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The provision of traffic progression along an arterial street has long been accepted as a desirable traffic control objective to improve the level of service. Bandwidth maximization is often used to optimize progression. A new scheme optimizes two circular phasing sequences in addition to those available in existing bandwidth maximizing programs. The new circular sequences, having the form main1-cross1-main2-cross2, can be clockwise or counterclockwise. The MAXBAND 89T program uses this enhanced optimization capability to find maximum progression bands on an arterial. This scheme expands the arterial formulation used in MAXBAND 86. It uses the mixed-integer linear programming method for optimizing progression bandwidth. Experimental results for some cases show that the new formulation can produce wider progression bands on an arterial than those of the MAXBAND 86 formulation.

The problem of finding signal timings that produce the maximum sum of progression bands along a two-way arterial was first modeled by Little (1) as a mixed-integer linear program (MILP). This formulation found the cycle length and offsets for a two-phase signal system. The basic MILP formulation was later enhanced by Little et al. (2) for optimizing National Electrical Manufacturers Association (NEMA) left-turn phasing sequences. Little et al. also developed the MAXBAND computer program (2) to optimize signal timing on signalized arterials and triangular networks. In 1986, MAXBAND was upgraded to MAXBAND 86 (3). The enhanced program was capable of optimizing signal timing on suburban arterials and urban grid networks. In recent years, Tsay et al. (4) and Gartner et al. (5) have produced further enhancements to the arterial bandwidth formulation used in MAXBAND; both of these enhancements deal with the shape of the progression bands. In addition, Chaudhary et al. (6; see also companion paper in this Record) and Mireault (7,8) have recently developed more efficient schemes to optimize arterial and network signal timing problems.

We present another enhancement to Little’s basic MILP formulation for the arterial signal timing optimization problem (2). This enhancement provides the capability to optimize two new circular phasing sequences in addition to the existing NEMA phasing sequence. The form of these four-phase sequences is main1-cross1-main2-cross2 (i.e., main lead—cross lead—main lag—cross lag), as opposed to the conventional four-phase sequences for which both green phases on one arterial are provided in a single contiguous block as main—cross (i.e., main lead—main lag—cross lead—cross lag). Figure 1 shows the circular phasing, which can be either clockwise or counterclockwise. Evaluation of the new formulation shows that it can produce wider bands than the original formulation and improve arterial performance in some cases.

Enhanced Mathematical Formulation

In this section we develop the enhanced arterial formulation. Readers not interested in the mathematical details may wish to scan this section. First, the original MILP arterial formulation is reproduced. A formulation that has the capability to optimize only circular phasing sequences is then shown. Finally, we show how these two formulations can be combined to produce a comprehensive formulation capable of optimizing both NEMA and circular phasing sequences.

Original MILP Arterial Formulation

The arterial formulation for maximizing progression bandwidth is obtained by using the basic progression bandwidth geometry shown in Figure 2. The variable are defined as follows:

- $b (\bar{b}) = \text{outbound (inbound) bandwidth}, \text{cycles}$;
- $z = \text{signal cycle, inverse of cycle length}$;
- $S_i = \text{signal segment } i, i = 1, \ldots, n$;
- $w_i (\bar{w}) = \text{time from right (left) side of red at } S_i \text{ to left (right) edge of outbound (inbound) green band, cycles}$;
- $t_i (\bar{t}) = \text{outbound (inbound) travel time from } S_i \text{ to } S_{i+1} \text{ (if applicable), cycles}$;
- $\Delta_r = \text{time in cycles from the center of } r \text{ to the nearest center of } r_i$;
- $\delta_i (\bar{\delta}) = 0-1 \text{ variables for phasing sequence selection}$.

The constants are defined as follows:

- $r_i (\bar{r}) = \text{outbound (inbound) red time at } S_i \text{, cycles}$;
- $s_i (\bar{s}) = \text{outbound (inbound) green time for through traffic at } S_i \text{, cycles}$;
- $\xi (\bar{\xi}) = \text{time allocated for outbound (inbound) left-turn green at } S_i \text{, cycles}$;
- $\gamma_i (\bar{\gamma}) = \text{queue clearance time, in cycles, an advance of the outbound (inbound) bandwidth upon leaving } S_i \text{, cycles}$;
- $c (\bar{c}) = \text{outbound (inbound) objective function weight}$;
- $\bar{r} = \text{outbound target bandwidth ratio}$;
- $T_1 = \text{lower limit on signal cycle length}$;
- $T_2 = \text{upper limit on signal cycle length}$.
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The fundamental loop equation for formulating the arterial problem obtained from Figure 2 is as follows:

\[
\frac{1}{h_i} = \text{lower limit on outbound (inbound) reciprocal change between two adjacent links.}
\]

The time from the center of \( r_i \) to the next center of \( r_i \) in terms of \( t_i \) and \( C_i \) for each case, \( \Delta_i \), can be expressed as a single equation having two binary variables as

\[
\Delta_i = \frac{1}{2} \left( 2\delta_i - 1 \right) \epsilon_i - \left( 2\delta_i - 1 \right) \bar{\epsilon}_i
\]

Each of the four possible left-turn patterns can be determined by the following combinations of binary decision variables:

**Pattern 1: Lead-Lead**

**Pattern 2: Lag-Lead**

**Pattern 3: Lead-Lag**

**Pattern 4: Lag-Lag**

**FIGURE 1** Circular phasing sequences.

**FIGURE 2** Basic progression bandwidth geometry.

**FIGURE 3** Four conventional phasing sequences.
In this section we present details on an arterial formulation that selects the cycle length, offsets, and only circular phasing sequences to maximize the sum of progression bands in both arterial directions. There are two reasons for devoting a section to this development. The first is to document completely this major step in the production of the complete mathematical formulation derived in the next section. The second is to emphasize that circular phasing sequence is not conventionally used in progression-based signal timings, and that reprogramming conventional signal controllers may be needed to implement a circular phasing sequence. However, this is not a difficult procedure with microprocessor-based systems.

The circular phasing sequences shown in Figure 1 have four signal phases, each of which displays a green indication to both through and left-tum movements on a signalized approach. These phasing sequences are different from the conventional NEMA sequences in two ways. First, the green splits for circular phasing sequences, in general, are not the same as those for NEMA phases. Second, the time between centers of red for inbound and outbound directions is different. Therefore, there is a need to calculate new green splits for all phases, and to develop a new equation representing time between the centers of red for inbound and outbound movements on an arterial.

\[
\max(g_{1i}, g_{6i}) + \max(g_{2i}, g_{5i}) + \max(g_{4i}, g_{7i})
\]

+ \max(g_{3i}, g_{8i}) = 1

\[G_{1i} = G_{6i} = \max(g_{1i}, g_{6i})\]

= main-street outbound movement

\[G_{2i} = G_{5i} = \max(g_{2i}, g_{5i})\]

= main-street inbound movement

\[G_{4i} = G_{7i} = \max(g_{4i}, g_{7i})\]

= cross-street outbound movement

\[G_{3i} = G_{8i} = \max(g_{3i}, g_{8i})\]

= cross-street inbound movement

Green Split Calculation

As opposed to Webster's method (9) of computing green splits for the NEMA sequences used in the original formulation, the green splits for the circular phasing sequences are calculated as follows:

\[\max(g_{1i}, g_{6i}) + \max(g_{2i}, g_{5i}) + \max(g_{4i}, g_{7i})\]

+ \max(g_{3i}, g_{8i}) = 1

\[G_{1i} = G_{6i} = \max(g_{1i}, g_{6i})\]

= main-street outbound movement

\[G_{2i} = G_{5i} = \max(g_{2i}, g_{5i})\]

= main-street inbound movement

\[G_{4i} = G_{7i} = \max(g_{4i}, g_{7i})\]

= cross-street outbound movement

\[G_{3i} = G_{8i} = \max(g_{3i}, g_{8i})\]

= cross-street inbound movement
\[ G_{s,i} = G_{n,i} = \max(g_{s,i}, g_{n,i}) \]

where

\[ g_{m,i} = \text{calculated green based on volume to saturation flow ratio for movement } m \text{ of signal } i, \]

\[ G_{m,i} = \text{green split for movement } m \text{ of signal } i \text{ for a circular phasing sequence}. \]

The labels “inbound” and “outbound” are assigned to the movements for consistency with the original MILP formulation. The split calculation given above requires the following modifications to Constraints 1, 5a, and 5b given previously:

\[
(w_i + \bar{w}_i) - (w_{i+1} + \bar{w}_{i+1}) + (t_i + \bar{t}_i) + \Delta_i - \Delta_{i+1} - m_i = -\frac{1}{2} (R_{s,i} + R_{z,i}) + \frac{1}{2} (R_{a,i+1} + R_{z,i+1}) + (\bar{t}_i + t_{i+1}) \quad i = 1, \ldots, n - 1
\]

(9)

\[
w_i + b \leq 1 - R_{s,i} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n
\]

(10a)

\[
\bar{w}_i + \bar{b} \leq 1 - R_{z,i} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n
\]

(10b)

**Equation for Selecting Best Circular Sequence**

Following is the derivation of a single equation describing the time between the centers of red for the two arterial phases in a circular phasing sequence.

For the clockwise phasing sequence:

\[
\Delta_{6-2,i} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (G_{s,i} - G_{a,i}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (R_{s,i} - R_{a,i})
\]

\[
\Delta_{4-8,i} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (G_{s,i} - G_{a,i}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (R_{s,i} - R_{a,i})
\]

For the counterclockwise phasing sequence:

\[
\Delta_{6-2,i} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (G_{s,i} - G_{a,i}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (R_{s,i} - R_{a,i})
\]

\[
\Delta_{4-8,i} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (G_{s,i} - G_{a,i}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (R_{s,i} - R_{a,i})
\]

where

\[ \Delta_{j-k,i} = \text{difference between the centers of red for outbound movement } j \text{ and inbound movement } k \text{ on signal } i \text{ of the artery, and} \]

\[ R_{m,i} = 1 - G_{m,i} \text{ is the red split for movement } m \text{ of signal } i. \]

Subscripts 6 and 4 represent outbound movements on the main and cross arteries, respectively. Subscripts 2 and 8 represent inbound movement on the main and cross arteries, respectively.

As opposed to the original formulation, the \( \Delta \) values derived here for the main artery contain red splits for the cross artery, and vice versa. Combining the above equations to obtain a single set of equations for both clockwise and counterclockwise phasing sequences, we have

\[ \Delta_{6-2,i} = \Delta_i = \frac{1}{2} + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \beta \right) (R_{s,i} - R_{a,i}) \quad (11) \]

for the main artery, and

\[ \Delta_{4-8,i} = \Delta_i = \frac{1}{2} + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \beta \right) (R_{s,i} - R_{a,i}) \quad (12) \]

for the cross artery.

The binary decision variable \( \beta \) selects clockwise phasing for the \( i \)th signal when its value is 1 and selects counterclockwise phasing for the \( i \)th signal when its value is 0. Equation 11 is a replacement for Equation 2 of the original formulation. Equation 12 is needed only when one also desires to simultaneously optimize bands on the cross artery at signal \( i \) (i.e., in a multiarterial network problem).

Substituting Equations 1, 2, 5a, and 5b in the original arterial formulation with Equations 9, 11, 10a, and 10b, we obtain a new formulation that is capable of optimizing only circular phasing sequences. The new formulation was manually tested on several real-world test problems. These problems were optimized using the LINDO optimization package (10) on a personal computer. Figure 4 shows the time-space diagram for a five-intersection test problem using only circular phasing sequences. The intersections at 906 ft and 1,965 ft have only three phases. This illustrates the fact that for a three-legged intersection, a circular phasing sequence reduces to a conventional three-phase sequence with either lead-lag or lag-lead phasing for the two-way street.

**Combined NEMA and Circular Phasing Optimization Capability**

Next, we develop a comprehensive formulation having the capability to select either NEMA or circular phasing sequences that produce the maximum total progression bands on an arterial. We accomplish this by combining the original and new formulations described previously. The process of combining these two formulations is slightly more complicated because Constraints 1, 2, 5a, and 5b in the original formulation and corresponding Constraints 9, 11, 10a, and 10b in the new formulation are mutually exclusive. We combine these constraints by introducing binary variables into the problem formulation. The purpose of these variables is to provide a systematic way of selecting either NEMA or circular phasing sequences. Additional variables are defined as follows:

\[ R_{s,i} = \text{main-street outbound approach (Movements } 1 + 6) \]

\[ R_{z,i} = \text{main-street inbound approach (Movements } 2 + 5) \]

\[ R_{s,i} = \text{circular phase red split for cross-street Movements } 3 + 8 \text{ at node } i; \]

\[ R_{s,i} = \text{circular phase red split for cross-street Movements } 4 + 7 \text{ for node } i; \]
\[ \beta_i = \text{binary variable that selects one of the two circular phasing sequences: a value of 0 selects the counterclockwise sequence, and a value of 1 selects the clockwise sequence; and} \]

\[ \alpha_i = \text{binary variable that selects between the NEMA and the circular phasing sequences: a value of 1 selects the NEMA sequence, and a value of 0 selects the circular sequence.} \]

**Constraints on Progression Bands**

Constraints 5a and 5b are combined with Constraints 10a and 10b, respectively, to form the following two constraints:

\[ w_i + b + (r_i - R_{a,i})\alpha_i \leq 1 - R_{a,j} \quad (13a) \]

\[ \bar{w}_i + \bar{b} + (\bar{r}_i - R_{a,j})\alpha_i \leq 1 - R_{a,j} \quad (13b) \]

**Loop Constraints**

The Loop Constraints 1 and 9 are combined using the binary variable \( \alpha_i \), defined above, as follows:

\[ (w_i + \bar{w}_i) - (w_{i+1} + \bar{w}_{i+1}) + (t_i + \bar{t}_i) - m_i + \Delta_i \]

\[ + \frac{1}{2}(r_i + \bar{r}_i - R_{a,j} - R_{a,j})\alpha_i - \Delta_{i+1} \]

\[ - \frac{1}{2}(r_{i+1} + \bar{r}_{i+1} - R_{a,j+1} - R_{a,j+1})\alpha_{i+1} = \]

\[ - \frac{1}{2}(R_{a,j} + R_{a,j} - R_{a,j+1} - R_{a,j+1}) + (\bar{r}_i + \bar{t}_i) \quad (14) \]

**Phasing Sequence Selection Equations**

During optimization, the proper values of \( \Delta_i \) used in Equation 14 depend on whether NEMA or circular phasing is selected by the optimization program. This means that for a signal, either Constraint 2 or Constraint 11 is active. In order to implement these either/or (disjunctive) constraints, each of them is replaced by two inequality constraints. Because the \( \Delta_i \) variables are unrestricted (i.e., their values can also be negative), we add a value of 2 to these variables to ensure that they are able to achieve a lower bound of \(-2\). However, this transformation does not change the formulation, because the added values are canceled when \( \Delta_i \) and \( \Delta_{i+1} \) are substituted in Loop Constraint 4. Finally, using the binary variable \( \alpha_i \) defined earlier, we obtain the following set of constraints:

\[ \Delta_i + 2\alpha_i - 2\delta_{i} + \delta_{i} \leq \frac{1}{2}(-\ell_i + \bar{\ell}_i) + 4 \quad (15a) \]

\[ \Delta_i - 2\alpha_i - 2\delta_{i} + \delta_{i} \leq \frac{1}{2}(-\ell_i + \bar{\ell}_i) \quad (15b) \]

\[ \Delta_i - 2\alpha_i + (R_{a,i} - R_{a,j})\beta_i \leq \frac{1}{2}(R_{a,i} - R_{a,j}) + \frac{5}{2} \quad (16a) \]

\[ \Delta_i + 2\alpha_i + (R_{a,i} - R_{a,j})\beta_i \geq \frac{1}{2}(R_{a,i} - R_{a,j}) + \frac{5}{2} \quad (16b) \]
Note that for simplicity, Movements 1 + 6 are assumed to be outbound movements on the main artery and Movements 4 + 7 are assumed to be outbound movements on the cross artery. Further, this notation is used for consistency with that used in the original MILP formulation presented earlier.

The final comprehensive formulation is as follows:

\[
\text{MILP} 2 \quad \text{Find } b, \bar{b}, z, w, \bar{w}, t_i, \bar{t}_i, \delta, \bar{\delta}, \alpha_i, \beta_i, m_i \text{ and } \Delta_i \text{ to maximize } \sum cb + \bar{c}b \text{ subject to } \]

\[
\begin{align*}
(w_i + \bar{w}_i) - (w_{i+1} + \bar{w}_{i+1}) + (t_i + \bar{t}_i) - m_i \\
&+ \Delta_i + \frac{1}{2}(r_i + \bar{r}_i - R_{a,i} - R_{s,i})\alpha_i - \Delta_{i+1} \\
&- \frac{1}{2}(R_{a,i} + \bar{r}_{i+1} - R_{a,i+1} - R_{s,i+1})\alpha_{i+1} = \\
- \frac{1}{2}(R_{a,i} + \bar{r}_{i+1} - R_{a,i+1} - R_{s,i+1}) \\
&+ (\bar{t}_i + t_{i+1}) \quad i = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \\
\Delta_i + 2\alpha_i - \delta_i \bar{\ell}_i + \delta_i \bar{\ell}_i \\
\leq \frac{1}{2}(-\ell_i + \bar{\ell}_i) + 4 \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \quad (14a) \\
\Delta_i - 2\alpha_i - \delta_i \bar{\ell}_i + \delta_i \bar{\ell}_i \\
\leq \frac{1}{2}(-\ell_i + \bar{\ell}_i) \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \quad (14b) \\
\Delta_i - 2\alpha_i + (R_{a,i} - R_{s,i})\beta_i \\
\leq \frac{1}{2}(R_{a,i} - R_{s,i}) + \frac{s}{2} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \quad (16a) \\
\Delta_i + 2\alpha_i + (R_{a,i} - R_{s,i})\beta_i \\
\geq \frac{1}{2}(R_{a,i} - R_{s,i}) + \frac{s}{2} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \quad (16b) \\
-kb + \bar{b} \begin{cases} 
= 0 & \text{if } k = 1 \\
\geq 0 & \text{if } k < 1 \\
\leq 0 & \text{if } k > 1 
\end{cases} \quad (3) \\
\frac{1}{T_2} \leq z \leq \frac{1}{T_1} \quad (4) \\

w_i + b + (r_i - R_{s,i})\alpha_i \\
\leq 1 - R_{s,i} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \quad (13a) \\
\bar{w}_i + \bar{b} + (\bar{r}_i - R_{s,i})\alpha_i \\
\leq 1 - R_{s,i} \quad i = 1, \ldots, n \quad (13b) \\
\left(\frac{d_i}{e_i}\right)z \leq \left(\frac{d_i}{e_i}\right) \quad i = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \quad (6a) \\
\left(\frac{d_i}{e_i}\right)z \leq \left(\frac{d_i}{e_i}\right) \quad i = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \quad (6b)
\end{align*}
\]

NEMA Left-Turn Choice Constraints on \(\delta_i\) and \(\bar{\delta}_i\):

\[
\begin{align*}
&b, \bar{b}, z, w_i, \bar{w}_i, t_i, \bar{t}_i, \text{ and } m_i \geq 0 \\
&i = 1, \ldots, n, j = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \\
&m_i \text{ general integer variables} \\
&\delta_i, \bar{\delta}_i, \alpha_i \text{ and } \beta_i \text{ binary variables} \\
&i = 1, \ldots, n \quad (8)
\end{align*}
\]

**EXPERIMENTS WITH ENHANCED FORMULATION**

The comprehensive formulation presented in the previous section was manually tested using four real-world arterial test problems with 3, 5, 6, and 12 intersections. Constraint 3, which enforces a user-desired relationship between the inbound and outbound bandwidths, was relaxed for this set of experiments. All optimizations were performed on a personal computer using the LINDO optimization package. The optimum time-space diagram for the 12-intersection problem, obtained using the original formulation, is shown in Figure 5. The optimum time-space diagram for the same test problem, obtained using the enhanced formulation, is shown in Figure 6. Table 1 summarizes the results of these two optimization runs on the 12-intersection problem. Following is a description of results for this problem.

1. The enhanced formulation resulted in a cycle length of 78 sec, compared to a value of 71 sec with the original formulation.
2. The enhanced formulation produced larger progression bands with a total increase of 15.04 sec in the total bandwidth. This increase can also be verified by a comparison of bands in terms of percent of cycle length.
3. The enhanced formulation resulted in different phasing sequences on intersections at 0, 3,480, 4,520, 11,050, 12,145, and 12,950 ft. A counterclockwise circular phasing sequence was selected at the intersection at 12,145 ft. For the other intersections, different NEMA sequences were selected.

Optimizing combined NEMA and circular phasing sequences (using MAXBAND 89T) for the problems with three, five, and six intersections produced the same total bandwidths as the optimization of NEMA phasing sequences alone.
FIGURE 5  NEMA-only phasing sequence optimization for 12-intersection problem.

FIGURE 6  Combined NEMA and circular phasing sequence optimization for 12-intersection problem.
TABLE 1 MAXBAND 86 AND MAXBAND 89T RESULTS FOR 12-INTERSECTION PROBLEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle length (Sec)</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northbound Band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seconds (% of Cycle)</td>
<td>19.0 (28.1)</td>
<td>26.0 (33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound Band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seconds (% of Cycle)</td>
<td>24.6 (34.5)</td>
<td>33.6 (43.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 1</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
<td>Lead-Lag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 2</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 3</td>
<td>Lag-Lag</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 4</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
<td>Lead-Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 5</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 6</td>
<td>Lead-Lag</td>
<td>Lead-Lag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 7</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 8</td>
<td>Lead-Lag</td>
<td>Lead-Lag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 9</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 10</td>
<td>Lead-Lag</td>
<td>Lead-Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 11</td>
<td>Lead-Lead</td>
<td>Counter-Clock Circular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal 12</td>
<td>Lead-Lag</td>
<td>Lag-Lead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(MAXBAND 86). These results were not unexpected for the following reasons:

1. The maximum progression bandwidth cannot be greater than the minimum through green time. Thus, the upper limit on total bandwidth is the sum of minimum inbound green and minimum outbound green. For many arterial problems, only NEMA phasing optimization produces this maximum. For these problems, the enhanced formulation will result in the same total bandwidth, even when a circular phasing is selected.

2. Even if the total band produced by NEMA- only optimization is less than the upper limit, the signal spacings, combined with practical travel speeds, may not allow full utilization of the additional green time windows provided by circular phasing sequences.

DEVELOPMENT OF MAXBAND 89T

Because the manual procedure was too tedious and time-consuming, an automated method was developed to perform this task. We accomplished this by modifying the arterial signal-timing optimization capability of MAXBAND 86. The modified program, MAXBAND 89T, is capable of optimizing arterial signal-timing problems only, and allows the selection of best values for cycle length, offset, link travel speeds, and either NEMA or combined NEMA and circular phasing sequences. The following phasing restrictions are programmed in MAXBAND 89T:

1. Circular phasing sequence optimization is not allowed for a three-legged intersection because this is a special case of the conventional NEMA phasing sequence.

2. If circular phasing optimization is desired in addition to the NEMA phasing, at least one of the two signalized approaches on an arterial must have left-turn demand.

The time-space diagram of MAXBAND 89T prints characters 6666, 2222, 4444, and 8888, to indicate Signal Phases 1, 2, 5, 4, +7, and 3 +8, respectively. The length of a character string indicates the duration of corresponding phase.

EXPERIMENTS WITH ENHANCED FORMULATION USING MAXBAND 89T

Eight real-world arterial problems were used to test MAXBAND 89T on a DecStation 3100 computer. This computer is about two times faster than a Compaq 386/25 personal computer with a math coprocessor (11). For these test problems, we used fixed cycle lengths to ensure proper comparison with the original arterial formulation. In addition, we forced the inbound and outbound progression bandwidths to be the same.

Figures 7 and 8 show optimal time-space diagrams for Problem 2 (Ridgewood Avenue) obtained from the two programs. The optimal MAXBAND solution produced bands equal to 28.9 sec in each direction. The travel speeds selected for northbound and southbound directions were equal to 34.5 mph. The phasing sequences selected for Signals 1 through 4 were lag-lead, lead-lag, lead-lag, and lag-lead, respectively. In comparison, MAXBAND 89T produced 37.5-sec bands in each direction, an increase of over 17 sec in the total band. As compared to the solutions from MAXBAND 86, the enhanced program selected higher travel speeds of 37.7 and 37.8 mph for northbound and southbound directions, respectively. The phasing sequences selected by MAXBAND 89T were also different from those selected by MAXBAND 86. It selected counterclockwise circular phasing for the first intersection, and selected lead-lead phasing for the second and third intersections as compared to lag-lead phasing selected by MAXBAND 86.

Table 2 compares the MAXBAND 86 and MAXBAND 89T optimization results for all eight test problems. A description of the overall test results follows:

1. Combined NEMA and circular optimization produced wider progression bands for four out of eight problems. The improvement in bandwidth was from 15.35 to 29.55 percent.

2. Bandwidth improvement in terms of actual time was 3.5, 5.73, 6.51, and 17.09 sec for Problems 2, 5, 7, and 8, respectively.

3. As expected, the computational time required to optimize the enhanced formulation (MAXBAND 89T) increased slightly.

The TRANSYT-7F (12) program was used to further analyze the two solutions for Problems 2, 5, 7, and 8. For each optimal solution obtained from MAXBAND 86 and MAXBAND 89T, we performed (a) evaluation of delay, (b) delay optimization without constraining the bands, and (c) bandwidth-constrained delay minimization. For delay op-
We requested a stop penalty that minimized fuel consumption. The results are shown in Table 3. Following is a summary of these additional TRANSYT-7F studies:

1. For Problem 8 (Fannin), combined NEMA and circular phasing optimization (MAXBAND 89T) resulted in smaller values of delay, stops, and fuel consumption. For the other three problems, these measures were worse than those produced by optimizing NEMA sequences alone (MAXBAND 86).

2. For all cases, the use of an optimal bandwidth solution as a starting point for TRANSYT optimization resulted in reduced delay, stops, and fuel consumption. However, minimization without constraining the bands was always better than the constrained bandwidth option.

**SUMMARY**

We present an enhanced MILP arterial formulation that produces maximal progression bands by finding the best cycle
### TABLE 2 COMPARISON OF MAXBAND 86 AND MAXBAND 89T OPTIMIZATION RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Problem Name</th>
<th>No. of Signals</th>
<th>Cycle Length (Sec)</th>
<th>Original b = b</th>
<th>CPU Time (Sec)</th>
<th>Original + Circular b = b</th>
<th>CPU Time (Sec)</th>
<th>Bandwidth Increase (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>29.71</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ridgewood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>37.47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fourth Street</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>M Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>N 33rd</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Nicholasville</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>27.06</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>N Michigan</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.54</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Fannin</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20.87</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>165.0</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-- indicate no difference in the total bandwidth

### TABLE 3 DELAY COMPARISON OF SOLUTIONS FROM MAXBAND 86 AND MAXBAND 89T

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Problem</th>
<th>TRANSYT Option</th>
<th>Total Delay (Veh-hr/hr)</th>
<th>Ave. Delay (sec/veh)</th>
<th>Stops (veh/hr)</th>
<th>Fuel Cons. (gal/hr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ridgewood (N)</td>
<td>(1) Evaluation</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>25.40</td>
<td>7426.0</td>
<td>144.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Unconstrained Optimization</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>7101.0</td>
<td>139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Bandwidth Constrained Optimization</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>24.10</td>
<td>7101.0</td>
<td>139.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgewood (N+C)</td>
<td>(1) Evaluation</td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>6694.0</td>
<td>145.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Unconstrained Optimization</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>6466.0</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Bandwidth Constrained Optimization</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>6466.0</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 33rd (N)</td>
<td>(1) Evaluation</td>
<td>121.90</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>23621.0</td>
<td>532.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Unconstrained Optimization</td>
<td>125.66</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>23314.4</td>
<td>533.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Bandwidth Constrained Optimization</td>
<td>125.66</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>23314.4</td>
<td>533.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 33rd (N+C)</td>
<td>(1) Evaluation</td>
<td>125.93</td>
<td>27.74</td>
<td>22610.0</td>
<td>551.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Unconstrained Optimization</td>
<td>128.97</td>
<td>28.22</td>
<td>22293.9</td>
<td>552.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Bandwidth Constrained Optimization</td>
<td>128.97</td>
<td>28.22</td>
<td>22293.9</td>
<td>552.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Michigan (N)</td>
<td>(1) Evaluation</td>
<td>182.98</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>16887.6</td>
<td>362.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Unconstrained Optimization</td>
<td>185.04</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>15172.7</td>
<td>331.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Bandwidth Constrained Optimization</td>
<td>185.04</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>15172.7</td>
<td>331.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Michigan (N+C)</td>
<td>(1) Evaluation</td>
<td>187.86</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>16887.6</td>
<td>362.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Unconstrained Optimization</td>
<td>190.78</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>15172.7</td>
<td>331.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Bandwidth Constrained Optimization</td>
<td>190.78</td>
<td>15.46</td>
<td>15172.7</td>
<td>331.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin (N)</td>
<td>(1) Evaluation</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>15135.0</td>
<td>409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Unconstrained Optimization</td>
<td>263.97</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>15135.0</td>
<td>409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Bandwidth Constrained Optimization</td>
<td>263.97</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>15135.0</td>
<td>409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fannin (N+C)</td>
<td>(1) Evaluation</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>15135.0</td>
<td>409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Unconstrained Optimization</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>15135.0</td>
<td>409.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Bandwidth Constrained Optimization</td>
<td>258.00</td>
<td>21.40</td>
<td>15135.0</td>
<td>409.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N) - NEMA optimization using MAXBAND 86
(N+C) - NEMA+Circular optimization using MAXBAND 89T
TRANSYT Options (1) Evaluation, (2) Unconstrained Optimization, (3) Bandwidth Constrained Optimization

These results are based on a small set of test problems. However, the results show that combined NEMA and circular phasing sequences can produce improved signal timings; therefore, optimization using the circular phasing sequence should not be excluded from the choices examined.

Further research is needed to more fully understand the advantages and disadvantages of the circular phasing optimization. Some of the questions that need to be answered are:

1. What is the effect of circular phasing selection on the cross street? On pedestrian traffic?
2. What causes the total delay to be increased or decreased?
3. Under what signal conditions (i.e., demand, signal spacings) can maximum benefits be obtained from circular phasing?
4. How would drivers react when they encounter a signal with the nontraditional circular phasing sequence?
5. What type of results would be obtained from using this capability in the other recent nonuniform arterial bandwidth models (4,5)?
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