travel time random variable for link (j,k) at time t conditional on information I, and $\tilde{I}'|I$ as the information random variable at the next node k and at time $t + \tilde{C}_{jk,t}|I$. We make the assumption that there exists at least one path from any

node to the destination node d under any possible value of the link travel time vector.

Denote $Z(j,t)$ as the set of all possible information at node j and at time t. For $\forall j \in N - \{d\}, \forall t \in T, \forall I \in Z(j,t)$, let $e_{\mu^*}(x)$ and μ^* be the solutions of the following system of equations:

$$e_{\mu^*}(j,t,I)$$
$$= \min_{k \in A(j)} \left\{ E_{\tilde{C}_{jk,t}} \left[\tilde{C}_{jk,t} + E_{\tilde{I}'} \right. \right.$$
$$\left. \left. \times \left[e_{\mu^*}(k, t + \tilde{C}_{jk,t}, \tilde{I}') | \tilde{C}_{jk,t} \right] \right| I \right] \right\} \tag{1}$$

$$\mu^*(j,t,I)$$
$$= \arg \min_{k \in A(j)} \left\{ E_{\tilde{C}_{jk,t}} \left[\tilde{C}_{jk,t} + E_{\tilde{I}'} \right. \right.$$
$$\left. \left. \times \left[e_{\mu^*}(k, t + \tilde{C}_{jk,t}, \tilde{I}') | \tilde{C}_{jk,t} \right] \right| I \right] \right\} \tag{2}$$

with the boundary conditions $e_{\mu^*}(d,t,I) = 0$, $\mu^*(d,t,I) = d, \forall t \in T, \forall I \in Z(d,t)$. Since $\tilde{I}'|I$ is dependent on $\tilde{C}_{jk,t}|I$, we first take the expectation over $\tilde{I}'|I$ with a given realization of $\tilde{C}_{jk,t}|I$ and then take the expectation over $\tilde{C}_{jk,t}|I$. As shown in [39], $e_{\mu^*}(x)$ and μ^* are optimal if I contains all links up to the current time, and are not necessarily optimal if I contains delayed, pretrip, limited location or no link travel time realizations. Dynamic programming algorithms have been developed in [12] and [39] to solve the system of equations, where all the states $\{j, t, I\}$ need to be generated in preprocessing, and the backward induction starts from the static period where a conventional shortest path algorithm can be applied. The optimality conditions and solution algorithms can be extended to other link additive optimization criteria, e.g., generalized cost as a weighted sum of travel time and monetary cost.

B. Modeling Framework

We present a conceptual framework for the routing policy-based DTA model, as shown in Fig. 2. The inputs to the DTA model are the stochastic dynamic demand and supply $(\widetilde{D}, \widetilde{S})$, represented by a joint distribution with R support points $\{(D^1, S^1), (D^2, S^2) \ldots, (D^R, S^R)\}$, each of which has a probability $p^r, r = 1, \ldots, R$. The demand is assumed to be independent of travel costs (inelastic). $D^r = \{D^r_{od,t}, t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \forall \text{ OD pair } \{o,d\}\}$, where $D^r_{od,t}$ is the number of trips between origin o and destination d for departure time t in the rth support point. $S^r = \{S^r_{jk,t}, t = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \forall \{j,k\} \in A\}$, where $S^r_{jk,t}$ is the capacity of link $\{j,k\}$ at time t in the rth support point.

The outputs include two major parts: 1) an equilibrium joint distribution of link travel times $\widetilde{C}$, represented by R support points $\{C^1, C^2, \ldots, C^R\}$ and the associated probabilities $\{p^1, p^2, \ldots, p^R\}$, where C^r is a vector of time-dependent link travel times $\{C^r_{jk,t}, \forall \{j,k\} \in A, \forall t\}$; and 2) the corresponding

Fig. 2. Conceptual framework of strategic DTA model.

routing policy splits $f = \{f^i_{od,t}\}$, i.e., the fraction of the flow between OD pair $\{o, d\}$ at time t assigned to routing policy i. Other measures of effectiveness of interest, such as the distribution and summary statistics of link volumes, OD travel times, and path flows, can be obtained from the equilibrium distribution of link travel times and routing policy splits. Note that the distributions of all relevant traffic random variables are discrete since the definition of a routing policy is based on a discrete distribution of link travel times. It is an interesting future research question to work with continuous distributions.

C. Fixed-Point Formulation

The routing policy-based DTA model comprises of the following two submodels:

1) the users' routing policy choice model, denoted as U;
2) the routing policy-based dynamic network loading (DNL) model, denoted as L.

The users' routing policy choice model takes as input a set of routing policies $G = \{\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_i, \ldots\}$ and a joint distribution of link travel times $\widetilde{C}$ generated by the routing policy-based DNL model. The link travel time distribution plays two roles. First, it provides the basis for the definition of a routing policy; note that a path is purely a topological concept by contrast. Second, the attributes of candidate routing policies, such as expected OD travel time and travel time standard deviation, are evaluated based on the link travel time distribution. We further assume that the splits of OD flows among the candidate routing policies f are determined by a policy-size Logit model [38], [40], where the utility function includes the aforementioned attributes of routing policies that might affect the travelers' decision making, i.e.,

$$f = U\left(G(\widetilde{C}), \widetilde{C}\right). \tag{3}$$

We can classify users according to various characteristics, as is typical in path-based DTA models. One important characteristic enabled by the use of routing policies is the classification by information access, which is embedded in the definition of a routing policy.

The demand is loaded onto the network according the routing policy splits by the routing policy-based DNL model. Note that we use "splits" rather than "flows" here: routing policy splits are deterministic, whereas routing policy flows could be stochastic when the demand is stochastic. For each support point of the random demand and supply, the network loading model outputs a single realization of the link travel time distribution. Therefore, through the loading, we obtain the PMF of link travel times from the PMF of the demand and supply. Note that although the input demand/supply support points are distinct from each other, the output link travel time realizations are not necessarily distinct. This is why the word "realization" is used here rather than support point. Nevertheless, the PMF of link travel times is still represented by R realizations with the corresponding probabilities. The loading model is presented as follows:

$$\widetilde{C} = L(f, \widetilde{D}, \widetilde{S}). \tag{4}$$

Fixed-point formulations of user equilibrium are first developed in [41] and later extended by a number of studies [18], [32], [42]. Combining the above two mappings, a fixed-point formulation of the routing policy-based equilibrium can be expressed in terms of the joint probabilistic distribution of all random link travel times $\widetilde{C}$, i.e.,

$$\widetilde{C} = L\left(U\left(G(\widetilde{C}), \widetilde{C}\right), \widetilde{D}, \widetilde{S}\right). \tag{5}$$

The formulation states that a distribution of link travel times represents an equilibrium if, after travelers make decisions based on the link travel time distribution and the network then reacts to the decisions that have been made, the resulting joint distribution of link travel times is the same as the initial distribution so that travelers have no reason to revise their decisions.

This paper does not examine the mathematical properties (existence and uniqueness) of this fixed-point problem, but rather uses it as a conceptual tool to understand the equilibrium and a guide in developing a heuristic algorithm to solve the routing policy-based DTA problem for the purpose of evaluating the impacts of real-time information. During the computational tests, solutions from the heuristic will be checked experimentally to determine whether fixed points are found. Mathematical properties of the fixed-point problem will be of interest for future research.

IV. SOLUTION ALGORITHMS

A. DNL Model

The DNL model takes as input the routing policies splits and the PMF of random demand/supply and outputs a PMF of

link travel times. Two features distinguish the routing policy-based stochastic dynamic network loader from a path-based deterministic dynamic network loader.

First, the demand and supply can both be stochastic and are described by a joint discrete set of support points $\{D^1, S^1, D^2, S^2, \ldots, D^R, S^R\}$ with associated probabilities $\{p^1, p^2, \ldots, p^R\}$. Stochastic factors in the supply side can generally be modeled as changes in capacities. For example, an incident may block several lanes and thus reduce the capacity of the link. The starting time, location, duration, and severity of an incident can all be random. Therefore, the STD supply can be modeled using time-dependent random capacities. The modeling of stochastic demand is straightforward by treating the number of OD trips at each time period as a random variable. The stochastic demand/supply feature actually does not necessitate fundamental changes to a path-based deterministic loader. What is needed is the repeated runs of a loader for R times, for each support point of the random demand/supply, to generate the PMF of the link travel times.

We consider the routing policy-based "single-loading" problem, where the demand and supply are set at a given support point, for example, D^r and S^r. The model we seek to build is an adaptive loader, denoted as AL and $C^r = AL(f, D^r, S^r)$, where f represents the routing policy splits. In a routing policy-based loading model, users follow routing policies rather than nonadaptive paths. A routing policy is a decision rule based on real-time information. To determine the next link of the routing policy μ for all links at time t, we must translate the currently available link travel times to a current information at time t used in the definition of routing policy μ. Then, we move the users according to the computed next links and repeat the above operation when they reach the end of the next links. Conceivably, the actual path taken by a user is not known until the end of the trip. This is different from a path-based (nonadaptive) network loader, where the sequence of links a traveler will take is known before the trip starts.

A conventional network loader can be revised to load routing policy flows by adding a module at each decision node to determine the next link for a routing policy. However, in this paper, we adopt an iterative approach that treats an existing path-based dynamic network loader as a black box. Recall that any routing policy will be manifested as a path with a given link travel time realization, represented by the function $h = V(f, C^r)$. At the end of the iterative process, we obtain path flows that if loaded onto the path-based loader will produce a realization of link travel times, based on which the routing policy flows will be manifested as the path flows just loaded. The statement for the iterative process is presented as follows, where NAL stands for a conventional nonadaptive loader.

Iterative Adaptive Dynamic Loading Algorithm with Support Point D^r, S^r
Step 0 (Initialization)
    0.1: $N = $ maximal number of iterations;
    0.2: $n = 0$ (the iteration counter);
    0.3: $C^r_{(n)} = $ free flow travel times;
    0.4: $h_{(n)} = V(f, C^r_{(n)})$
    0.5: $n = n + 1$

Step 1 (Main Loop)
    1.1: Nonadaptive loader: $C^r_{(n)} = NAL(pf_{(n-1)}, D^r, S^r)$
    1.2: Policy-to-path translation: $h = V(f, C^r_{(n)})$
    1.3: Path flow update: $h_{(n)} = (1 - \alpha)h_{(n-1)} + \alpha h$,
        where $\alpha = 1/n$
Step 2 (Stopping Criterion)
    If $n = N$, then $C^r = NAL(h_{(N)}, D^r, S^r)$ and STOP
    Otherwise, $n = n + 1$, and go to Step 1.

The iterative process will be stopped after a maximum number of iterations are reached. In Section V, where computational tests are carried out, a convergence check is performed for this fixed point problem, ensuring that the difference between path flows from two successive iterations is small enough.

Based on the single loading $C^r = AL(f, S^r, D^r)$, a generic algorithm for the routing policy-based DNL model $\widetilde{C} = L(f, \widetilde{D}, \widetilde{S})$ is proposed.

Routing Policy-Based DNL Algorithm
Step 0 (Initialization)
    0.1 $r = 1$ (the counter for the number of demand/supply PMF support points)
    Step 1 (Loading)
    1.1 Perform a single loading: $C^r = AL(f, S^r, D^r)$
    1.2 $p^r = $ the probability associated with (S^r, D^r)
    Step 2 (Stopping Criterion)
    If $r = R$, STOP
    Otherwise $r = r + 1$, and go to Step 1.

For each support point of the demand/supply, we do single loading to obtain one support point of link travel times. The corresponding probability is the same as that for the demand/supply support point. We repeat the process for all the support points and thus obtain the PMF of link travel times.

B. Solution Algorithm to the DTA Problem

We adopt MSA to solve the fixed-point problem [see (5)]. At each iteration, the routing policy splits are updated by combining the splits from the current and previous iterations. Since no proof of convergence is available at this moment, the method is heuristic for the DTA problem. The algorithm is presented as follows.

Routing Policy-Based DTA Heuristic
Step 0 (Initialization)
    0.1: $N = $ maximal number of iterations;
    0.2: MSA counter $i = 1$
    0.3: $C^r_{(0)} = $ free flow link travel times, $r = 1, \ldots, R$
    0.4: Policy choice set $G_{(0)} = \{\text{paths}\}$
    0.5: Policy splits $f_{(0)} = 0$
Step 1 (Main Loop)
    1.1: Generate an optimal routing policy based on $\widetilde{C}_{(i-1)}$ for each OD pair

1.2: Choice set update $G_{(i)} = G_{(i-1)} \cup \{\mu_i\}$

1.3: Users' choice model $f' = U(G_{(i)}, \widetilde{C}_{(i-1)})$

1.4: MSA update $f_{(i)} = (1 - \alpha)f_{(i-1)} + \alpha f'$, where $\alpha = 1/i$

1.5: Loader $\widetilde{C}_{(i)} = L(f_{(i)}, \widetilde{D}, \widetilde{S})$

Step 2 (Stopping Criterion)

If $i = N$, STOP

Otherwise, $i = i + 1$, and go to Step 1.

A reasonable value for the maximum number of iterations will be obtained by running the heuristic for a sufficiently large number of iterations and observing the convergence property. Experimental results on this topic will be presented in the next section. In Step 0.4, we initialize the routing policy choice set to include all paths that would have been included in a choice set for a path-based DTA model. Note that for each OD pair and each departure time, there is a choice set, and the initialization is done for all choice sets. The subscripts for OD pair and departure time are omitted to avoid heavy notation. In Step 0.5, we initialize the routing policy splits to be zeros for all OD pairs and departure times. These are infeasible splits that are just for the convenience of writing a formula in Step 1.4. $f_{(0)}$ is not taken into account in the MSA update, as when $i = 1$, its coefficient is zero.

In each MSA iteration, we generate a new PMF of the link travel time distribution based on the PMF of the link travel time distribution from the last MSA iteration. The process is a sequential application of the optimal routing policy algorithm, the users' policy choice model, and the DNL model. The PMF of the link travel time distribution from the last iteration is used in two places: First, an optimal routing policy is generated based on this PMF and added to the choice set, and then the attributes of routing policies in the choice set are evaluated based on this PMF and used in the users' routing policy choice model. A policy-size Logit is used for the routing policy choice model [38], where the policy size is analogous to the path size as used in a Logit path choice model [43] to correct for overlapping of alternatives. The major difference between a path and routing policy choice models is that the choice set in a routing policy choice model is composed of routing policies (paths are special cases of routing policies). Routing policy splits obtained from the choice model are then combined with those from the last iteration, multiplied by the demand, and loaded into the network to generate the PMF of link travel times.

Note that in the users' choice model, the attributes of an alternative routing policy are calculated based on the link travel time distribution from the last iteration $\widetilde{C}_{(i-1)}$, not based on the link travel time distribution that defines the specific routing policy. As a matter of fact, each routing policy in the choice set is defined over different link time distributions, as each of them is generated in a different MSA iteration. In the calculation, we will encounter the problem that we might not be able to find an exact match between link travel times in a routing policy's definition and those at the current iteration. In this case, some measures that describe the similarity (or difference) between two vectors are used to make an approximate match. A detailed discussion of the problem can be found in [44].

TABLE I
THREE EQUILIBRIUM MODELS

	Base	Path-Based	Policy-Based
Random Capacities	No	Yes	Yes
Adaptive choices	No	No	Yes

V. COMPUTATIONAL TESTS

We present a specific computer implementation of the DTA model and carry out computational tests. The objectives of the computational test are as follows.

1) Study the convergence properties of the MSA heuristic.
2) Study the behavior of the routing policy-based DTA model through sensitivity analyses.
3) Explore the effect of real-time information by comparing results from the path- and routing policy-based models.

This section is organized as follows. First, we present the three models that will be implemented: 1) the base model; 2) the path model; and 3) the routing policy model. The first two models are implemented as specializations of a general routing policy model. The test design is then described, including the network, probabilistic descriptions of the random supply, specifications of users' choice model and information access, and simulation parameters. Results from the tests then follow. We give the empirical convergence performance of the MSA heuristic proposed in Section IV. The OD travel times at equilibrium are compared across the three models both under typical support points and in expected values. Two sets of sensitivity analyses are provided with respect to incident probability and market penetration of real-time information.

A. Three Models

The motivation for the routing policy-based DTA model is to be able to model the users' strategic choices in a network with random travel times. Some interesting questions then arise. What if the random disturbances to the network are ignored in calculating equilibrium? What if we do not model the strategic choices? The comparison of results from different models will give us a better understanding of the routing policy-based model. We develop three models for comparison purposes, as shown in Table I.

In each column, we have one equilibrium model: base model, path-based model, and policy-based model, respectively. We have two features listed, i.e., 1) random capacities and 2) real-time information, which specify respectively whether random capacities are considered and whether travelers are assumed to make strategic routing choices. We elaborate on the models one by one.

The first model is the base model with conventional assumptions of a DTA model in the literature. It is an equilibrium assignment model in a deterministic network, where stochastic disturbances are ignored, e.g., incidents are not considered at all. It corresponds to the case where users have no idea about the incident and just follow their habitual paths. After the equilibrium path flows are obtained, they are loaded onto the

network with random capacities, and the resulting measures of effectiveness are calculated.

The second model is the path-based model with equilibrium in distribution. In this model, the distributions of random supply are known to the travelers, but no strategic choice behavior is assumed. The equilibrium is expressed as distributions, not average values of link travel times. Behaviorally, both the base model and the path model assume travelers follow paths, yet the underlying network in the path model is random. By comparing results of the base model and the path model, we can study the value of *a priori* information on the stochasticity of supply.

The third model is the routing policy-based model with equilibrium in distribution. Again, the underlying network is random as in the path model. In addition, travelers make use of real-time information as compared with those in previous models, and therefore, the travelers' choice sets consist of routing policies rather than paths. By comparing the results of the path model and the routing policy model, we can study the value of real-time information.

Computational tests on an additional model have also been conducted but not presented due to the space limit. This model assumes that a traveler takes into account real-time travel information at a given node and time, but the choice is myopic in the sense that a shortest path is sought, implicitly assuming no future diversions will take place. In all the tests, results from this myopic model are very close to those from the routing policy-based model, suggesting that the myopic nature does not impose significant disadvantage compared with the look-ahead strategies. More computational tests in larger and more complex network settings are desired to study the difference between the two types of adaptive models.

We implemented the three models using the C++ programming language in a Red Hat Linux environment. The MSA algorithm for a routing policy-based DTA presented in Section IV is a general description of all the three models. The base and path model algorithms are implemented by specializing the policy model algorithm.

The network loading model is based on the mesoscopic traffic simulator of DynaMIT [45]. We make the DynaMIT loader deterministic by suppressing all random factors in the loader. This is to make sure that the stochasticity of the model comes solely from random incidents, and thus, the test results across models are comparable.

B. Test Network

We conduct computational tests on the simple hypothetical network shown in Fig. 3. The network has six nodes and eight directed links.

We deal with one OD pair between nodes 0 and 5, and assume zero flows between any other OD pair. Four paths exist for OD pair (0,5), as shown in Fig. 3, with real-time diversion possibilities at nodes 0, 1, and 2. The study period is from 6:30 AM to 8:00 AM. The time resolution is 1 min for the optimal routing policy algorithm and the users' behavior model. The DynaMIT supply simulator works at a finer resolution (5 s) for the simulation, but the postprocessed link (path) travel times are also by the minute. Therefore, we have 90 time periods in the tests.


Fig. 3. Test network.

C. Random Incidents

There are random incidents in the network. An incident is defined by the link ID, start time, duration, and capacity reduction factor. If an incident starts from 8:00 AM and lasts for 20 min with a capacity reduction factor 0.5 on link 0, the output capacity of link 0 will be $0.5 \times 1.1 = 0.55$ veh/link/sec from 8:00 AM to 8:20 AM and will revert to the original value of 1.1 veh/link/s from 8:20 AM onwards.

The random incident is set up according to the following rules.

1) There is at most one incident during the study period for any given day.
2) The probability of one incident in the network on any given day is p.
3) The incident has a positive probability on links 0, 2, 3, and 6 but zero on links 1, 4, 5, and 7.
4) The incident probability on a link is proportional to the link's length (for links 0, 2, 3, and 6).
5) If an incident occurs on a link, the start time can be 6:30, 6:40, 6:50, ..., 7:50 AM with equal probability.
6) The duration of any incident is fixed as 10 min, and the capacity reduction factor is fixed as 0.3.

Based on the foregoing assumptions, a random incident can be defined by the joint distribution of the incident location and the start time. As there are four possible link locations and nine possible start times, the joint distribution has 37 support points in total: 36 support points for the case of one incident, and an additional one support point for the case of no incident. Note that all link travel times at all time periods are jointly distributed random variables due to traffic flow propagations, even though the incident could only occur at one link in a given support point.

D. Demand

We assume deterministic demand between OD pair (0, 5) with 2880 veh/h between 6:30 and 7:00 AM and 4680 veh/h between 7:00 and 8:00 AM.

Users are assumed to minimize expected travel time with perception errors. The coefficient of the expected travel time in the policy-size Logit model is negative with a large

enough absolute value (-6.0) to approximate a fastest routing policy (path) choice situation. All users have perfect real-time information in the routing policy model, i.e., knowledge of travel time realizations on all links up to the current time (see Algorithm DOT-SPI in [12] for details of the perfect real-time information variant of the optimal routing policy problem). Obviously, users have no real-time information in the base model or the path model.

E. Results

We set 7:00–7:30 as the statistics collection period based on the following two considerations. First, an implicit assumption of the incident distribution is that there is zero probability of incidents outside the study period (6:30–8:00). This assumption is not realistic, as naturally random incidents can happen any time of the day. To eliminate the effect of this assumption, we choose a statistics collection period such that incidents before 6:30 or after 8:00 have no effect on travelers departing during the period. Second, since OD travel times are needed in the equilibrium assignment, we require that the computation of OD travel times is correct, that is, travelers departing during the statistics collection period must leave the network before 8:00.

1) Convergence Study: Recall that a routing policy is defined over a link travel time distribution. At each MSA iteration, one routing policy is generated based on the link travel time distribution obtained in that iteration. However, as we start from free flow travel times, the link travel time distributions at early iterations could be quite different from the equilibrium distribution, and routing policies defined over them can be misleading and make the MSA stuck in some nonequilibrium point. This problem does not exist in a path-based equilibrium assignment model, as a path is defined topologically and has nothing to do with travel times. An intuitive solution idea is that routing policies should be defined over distributions that are close to (if not equal to) the equilibrium values. We then adopt the reset method proposed in [46], which resets the MSA counter to 1 after $x, 2x, 3x, \ldots$ iterations for a chosen value of x. By resetting the MSA counter, we eliminate the effects of all early routing policies and effectively use the latest link travel time distribution as an initial solution to a new round of MSA iterations.

An inconsistency norm of link travel time for each support point is used to check for the convergence of the fixed-point problem as an equilibrium in the distribution of link travel times is sought. Let C^r be the vector of all link travel times at all time intervals for support point r and $F(\widetilde{C})^r$ the rth support point of the combined mapping of $\widetilde{C}$, as defined in (5). The inconsistency norm is defined as

$$\left\| C^r - F(\widetilde{C})^r \right\| = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{(j,k)\in A}\sum_{t\in T}\left(C^r_{jk,t} - F(\widetilde{C})^r_{jk,t}\right)^2}{|A|\times|T|}}. \tag{6}$$

Fig. 4 shows the convergence process of the routing policy model when $p = 0.9$. The inconsistency norm is plotted against the number of iterations. Each plot in the figure is one of the 37 discrete supporting points for the distribution of OD travel


Fig. 4. Convergence of the routing policy model (x-axis: number of iterations; y-axis: $\|C^r - F(\widetilde{C})^r\|$; $p = 0.9$; each subgraph represents a support point, and the title indicates the incident location and starting time with the exception of the last one).

times. The x-axis represents the departure time, whereas the y-axis represents the OD travel time. The incident link ID and the incident start time corresponding to a given support point are listed on top of each graph. We see that after around 30 iterations, the inconsistency norms become stable and fairly small, which is an indication of achieving an approximate fixed point. The spikes at iterations 7 and 21 are due to the reset of the MSA counter.

A commonly accepted measure of the distance from a user equilibrium is the relative gap, which is the relative difference between the total system costs under the current flow assignment and when all travelers follow the optimal routing policy based on the current travel costs. In general, the relative gap is not good for our model since perception errors are considered by utilizing a random utility choice model, and the optimal routing policy perceived by a traveler is not necessarily the same as the "true" one based on actual link costs.

2) Solution Discussion: We discuss the solutions of the three models and compare them when appropriate. Note that we focus on the statistics collection period of 7:00–7:30 AM, although statistics for all time intervals are presented. Special caution should be taken when reading statistics close to 8:00 AM, when unfinished trips make the calculation of travel times unreliable.

Fig. 5. OD travel time distributions of the path model (dotted) and routing policy model (solid) (x-axis: departure time; y-axis: OD travel time (in seconds); $p = 0.9$; each subgraph represents a support point, and the title indicates the incident location and starting time with the exception of the last one).

Fig. 6. Path 2 flow distribution of the routing policy model (x-axis: departure time; y-axis: path share; $p = 0.9$; each subgraph represents a support point, and the title indicates the incident location and starting time with the exception of the last one).

We present the equilibrium OD travel time distribution of the path model (dashed lines) and routing policy model (solid lines) together in Fig. 5. Generally, the routing policy model gives a lower OD travel time, and the savings are quite outstanding in some cases (e.g., when incidents are on link 6 and start from 7:00 and 7:10). This can be attributed to the flexibility gained through strategic routing, where the realized link travel times tell the travelers about the development of the incident and travelers plan ahead for such type of information.

Fig. 6 gives the time-dependent path flow distributions for path 2. We omit the presentation of other path flow distributions for the sake of brevity. A very distinctive feature is the decrease of the path flow around the duration of the incident in most support points. As we arrange the graphs by the start time of incident, we can see a moving "pit" in the path flow. This is more intelligent than fixed path flows in the path model, as path 2 could be severely affected by an incident. Routing policy flows are deterministic; however, a routing policy will manifest itself as different paths in different support points, and thus, path flows are random, and we can talk about path flow distributions.

Next, we compare expected OD travel times from the three models in Fig. 7. The expected OD travel time is the major measure of effectiveness (MOE) in our tests. The path model gives lower expected OD travel times than the base model, and the routing policy model provides further travel time savings. Fig. 8 gives the time-dependent OD travel time standard deviations. Although travelers are minimizing the expected travel


Fig. 7. Expected OD travel time at equilibrium ($p = 0.9$).

time only, their travel time variances are also reduced by taking strategic routing choices. This is due to the fact that their travel times are reduced in incident scenarios and, thus, smoother across support points.

3) Sensitivity Analysis: We are interested in the behavior of the models when we vary the incident probability. We define a single MOE to be compared in the sensitivity analysis, which is the expected OD travel time averaged over the 30 departure times in the statistics collection period.

Fig. 8.   OD travel time standard deviations at equilibrium ($p = 0.9$).

Fig. 9.   Average expected OD travel times as functions of the incident probability.

We vary p from 0 to 1.0 by a step size of 0.1. The result is plotted in Fig. 9. For each of the models, the average expected OD travel time increases as the incident probability increases, but different models have different increasing rates. This increasing function seems intuitively correct, as a more likely incident increases the probability that a network is congested, and thus, a higher expected travel time. We note that the routing policy model gives a higher value for $p = 0.9$ (216.06) than for $p = 1.0$ (216.00). We believe that this difference is too small to be significant and is likely due to numerical reasons.

The relationship for the base model is linear. The explanation is as follows. The path flows are the same for all incident probabilities, since the base model does not consider incidents at all. The OD travel time for each support point is calculated, and a weighted average is taken to obtain the expected OD travel time. The weight is the probability of a support point that is a linear function of p. Therefore, the expected OD travel time is also a linear function of p. While in the other two models, random incidents are considered in the equilibrium process, and equilibrium path (routing policy) flows differ when p differs. Therefore, the relationship is, in general, nonlinear.


Fig. 10.   Average expected OD travel time as a function of the market penetration ($p = 0.1$).

The path model gives less expected travel time than the base model, and the routing policy model gives less expected travel time than the path model. The savings (path over base and routing policy over path) increase as the incident probability increases both in absolute value and in percentage. The relative saving of the path model over the base model is in the range of $0 \sim 2.9\%$, and the relative saving of strategic models over the path model is in the range of $0 \sim 4.4\%$. This increasing function suggests that values of both *a priori* and real-time information are more evident when traffic conditions are worse. This could be reasonable in reality when traffic conditions without incident are not too congested, as then there is enough room for diversion. This is actually the setting of our tests, as traffic is almost in free flow state with no incident. We expect that when a network is already quite congested without incident, this function might become flat after a certain value of p.

Next, we carry out sensitivity analysis with respect to market penetration of real-time information. For a given penetration k, which is a value between 0% and 100%, we assign k of the demand to take minimum expected travel time routing policies, while the remaining $1 - k$ of the demand to take minimum expected travel time paths. Equilibrium is sought by an MSA heuristic that updates the path splits and policy splits simultaneously.

We have the results for $p = 0.1$ in Fig. 10. The average system expected OD travel time is at its largest value when the market penetration of real-time information is zero. At that time, if one traveler is intelligent enough and take a routing policy rather than a path, he/she can save travel time. More and more of them find the benefits of real-time information, and they gain travel time savings and thus bring down the average expected travel time. However, in a congested traffic network, the changing of users' behavior changes the network-wide traffic conditions through interaction between supply and demand. As seen from the figure, the reduction in expected travel time becomes less evident when penetration goes from 20% to 40% and from 40% to 60%. Later on, higher penetrations of real-time information actually result in increases in the expected travel time. We then conclude that the total system travel time reduction resulting from travelers adapting to

real-time information is not a monotonic function of the market penetration of real-time information. Furthermore, despite the varying effect of real-time information, travel time reductions are always positive with real-time information compared with the no-real-time-information case. Results for $p = 0.5$ and $p = 0.9$ also show the nonmonotonicity of benefits of real-time information. Note that these results are valid for the specific settings in this paper, and caution should be taken in generalizing them.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The development of traffic models in the presence of traveler information is pertinent and timely, given the advent of ATIS. This paper has established a user equilibrium DTA model where users make strategic routing choices in an STD network. Travel times on all links at all discrete times are jointly distributed random variables whose distribution is endogenous to the DTA model. A traveler is assumed to know *a priori* the joint distribution, and during a trip, s/he has access to real-time information on the realized link travel times based on which a decision on what node to take next is made. Such a traveler is said to follow a routing policy, defined as a mapping from all possible states to the next nodes to take, where a state is a triple of node, time, and real-time information. A simple path is a special case of a routing policy, where the decision on the next node is not dependent on time or real-time information.

A general framework of the routing policy-based DTA model is established, and a fixed-point problem formulation of the user equilibrium is given. The DTA model takes as input a discrete distribution of random dynamic OD trips and/or supply variables and generates equilibrium routing policy splits and an equilibrium discrete distribution of link travel time distribution. The random supply includes incidents, work zones, breakdowns, and bad weather, and can be expressed through random changes of network parameters, e.g., link capacity reduction. The DTA model has two components: 1) the routing policy choice model and 2) the routing policy-based DNL model.

An MSA heuristic is designed to solve the fixed-point problem of routing policy-based DTA. Computational tests are carried out in a hypothetical network where random incidents are the source of stochasticity. The heuristic converges satisfactorily in the test network under the proposed test settings. The strategic feature in the routing policy-based model leads to shorter expected travel times at equilibrium. Smaller travel time variances are obtained as a byproduct. The value of real-time information is an increasing function of the incident probability when the traffic with no incident is relatively light. However, it is not a monotonic function of the market penetration of real-time information, which suggests that in designing a traveler information system or route guidance system, the information penetration needs to be chosen carefully to maximize benefits.

For future research, tests on a real-world network with actual data are of great interest. Computational efficiency is a potential concern for real-world applications, with the large number of feasible routing policies and support points and a doubly iterative solution process (DTA and DNL). However, the problem is not as serious as it seems. First, no explicit routing policy enumeration is needed, as the choice set is expanded by adding the optimal routing policy from each MSA iteration. Second, the number of support points (and thus the number of simulation runs in the main DNL loop) can be controlled by the users to make a good tradeoff between modeling accuracy and tractability and needs not increase exponentially with the network size. Third, the iterative process to load routing policy flows is not necessary and only a shortcut to make use of currently available nonadaptive network loaders. Conceptually, a conventional chronological network loader can be revised to load routing policy flows by adding a module that determines the next link for a routing policy at each node based on realized travel times from loaded flows up to the current time.

The model and solution algorithm can be applied directly to multiple OD scenarios, even though a single OD is assumed in the current case study. It is hypothesized that the optimal penetration rate for a given OD pair will decrease with more OD pairs, as the advantage of a detour in case of disruptions will decrease if the detour is already saturated by flows from other OD pairs.

Tests with users classified by their real-time information accessibilities are also of great interest, as in reality users are heterogeneous. Note that a path is a special type of routing policy, where the next node is fixed regardless of the time and real-time information. In this sense, the encapsulation of real-time information in the definition of a routing policy enables the general framework to handle as many information access situations as possible: Each additional user class only requires one more routing policy definition.

The capability of the routing policy-based DTA to deal with a wide range of information access situations also allows for the systematic study of information system design problems, e.g., the location [47], content, coverage, and dissemination frequency of information.

The routing policy as defined in this paper uses every node as a potential decision node, whereas in reality, a traveler has limited cognitive capacity and cannot store and process information in such a fine resolution. It is found in a recent driving simulator study [4] that travelers can plan ahead for information downstream and furthermore are less strategic in more complex networks. Conceivably, in a real network, only a few decision nodes exist for a traveler, e.g., a diversion point between two major highways. The current DTA framework can accommodate this more realistic definition of routing policies; however, more work is needed to design algorithms to calculate optimal routing policies with limited decision points. Furthermore, travelers might not be able to accurately perceive travel times, and thus, routing policies defined on coarser states, e.g., levels of service, could be used under the same DTA framework.

APPENDIX
ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE FOR
ROUTING POLICY DEFINITION

Fig. 11 shows a network with three nodes, three links, and three time periods. All possible values of travel times are shown in Table II. Each of the eight support points has a probability of 1/8.

Fig. 11. Small network.

TABLE II
JOINT DISTRIBUTION OF LINK TRAVEL TIMES

| t	Link	C^1	C^2	C^3	C^4	C^5	C^6	C^7	C^8
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	3	1	1	1	4	4	4	3	3
	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1
	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	3	2
	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2
≥ 2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1
	3	3	2	2	3	4	3	5	2
	p^r	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8	1/8

Fig. 12. State chains for a routing policy.

We describe the routing decision process as follows. Assume that the traveler has perfect real-time information that includes all link travel time realizations up to the current time, regardless of the current node. Therefore, the information I at time t would be one of the joint realizations of $\widetilde{C}_{1,0}, \widetilde{C}_{2,0}, \widetilde{C}_{3,0}, \ldots, \widetilde{C}_{1,t}, \widetilde{C}_{2,t}$ and $\widetilde{C}_{3,t}$. Note that we use a single subscript to denote a link rather than a pair of nodes for the sake of simplicity. There are three possible I at time 0: (1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 4), and (1, 1, 3); six possible I at time 1: (1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 3), (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2), (1, 1, 4, 1, 2, 2), (1, 1, 4, 1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 3, 1, 2, 3), and (1, 1, 3, 1, 1, 2); and eight possible I at time 2 and beyond: $C^1, C^2, \ldots, C^8$. With three nodes, this results in $(3 + 6 + 8) \times 3 = 51$ possible states. A routing policy is then a mapping from the 51 possible states to feasible nodes to take next.

Consider a traveler traveling from nodes a to c following a routing policy. Suppose the initial state is $\{a, 0, (1, 1, 4)\}$, as shown in Fig. 12. We can see from the joint distribution table that the network could be C^4, C^5, or C^6. Suppose the routing policy maps the initial state to node b, upon arrival at which the traveler could be in two possible states: $y = \{b, t', I'\} = \{b, 1, (1, 1, 4, 1, 2, 2)\}$ or $\{b, 1, (1, 1, 4, 1, 1, 1)\}$.

The only choice at node B is node c, and after that, the traveler arrives at the destination. The ending states are also random. From the state $\{b, 1, (1, 1, 4, 1, 2, 2)\}$, the traveler could end up at state $\{c, 3, C^4\}$ or $\{c, 3, C^5\}$. From the state $\{b, 1, (1, 1, 4, 1, 1, 1)\}$, the traveler could end up at state $\{c, 2, C^6\}$. The OD travel time is a random variable: three with probability (w.p.) 2/3, and one w.p. 1/3.

REFERENCES

[1] D. Schrank and T. Lomax, The 2009 annual urban mobility report, Texas Transp. Inst., Austin, TX, Tech. Rep. [Online]. Available: http://mobility.tamu.edu/
[2] P. Bonsall, "Traveler behavior: Decision-making in an unpredictable world," *J. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 45–60, 2004.
[3] M. Razo and S. Gao, "Strategic thinking and risk attitudes in route choice: Stated preference approach," *Transp. Res. Rec. J. Transp. Res. Board*, vol. 2156, pp. 28–35, 2010.
[4] H. Tian, S. Gao, D. L. Fisher, and B. Post, "Route choice behavior in a driving simulator with real-time information," presented at the 90th TRB Annu. Meeting DVD, Washington, DC, 2011, Paper 11-1474.
[5] R. W. Hall, "The fastest path through a network with random time-dependent travel times," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 182–188, Aug. 1986.
[6] G. Polychronopoulos and J. N. Tsitsiklis, "Stochastic shortest path problems with recourse," *Networks*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 133–143, Mar. 1996.
[7] P. Marcotte and S. Nguyen, Eds., *Equilibrium and Advanced Transportation Modeling*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer, 1998, ch. 9.
[8] D. Pretolani, "A directed hyperpath model for random time dependent shortest paths," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 123, pp. 315–324, 2000.
[9] E. D. Miller-Hooks and H. S. Mahmassani, "Least expected time paths in stochastic, time-varying transportation networks," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 198–215, May 2000.
[10] E. Miller-Hooks, "Adaptive least-expected time paths in stochastic, time-varying transportation and data networks," *Networks*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 35–52, Jan. 2001.
[11] S. T. Waller and A. K. Ziliaskopoulos, "On the online shortest path problem with limited arc cost dependencies," *Networks*, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 216–227, Dec. 2002.
[12] S. Gao and I. Chabini, "Optimal routing policy problems in stochastic time-dependent networks," *Transp. Res. B*, vol. 40, no. 2, pp. 93–122, Feb. 2006.
[13] R. Claes, T. Holvoet, and D. Weyns, "A decentralized approach for anticipatory vehicle routing using delegate multiagent systems," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 364–373, Jun. 2011.
[14] S. Peeta and A. K. Ziliaskopoulos, "Foundations of dynamic traffic assignment: The past, the present and the future," *Netw. Spatial Econom.*, vol. 1, no. 3/4, pp. 233–265, 2001.
[15] C. F. Daganzo and Y. Sheffi, "On stochastic models of traffic assignment," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 11, no. 3, pp. 253–274, Aug. 1977.
[16] Y. Sheffi and W. B. Powell, "An algorithm for the equilibrium assignment problem with random link times," *Networks*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 191–207, 1982.
[17] E. Cascetta, "A stochastic process approach to the analysis of temporal dynamics in transportation networks," *Transp. Res. B*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Feb. 1989.
[18] G. E. Cantarella and E. Cascetta, "Dynamic processes and equilibrium in transportation networks: Toward a unifying theory," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 29, no. 4, pp. 305–329, Nov. 1995.
[19] G. A. Davis and N. L. Nihan, "Large population approximations of a general stochastic traffic assignment model," *Oper. Res.*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 169–178, Jan./Feb. 1993.
[20] M. L. Hazelton, S. Lee, and J. W. Polak, "Stationary states in stochastic process models of traffic assignment: A Markov Chain Monte Carlo approach," in *Proc. 13th Symp. Transp. Traffic Theory*, J.-B. Lesort, Ed., 1996, pp. 341–359.
[21] M. Hazelton, "Some remarks on stochastic user equilibrium," *Transp. Res. B*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 101–108, Feb. 1998.
[22] D. Watling, "A second order stochastic network equilibrium model, I: Theoretical foundation," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 149–166, May 2002.
[23] D. Watling, "A second order stochastic network equilibrium model, II: Solution method and numerical experiments," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 167–183, May 2002.

[24] P. Mirchandani and H. Soroush, "Generalized traffic equilibrium with probabilistic travel times and perceptions," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 21, no. 3, pp. 133–152, Aug. 1987.

[25] H. X. Liu, X. Ban, B. Ran, and P. Mirchandani, "Analytical dynamic traffic assignment model with probabilistic travel times and perceptions," *Transp. Res. Rec.*, vol. 1708, pp. 125–133, 2002.

[26] H. Lo and Y. K. Tung, "Network with degradable links: Capacity analysis and design," *Transp. Res. B*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 345–363, May 2003.

[27] A. Chen and Z. Zhou, "The alpha-reliable mean-excess traffic equilibrium model with stochastic travel times," *Transp. Res. B*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 493–513, May 2009.

[28] R. D. Connors and A. Sumalee, "A network equilibrium model with travellers' perception of stochastic travel times," *Transp. Res. B*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp. 614–624, Jul. 2009.

[29] Y. Nie, "Multi-class percentile user equilibrium with flow-dependent stochasticity," *Transp. Res. B*, vol. 45, no. 10, pp. 1641–1659, 2010.

[30] S. Nguyen and S. Pallottino, "Equilibrium traffic assignment for large scale transit network," *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, vol. 37, no. 2, pp. 176–186, Nov. 1988.

[31] H. Spiess and M. Florian, "Optimal strategies: A new assignment model for transit networks," *Transp. Res. B*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 83–102, Apr. 1989.

[32] G. E. Cantarella, "A general fixed-point approach to multimode multi-user equilibrium assignment with elastic demand," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 107–128, May 1997.

[33] Y. Hamdouch, P. Marcotte, and S. Nguyen, "A strategic model for dynamic traffic assignment," *Netw. Spatial Econom.*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 291–315, Sep. 2004.

[34] P. Marcotte, S. Nguyen, and A. Schoeb, "A strategic flow model of traffic assignment in static capacitated networks," *Oper. Res.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 191–212, Mar./Apr. 2004.

[35] S. Ukkusuri and G. Patil, "Exploring user behavior in online network equilibrium problems," in *Proc. 11th Int. Conf. Travel Behav. Res.*, Kyoto, Japan, Aug. 2006, pp. 31–38.

[36] A. Unnikrishnan and T. Waller, "User equilibrium with recourse," *Netw. Spatial Econom.*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 575–593, Dec. 2009.

[37] R. B. Dial, "A probabilistic multipath traffic assignment model which obviates path enumeration," *Transp. Res.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 83–111, Jun. 1971.

[38] S. Gao, E. Frejinger, and M. E. Ben-Akiva, "Adaptive route choice models in stochastic time-dependent networks," *Transp. Res. Rec.*, vol. 2156, pp. 28–35, 2008.

[39] S. Gao and H. Huang, "Real-time traveler information for optimal adaptive routing in stochastic time-dependent networks," *Transp. Res. C*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 196–213, Apr. 2012, DOI: 10.1016/j.trc.2011.09.007S.

[40] S. Gao, E. Frejinger, and M. Ben-Akiva, "Adaptive route choices in risky traffic networks: A prospect theory approach," *Transp. Res. C*, vol. 18, no. 5, pp. 724–740, Oct. 2010.

[41] C. F. Daganzo, "Stochastic network equilibrium with multiple vehicle types and asymmetric, indefinite link cost Jacobians," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 282–300, Aug. 1983.

[42] D. E. Kaufman, R. L. Smith, and K. E. Wunderlich, "User-equilibrium properties of fixed points in dynamic traffic assignment," *Transp. Res. C*, vol. 6, no. 1/2, pp. 1–16, Feb. 1998.

[43] M. E. Ben-Akiva and M. Bierlaire, "Discrete choice methods and their applications to short term travel decisions," in *Transportation Science Handbook*. Norwell, MA: Kluwer, 1999.

[44] S. Gao, "Adaptive routing and traffic assignment in stochastic time-dependent networks," Ph.D. dissertation, Mass. Inst. Technol., Cambridge, MA, Feb., 2005.

[45] M. E. Ben-Akiva, M. Bierlaire, J. Bottom, H. Koutsopoulos, and R. Mishalani, "Development of a route guidance generation system for real-time application," in *Proc. 8th IFAC Symp. Transp. Syst.*, M. Papageorgiou and A. Pouliezos, Eds., Chania, Greece, Jun. 1997, pp. 433–438.

[46] E. Cascetta and M. N. Postorino, "Fixed point approaches to the estimation of o/d matrices using traffic counts on congested networks," *Transp. Sci.*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 134–147, May 2001.

[47] B. Bartin and K. Ozbay, "Determining the optimal configuration of highway routes for real-time traffic information: A case study," *IEEE Trans. Intell. Transp. Syst.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 225–231, Mar. 2010.

Song Gao received the B.S. degree in civil engineering from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China, in 1999 and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, in 2002 and 2005, respectively.

She has been an Assistant Professor of civil and environmental engineering with the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, since 2007. Her research focuses on modeling and optimization of transportation systems, including travel behavior models, network optimization algorithms, and equilibrium models, with applications in intelligent transportation systems and transportation planning.