



AN EFFICIENT APPROACH TO SOLVING THE ROAD NETWORK EQUILIBRIUM TRAFFIC ASSIGNMENT PROBLEM†

LARRY J. LEBLANC

Department of Computer Science and Operations Research, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX 75275
U.S.A.

and

EDWARD K. MORLOK

Department of Civil and Urban Engineering, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19174, U.S.A.

and

WILLIAM P. PIERSKALLA

Department of Industrial Engineering and Management Sciences, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL 60201,
U.S.A.

(Received 1 February 1975)

Abstract—This paper presents a solution technique for large scale road network equilibrium assignment and related flow problems with nonlinear costs. It is shown that this nonlinear network problem can be solved without explicitly considering any of the constraints—they are satisfied automatically in the procedure developed—and without storing all of the individual decision variables. The computational requirements of the algorithm reported are almost identical to the requirements of heuristic solution techniques for traffic assignment. A solution time of nine seconds on the CDC 6400 was obtained for the test problem, which included 76 arcs and 24 nodes, all of which were origins and destinations.

INTRODUCTION

We consider the following multi-commodity network flow problem. Given a network with n nodes, let nodes $1, 2, \dots, p, p \leq n$ be a set of nodes which are either supply points or demand points or both. Typically, $p = n$, i.e. every node is a supply point and/or a demand point. In addition, every node in the network will be considered a transshipment point. Let A denote the set of arcs in the network and D be a $p \times p$ matrix whose (i, j) entry indicates the number of units which must flow between nodes i and j . To write the conservation of flow equations insuring that $D(j, s)$ units flow from node j to node s , we introduce the following notation:

x_{ij}^s —flow along arc (i, j) with destination s
 x_{ij} —total flow along arc (i, j) .

We then must have

$$D(j, s) + \sum_i x_{ij}^s = \sum_k x_{jk}^s \quad \begin{matrix} j = 1, \dots, n \\ s = 1, \dots, p \\ j \neq s. \end{matrix}$$

These constraints state that for every node j , for every

destination s , the flow which originates at node j destined for node s plus the transiting flow destined for s must equal the total flow which leaves node j destined for s . Thus, for each destination node s we have a system of conservation of flow equations: one equation for all nodes j in the network, $j \neq s$. We may omit the equation for $j = s$, since it is generally true that if we require the correct amount of flow to leave each supply point, and if flow is conserved at every intermediate node, then the equation requiring the flow to arrive at the demand point is redundant. Let the cost of shipping x_{ij} units along arc (i, j) be $f_{ij}(x_{ij})$. The cost function $f_{ij}(\cdot)$ is a function of the total flow along the arc, i.e. the sum of all the commodities flowing along the arc. The multi-commodity transshipment problem which we address, expressed in its most general form, is then

$$(NLP) \quad \text{Min} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} f_{ij} \left(\sum_{s=1}^p x_{ij}^s \right) \quad (1)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad D(j, s) + \sum_i x_{ij}^s = \sum_k x_{jk}^s \quad \begin{matrix} j = 1, \dots, n \\ s = 1, \dots, p \\ j \neq s \end{matrix} \quad (2)$$

$$x_{ij}^s \geq 0 \quad (i, j) \in A, \quad s = 1, \dots, p. \quad (3)$$

As will be described below, various forms of the $f_{ij}(\cdot)$ function yield a model corresponding to different problems.

A more intuitive (although computationally more difficult) form for the conservation of flow equations, is as

†This work was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation to the Urban Systems Engineering Center at Northwestern University (grant No. GU-3851) and by a contract between the Federal Highway Administration, Environmental Planning Branch, and the Technological Institute at Northwestern University (contract No. DOT-FH-11). This support in no way implies agreement with the conclusions reached in this research.

follows: Define

x_{ij}^r —flow along arc (i, j) which originates at node r and is destined for node s

x_{ij} —total flow on arc (i, j) , $x_{ij} = \sum_r x_{ij}^r$.

Our problem is then

$$\text{Min} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} f_{ij} \left(\sum_{r,s} x_{ij}^r \right) \quad (1')$$

$$\sum_r x_{ij}^r - \sum_k x_{jk}^r = \begin{cases} -D(r, s) & j = r & j = 1, \dots, n \\ 0 & j \neq r, s & r, s = 1, \dots, p \\ D(r, s) & j = s & r \neq s \end{cases} \quad (2')$$

$$x_{ij}^r \geq 0 \quad (i, j) \in A, \quad r, s = 1, \dots, p, \quad r \neq s. \quad (3')$$

Constraints (2') state that the flow into node j traveling from node r to node s equals the flow out of node j traveling from r to s (unless $j = s$). For any specified network, the constraints (2') are clearly much greater in number than the constraints (2).

THE ROAD NETWORK EQUILIBRIUM ASSIGNMENT PROBLEM

The equilibrium traffic assignment problem may be stated as follows: We are given a set of roads and zones representing a particular urban area, and we have estimates of the total demand for travel via road between each pair of zones. We wish to determine how this traffic will distribute itself over the roads of the area. Typically, we have projections of the traffic between each zone pair in some future period, and we wish to determine if the existing or various proposed road networks can handle the increased traffic, what the associated user costs or travel time will be, etc.

A system of streets and expressways may be modeled by a network in which the nodes are used to represent intersections (or interchanges). Nodes are connected by directed arcs so that a two-way street is modeled by two arcs in opposite directions. The network is generally used to represent only the major streets of an urban area, while minor roads such as side streets in residential areas are usually not included.

Nodes also are used as the places at which traffic enters and leaves the system (i.e. places where it is generated). It is assumed in this model that the origin to destination demands are fixed. In general, of course, it is known empirically and from *a priori* economic theory that the quantity of travel between two points is a function of the overall cost of that travel and the cost to alternative destinations where the same trip purpose might be satisfied. In traffic assignment, this interdependence is treated exogenously. In principle, after each assignment of a fixed demand, that demand would be checked against the user costs, and if they were not in correspondence, the assignment would be performed again with a revised demand estimate, and so on.

One of the most common behavioral assumptions made

in traffic assignment modeling is that each user of the urban network will take the path of least perceived cost from his origin to his destination. It is known that travel time is a significant factor to the majority of travelers when they choose their routes between their respective origins and destinations, and most applications of traffic assignment utilize travel time as the basic measure of travel cost (Comsis, 1972). However, research over the past decade indicates that other factors are important, such as distance and the tension of driving on various streets. For example, after considerable behavioral research, Michaels (1960, 1962, 1965) has concluded that it is the net impedance or total disutility—a composite measure of travel time, tension and other factors—that drivers seek to minimize. Thus, if a traveler is faced with a choice between two routes of roughly equal travel time, he may prefer not to choose the one which is characterized by heavy stop-and-go traffic. It is far beyond the scope of this paper to attempt to resolve differences in the factors included in drivers' choice of routes. In the remainder of this paper, the term travel cost will be used to mean some scalar measure of cost upon which users' select their routes, perhaps including time, tension, distance, dollars or some weighted combination of these.

The travel time experienced by the user of any road or arc, called the average travel time function or the volume delay curve, is a known function of the total volume of flow along the road. While various functional forms are in use in different nations, all seem to be nonlinear and strictly increasing with flow on the arc. The parameters of these travel time functions are determined by its length, speed limit, geometric design, number of lanes, number of traffic lights and other road characteristics. If there is a significant delay in making a left turn at an intersection (node), then turn penalties can be incorporated by using dummy arcs to represent the delay in making the turn. The other components of user cost are not well researched, although tension probably increases with volume of traffic. However, it probably can be reasonably assumed that a measure of overall traveller disutility is an increasing function of volume, and it probably is nonlinear.

The assumption that each driver takes the path of least cost between his origin and destination gives rise to the concept of network equilibrium. A set of flows along the arcs of the network is said to be at equilibrium if the following two conditions are satisfied for every origin-destination pair, $r-s$. (i) If two or more routes between node r and node s are actually traveled, then the cost to each traveler between r and s must be the same for each of these routes. (ii) There does not exist an alternative unused route between nodes r and s with less cost than that of the routes which are traveled.

The assumption is made that each user of the network seeks to minimize his own travel cost and that he experiments with different routes, eventually finding the least cost one. Although this may not be completely true in reality, it is assumed that those drivers using more costly routes constitute a negligible portion of the total. It is clear that if (i) or (ii) were not true, some drivers would

constitute the equilibrium flows. Problem (NLP) is closely related to the work done by Kirchoff in electrical networks. The proof is based on the Kuhn-Tucker conditions; see Beckman (1956), Le Blanc (1973).

The objective function (1) contains many cross products involving fifth degree terms. There is one constraint (2) for every node j , for every destination s in the network, $j \neq s$. There is one variable for each arc, for each destination in the network. Thus if we wish to find the equilibrium on a 500 node, 2,000 arc grid network in which each node is an origin and a destination, then problem (NLP) has $500 \cdot 499 = 249,500$ conservation of flow constraints and $2000 \cdot 500 = 1,000,000$ variables and non-negativity constraints. In this paper, we will present an efficient method for solving such large scale versions of (NLP). First we give a lemma which is fundamental to the remainder of this paper.

Lemma If $A_{ij}(\cdot)$ is a nondecreasing continuously differentiable function on $[0, \infty)$, then the objective function (1) is convex with respect to the x_{ij}'' (and the x_{ij}').

Proof: It is only necessary to show that each f_{ij} is convex with respect to the $x_{ij} = \sum_{r''} x_{ij}'' = \sum_{r'} x_{ij}'$. Then, since x_{ij} is a linear function of the x_{ij}'' (and the x_{ij}'), each f_{ij} will be convex with respect to the x_{ij}'' (and the x_{ij}'). Now $f'_{ij}(x_{ij}) = A_{ij}(x_{ij})$, and since A_{ij} was assumed continuously differentiable and nondecreasing—the travel time per user does not get smaller as a road gets more congested—then $A'_{ij}(x_{ij}) = f''_{ij}(x_{ij})$ is non-negative on $[0, \infty)$. Therefore, each f_{ij} is a convex function of the x_{ij}'' (and the x_{ij}'). Since the sum of convex functions is convex, the proof is completed.

Therefore, any local optimal solution to (1), (2), (3) is also a global optimal solution, and hence is the desired equilibrium flow. When $A_{ij}(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing, the objective function (1) is strictly convex with respect to the x_{ij} , but is not strictly convex with respect to the x_{ij}'' . Although the optimal solution to the NLP problem above may not be unique, the total flows along each arc at equilibrium (e.g. the $x_{ij} = \sum_{r''} x_{ij}''$) are unique in the strictly increasing case.

AN ALGORITHM FOR THE NETWORK EQUILIBRIUM PROBLEM

Now if x^1 is a set of flows which satisfies constraints (2) and (3), then we can use a first order Taylor's Expansion for the objective junction $f(\cdot)$ to write, for any y ,

$$f(y) = f(x^1) + \nabla f(x^1) \cdot (y - x^1) \text{ some } \theta \in [0, 1].$$

Here, the gradient of f is being evaluated at some point between x^1 and y . A convenient linear approximation to $f(y)$ is to let θ equal zero

$$f(y) \approx f(x^1) + \nabla f(x^1) \cdot (y - x^1). \tag{4}$$

If we solve the linear programming problem in y

$$(P) \text{ Min}_{y \geq 0} \nabla f(x^1) \cdot y + [f(x^1) - \nabla f(x^1) \cdot x^1]$$

$$\text{s.t. } D(j, s) + \sum_i y_{ij}'' = \sum_k y_{ik}' \quad \begin{matrix} j = 1, \dots, n \\ s = 1, \dots, p \\ j \neq s. \end{matrix} \tag{5}$$

getting y^1 as the optimal solution, then y^1 is also a feasible solution to (NLP), since the constraints are identical for both problems. Note that the term $[f(x^1) - \nabla f(x^1) \cdot x^1]$ is a constant, so we may omit it from the linear programming problem. The direction $d^1 = y^1 - x^1$ is then a good direction along which to minimize f (Zangwill, 1969). Since the feasible region (2), (3) is convex, any point on the line segment between x^1 and y^1 will also satisfy the constraints. Thus to minimize f in the direction d^1 , we solve the one dimensional problem

$$\text{Min } f(x^1 + ad^1) \tag{6}$$

$$a \in [0, 1].$$

It is well known that a Bolzano search is an efficient technique for solving this problem (Zangwill, 1969). After solving the one dimensional problem, we get a new feasible point, x^2 .

Lemma $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} x^n = x^*$, where x^* is optimal for (NLP).

See Zangwill (1969) for a proof of this. This algorithm of iteratively solving one dimensional searches and linear programming problems which minimize successively better approximations to f near x^* is known as the Frank-Wolfe algorithm. One nice aspect of this algorithm is that at every iteration we have a lower bound on the optimal value of the NLP problem. By convexity, we have

$$f(x^*) \geq f(x^k) + \nabla f(x^k) \cdot (x^* - x^k)$$

where x^* is the optimal solution, and x^k is the feasible solution at iteration k . Also, we have that

$$f(x^k) + \nabla f(x^k) \cdot (x^* - x^k) \geq f(x^k) + \nabla f(x^k) \cdot (y^k - x^k)$$

since y^k minimizes $\nabla f(x^k) \cdot y$ for every feasible y . Therefore $f(x^k) + \nabla f(x^k) \cdot (y^k - x^k)$ is a lower bound on $f(x^*)$, for every k . One possible stopping criterion is to stop when the current functional value is within a given epsilon of this lower bound.

Unfortunately, if we wish to find the equilibrium on the 500 node network mentioned above, then the problem (NLP), and consequently each subproblem, has a prohibitively large number of constraints and variables. Not only are the linear programming subproblems apparently unsolvable, but also the 1,000,000 variables in the example present a serious challenge for the one dimensional search. Even a highly efficient technique such as the Bolzano search will require a considerable amount of time, and yet larger networks are not uncommon in an urban context.

We will now develop an efficient algorithm for solving the linear programming subproblem (P) and the one dimensional searches of the type in (6). After developing the algorithm, numerical results will be presented. Omitting the constant terms in the objective function in

(P), we have

$$\text{Min } \nabla f(x^1) \cdot y = \text{Min } \sum_{ij} \frac{\partial f(x^1) y_{ij}^1}{\partial x_{ij}^1}$$

Now let us look at $\nabla f(x)$. We see that

$$\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{ij}^s} = \frac{\partial \sum_{k_1} f_{k_1}(x_{k_1})}{\partial x_{ij}^s} = \frac{\partial f_{ij}(x_{ij})}{\partial x_{ij}^s} = \frac{\partial f_{ij}(x_{ij})}{\partial x_{ij}} \cdot \frac{\partial x_{ij}}{\partial x_{ij}^s}$$

where $x_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^p x_{ij}^s$. The second equality is true because all of the cost functions except f_{ij} are independent of x_{ij}^s . The third equality is an application of the chain rule. Clearly, $\partial x_{ij} / \partial x_{ij}^s = 1$. Therefore, we have that

$$\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{ij}^s} = A_{ij} \left(\sum_s x_{ij}^s \right)$$

by definition of f_{ij} and continuity of the A_{ij} . Notice that this is independent of s . Now define

$$c_{ij} = A_{ij}(x_{ij})|_{x=x}$$

This is the average time or cost on arc (i, j) —the time experienced by each user of arc (i, j) —when the flow in the network is equal to the fixed amount x^1 . The linear programming subproblem is then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Min}_{y \geq 0} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \sum_{s=1}^p c_{ij} y_{ij}^s &= \text{Min}_{y \geq 0} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} \sum_{s=1}^p c_{ij} y_{ij}^s \geq \sum_{s=1}^p \text{Min}_{y \geq 0} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{ij} y_{ij}^s \\ \text{s.t. (5)} \quad \quad \quad \text{s.t. (5)} \quad \quad \quad \text{s.t. (5)} \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The right hand side of (7) constitutes a lower bound on the optimal value of the linear programming problem since the minimum of a sum is always greater than or equal to the sum of the minima. Note that there are no capacities on the arcs in problem (P). The constraints are only non-negativity and conservation of flow. It was not necessary to introduce capacities into the original NLP problem because the travel time for each user of any arc becomes very large when the flow exceeds the level for which the arc was designed. By definition of an equilibrium, no one will voluntarily accept ϵ higher travel time than necessary; thus at equilibrium, flows will necessarily avoid a high state of congestion on any arc (unless every arc in the network is congested). Since the optimal solution to (1), (2), (3) is the desired equilibrium, there is therefore no reason to introduce capacities for any of the arcs; it is the non-linearity of the travel time functions which obviates the need for capacities on any arc.

Since the Frank-Wolfe algorithm is an iterative procedure, the subproblem (7) will be solved many times. At each iteration k , the vector of objective function coefficients is $\nabla f(x^k)$, where x^k is the k th feasible solution. This changes at every iteration; hence we must iteratively solve problem (7). For every iteration, the linear programming subproblem (7) has the very special form

$$\text{Min}_{y \geq 0} \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{ij} y_{ij}^1 + \dots + \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{ij} y_{ij}^s + \dots + \sum_{(i,j) \in A} c_{ij} y_{ij}^p$$

$$\text{s.t. } - \sum_i y_{ij}^1 + \sum_k y_{jk}^1 = D(j, 1)$$

$$j = 2, 3, \dots, n$$

$$- \sum_i y_{ij}^s + \sum_k y_{jk}^s = D(j, s)$$

$$j = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad j \neq s$$

$$- \sum_i y_{ij}^p + \sum_k y_{jk}^p = D(j, p)$$

$$j = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad j \neq p$$

where n is the number of nodes in the network. There are no linking constraints at all in this problem; the variables within any block do not interact with the variables in any other block. Therefore the problem reduces to n separate linear programming problems; by solving each "block" problem separately from the others, we get a feasible solution to the linear programming problem, and thus the lower bound (7) is achieved.

An additional important simplification occurs due to the structure of each of the above blocks. We can think of the problem in block s as minimizing total shipping cost from every node in the network to node s , where c_{ij} is the constant shipping cost of arc (i, j) . It is not necessary to use the simplex method to solve the problem—this is the simplest of all transportation problems. Using the $D(j, s)$ as quantities to be shipped from node j to node s and the c_{ij} as the length of the arc (i, j) , we can find the shortest route between nodes j and s , for all j . Since there are no capacities on any of the arcs, we send all of the quantity $D(j, s)$ along this shortest path. Since the shortest route algorithm due to Dijkstra (Dreyfus, 1969) finds the shortest route between any given node and all other nodes, the optimal solution for block s can be found by solving one shortest route problem. Certainly the above procedure does not violate the conservation of flow requirement (5) or the non-negativity requirement. This procedure is summed up by the following theorem.

Theorem: At each iteration k of the Frank-Wolfe algorithm the optimal solution to subproblem k , problem (P), is given by $y_{ij}^k = \sum_r y_{ij}^{rk}$, where

$$y_{ij}^{rk} = \begin{cases} D(r, s) & \text{if arc } (i, j) \text{ is on the shortest path between } r \\ & \text{and } s \text{ using the } c_{ij} = A_{ij}(x_{ij})|_{x=x}^k \text{ as the lengths of} \\ & \text{the arcs } (i, j). \\ 0 & \text{if arc } (i, j) \text{ is not on the shortest path.} \end{cases}$$

Proof: Assume that at the optimal solution to the subproblem, all the flow does not follow the minimum path or least cost path between at least one origin-destination pair; let this pair be r and s . If we change this flow so that all of the flow does follow the shortest path, then we get a smaller cost for this origin-destination pair. Since all costs are linear in the subproblems, adding additional flow to any arc has no affect on the cost of

other users. Their unit cost is c_{ij} , independent of the level of flow on the arc, so their total cost remains the same. We then have a smaller value of the objective function, contradicting the assumed optimality. Observe that with this approach to solving the sub-linear programming problem (7), we do not have to write out any of the tens of thousands of conservation of flow and non-negativity constraints. The constraints are implicitly satisfied—we simply observe that we have the best solution which satisfies them. Conservation of flow is satisfied by definition of a path between two nodes; obviously this procedure does not yield negative flows.

Thus we can solve the NLP problem by a sequence of shortest route problems and one dimensional searches. Since the subproblems are linear, all of the existing theory of network decomposition (Hu, 1970) can be used to solve the shortest routes in each subproblem. It is appropriate to point out at this juncture that the algorithm is similar to that of Bruynooghe, Gibert and Sakarovitch (1968), although the means of developing it and the details differ.

An initial set of feasible flows is required to begin the algorithm. Fortunately, in a problem such as this one, it is relatively easy to get a good starting solution; we may estimate the equilibrium flows (i.e. the optimal solution to (NLP)) by dividing the flow required for each origin-destination pair among several promising routes between the origin and destination. In general, the better this initial estimate of the equilibrium point is, the fewer the number of iterations required will be. Since we are more interested in the optimal flows than the optimal value to the (NLP) problem, the best stopping rule is to stop when the maximum percentage change between the components of two consecutive flow vectors is less than some specified amount. In summary, the algorithm is as follows; we begin with the index $k = 0$.

1. Let the current feasible solution be x^k .
2. Compute $A_{ij}(x^k)_{i-x}^k \equiv c_{ij}$. Set $y_{ij} = 0$, all (i, j) . Set $s = 1$.
3. Find the shortest route between every node in the network and node s (i.e. solve one shortest route problem) using the c_{ij} as distances.
4. For each origin r in the network, perform the Fortran operation $y_{ij} = y_{ij} + D(r, s)$ for every arc (i, j) on the shortest route between node r and node s .
5. If s is not equal to the number of destinations, set $s = s + 1$ and go to step 3; otherwise go to step 6.
6. Now the y_{ij} are the solution to subproblem k . Denote by y^k the vector of the y_{ij} . Minimize the function f along the line segment between x^k and y^k , using a one-dimensional search technique. Let the minimizing point be x^{k+1} .
7. Test the stopping criterion, and go to step 2 if it fails.

As stated previously, the exceeding large number of decision variables in this problem can cause computational difficulty in step 6. The number of variables will usually number approximately one million on a 500 node network. However, only the variables $x_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^p x_{ij}^s$ affect the objective function; the objective function is uniquely determined by $\sum_{s=1}^p x_{ij}^s$, regardless of the values of the

individual x_{ij}^s . Obviously, the x_{ij} are far fewer in number than the variables x_{ij}^s . Each time we solve the subproblem (7) in y , we can find the optimal $y_{ij} = \sum_{s=1}^p y_{ij}^s$ without storing any of the y_{ij}^s by using counters, y_{ij} , to store the cumulative flow on each arc. We do this in the following manner. First compute the y_{ij}^1 by sending the flow from each node to node 1 along the shortest paths. Next perform the Fortran operation $y_{ij} = y_{ij} + y_{ij}^1$ for all arcs (i, j) in the network, and then compute the y_{ij}^2 . We again increment the counters, and repeat the process, computing $y_{ij}^3, y_{ij}^4, \dots$, and then y_{ij}^p , incrementing y_{ij} each time. This procedure gives the optimal y_{ij} for (7), although the optimal y_{ij}^s will not be known. Given these y_{ij} , the one dimensional search will yield new values for the flows by solving the problem (6).

After performing this one-dimensional search, we will not know the values of the x_{ij}^s , but only the values of the total flow, the x_{ij} . But we do not need the x_{ij}^s in implementing this algorithm, since the x_{ij} alone uniquely determine $\nabla f(x^{k+1})$, the new vector of arc lengths for solving (7) again. Using this procedure on the 500 node, 2,000 arc network discussed above, the one dimensional search need only work with 2,000 variables instead of 1,000,000. This is a significant improvement—a Bolzano search of a polynomial function of 2,000 variables takes less than half a second on the CDC 6400.

It is important to realize that solving the NLP (1), (2), (3) with any straight forward algorithm would certainly require storing each individual decision variable, x_{ij}^s . These variables x_{ij}^s had to be introduced in the NLP to assure that the correct number of units flowed between each origin-destination pair. Multi-commodity conservation of flow equations require that flow be identified by its ultimate destination. By exploiting the structure of the NLP explicit consideration of each decision variable was obviated. Thus this (NLP) problem can be solved by the procedure developed above without ever writing down any of the tens of thousands of constraints and without ever storing the values of the individual decision variables.

DISCUSSION AND COMPARISON OF THE ALGORITHM

A common problem in any algorithm which utilizes derivatives of a function is the excessive computation time required to precisely calculate these derivatives. In this particular model, the problem is non-existent—since we are minimizing the integral of the average cost function, the derivatives are explicitly available. In fact, derivatives are easier to compute than functional values, since they contain only fourth powers, and the objective function contains fifth powers. Accuracy is limited only by the accuracy of the actual parameters, a_{ij} and b_{ij} , input to the model.

Another difficulty inherent to feasible direction algorithms such as the Frank-Wolfe occurs when the objective function assumes a minimum point in the interior of the feasible region. If x^* is an interior minimum point, then $\nabla f(x^*) = 0$. In a small neighborhood of x^* , the individual components of the gradient, because they are near zero, may oscillate positive and negative. Thus the geometric direction indicated by the gradient may

change very rapidly as the sequence of points nears the optimal solution. This can cause the points to zig zag around the optimal solution, retarding the speed of convergence. Fortunately, the gradient of the objective function (1) will not be zero at the optimal solution, since the function is strictly increasing and has no stationary point in the feasible region. Thus the NLP (1), (2), (3) appears to be well suited to a feasible directions approach.

In very large linear programming problems, there is frequently a certain amount of round-off error introduced into the optimal solution given by the simplex method. This type of error is primarily caused by multiplication and division operations. The error should be almost non-existent in the solution given by the theorem above, since shortest route algorithms typically require only addition and comparison operations.

The most time consuming portion of the algorithm described above is in finding all shortest paths in the network, i.e. in solving subproblem (P). We solve subproblem (P) to determine a direction in which to minimize the objective function (1). It is intriguing to note that the computational requirements of (P) are identical to one iteration of one of the most common simulation traffic assignment procedures used today. This is the iterated capacity restraint algorithm (Comsis, 1972; Hershendorfer, 1966). The rationale behind this simulation procedure is taken from a game theoretic interpretation of the network equilibrium problem. Associated with each origin in the network is a player who tries to choose a set of routes such that the correct number of vehicles will travel from his origin to each destination at minimum travel time for the vehicles associated with his origin. Since vehicles from the various origins interact, the travel times as seen by a given player depend on the actions of the other players. Thus an iterative technique is used to determine the equilibrium flows in the network. Each player chooses his routes in turn: after all the players have made their decisions, the resulting travel times are revealed to all the players, and they again take turns in revising their routes (Hershendorfer, 1966).

The computational requirements of this rather colorful interpretation of the network equilibrium problem are as follows. At each iteration of the procedure, the length of each arc is computed as the average travel time function evaluated at the current flow level on the arc. Next, shortest routes between each origin and destination are determined so that each player can direct his vehicles along the shortest path to their destination. The algorithm developed in this paper also iteratively computes the length of each arc as the arc's average travel time function evaluated at the current flow on that arc and finds all shortest paths. The fundamental difference between the two procedures is that our proposed algorithm minimizes the objective function along this generated direction to compute a new vector of flows. The simulation procedure in Hershendorfer (1966) on the other hand, uses this n -dimensional direction itself as a new vector of flows. This leads to completely distinct flow vectors. These two approaches to the network equilibrium problem are fundamentally different: one is a simulation technique based on heuristic assumptions about the system; it

frequently does not converge. The other is a rigorous application of a convergent algorithm to an NLP problem whose optimal solution is proven to be the equilibrium. Nevertheless, the only difference in computational requirements is in the one dimensional search, a negligible procedure.

NUMERICAL RESULTS

The algorithm developed above was programmed in Fortran on a CDC 6400 computer; a small test network of ten arcs and four nodes was used for debugging purposes. Each of the four nodes was considered to be an origin and a destination. The network, trip table, and travel time functions were chosen so that the equilibrium flows could be calculated by hand. The (NLP) problem for this network consisted of 40 variables x_{ij}^s , $s = 1, 2, 3, 4$ for each of the ten arcs; $4 \cdot 3 = 12$ conservation of flow constraints; and 40 non-negativity constraints. Ten iterations of the procedure were required to yield a vector of flows with each component accurate to 5% of its true value. Computing time (central processing unit) was approximately one second.

The algorithm was then run on the 76 arc, 24 node network in Fig. 2. The trip table and parameters for the average travel time functions are given in Table 1. The (NLP) problem for this network had 1,824 variables: x_{ij}^s , $s = 1, 2, \dots, 24$, for each of the 76 arcs, (i, j) ; $(24) \cdot (23) = 552$ conservation of flow constraints; and 1,824 non-negativity constraints. Since this is a general nonlinear programming problem, it is impossible to determine the exact solution in a finite amount of time. However, Table 2 shows the sequence of flow vectors generated: there are 76 components, one for each arc. After 20 iterations, only 2 variables changed by more than 5%; the majority changed by less than 2%. Thus the vector x^{20} appears to be a highly accurate estimate of the equilibrium solution. Computing time for twenty iterations, excluding 3 seconds of compilation time, was nine seconds. If the termination rule had been to stop when the maximum percentage change in components was less than 8%, the procedure would have terminated after 16 iterations.




Fig. 2. Test network for the equilibrium problem.

Table 1. Matrix of trips between each node pair (thousands of vehicles/day) and arc parameters (hours/thousand vehicles) for the network in Fig. 2

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 |
|----|----|---|---|----|----|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 13 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 12 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| 6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 7 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 10 | 6 | 19 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 14 | 10 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| 8 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 8 | 16 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 22 | 14 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| 9 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 28 | 14 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 14 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 2 |
| 10 | 13 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 10 | 8 | 19 | 16 | 28 | 0 | 40 | 20 | 19 | 21 | 40 | 44 | 39 | 7 | 18 | 25 | 12 | 26 | 18 | 8 |
| 11 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 14 | 39 | 0 | 14 | 10 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 10 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 11 | 13 | 6 |
| 12 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 20 | 14 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 5 |
| 13 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 19 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 13 | 8 | 8 |
| 14 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 21 | 16 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 4 |
| 15 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 40 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 26 | 10 | 4 |
| 16 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 14 | 22 | 14 | 44 | 14 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 28 | 5 | 13 | 16 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 3 |
| 17 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 10 | 14 | 9 | 39 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 28 | 0 | 6 | 17 | 17 | 6 | 17 | 6 | 3 |
| 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| 19 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 4 | 18 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| 20 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 25 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 16 | 17 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 12 | 24 | 7 | 4 |
| 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 12 | 0 | 18 | 7 | 5 |
| 22 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 26 | 11 | 7 | 13 | 12 | 26 | 12 | 17 | 3 | 12 | 24 | 18 | 0 | 21 | 11 |
| 23 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 18 | 13 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 21 | 0 | 7 |
| 24 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 7 | 0 |

| ARCS | PARAMETERS | ARCS | PARAMETERS |
|---------------------|------------|---------------------|------------|
| | A | | B |
| (7,18) AND (18,7) | 0.02 | (13,24) AND (24,13) | 0.04 |
| (10,15) AND (15,10) | 0.06 | (24,21) AND (21,24) | 0.03 |
| (3,4) AND (4,3) | 0.04 | (20,21) AND (21,20) | 0.06 |
| (1,3) AND (3,1) | 0.04 | (2,6) AND (6,2) | 0.05 |
| (1,2) AND (2,1) | 0.06 | (6,8) AND (8,6) | 0.02 |
| (3,12) AND (12,3) | 0.04 | (7,8) AND (8,7) | 0.03 |
| (12,13) AND (13,12) | 0.03 | (5,6) AND (6,5) | 0.04 |
| (18,20) AND (20,18) | 0.04 | (23,24) AND (24,23) | 0.02 |
| (10,11) AND (11,10) | 0.05 | (21,22) AND (22,21) | 0.02 |
| (16,18) AND (18,16) | 0.03 | (14,23) AND (23,14) | 0.04 |
| (15,19) AND (19,15) | 0.03 | (22,23) AND (23,22) | 0.04 |
| (10,17) AND (17,10) | 0.08 | (14,15) AND (15,14) | 0.05 |
| (8,9) AND (9,8) | 0.10 | (16,17) AND (17,16) | 0.02 |
| (4,11) AND (11,4) | 0.06 | (17,19) AND (19,17) | 0.02 |
| (5,9) AND (9,5) | 0.05 | (19,20) AND (20,19) | 0.04 |
| (9,10) AND (10,9) | 0.03 | (11,14) AND (14,11) | 0.04 |
| (15,22) AND (22,15) | 0.03 | (20,22) AND (22,20) | 0.05 |
| (11,12) AND (12,11) | 0.06 | (8,16) AND (16,8) | 0.05 |
| (4,5) AND (5,4) | 0.02 | (10,16) AND (16,10) | 0.04 |

After sixteen iterations, the maximum percentage change in the components was 7.7%; computing time was seven seconds.

Each subproblem for this network decomposed into 24 shortest route problems. Since every node is both an origin and a destination, all shortest routes in the network are required, and the multi-terminal shortest route algorithm of Floyd (Dreyfus, 1969) was used.

A very encouraging result was the extremely small computing time for solving (NLP). This same problem for the 76 arc, 24 node network was also solved by linearizing the objective function (1) and using the OPTIMA linear programming package for the CDC 6400. Computing time was significantly higher—11 minutes and 40 seconds.

Equally encouraging was the very small increase in the number of iterations required by the Frank-Wolfe algorithm for the two example problems above. In Table 3

we see that there were 12 conservation of flow constraints and 40 non-negativity constraints for the first network. The larger network resulted in 552 conservation of flow equations and 1,824 variables and non-negativity constraints. Nevertheless, the required number of iterations increased from 10 to only 16 or 20. The number of iterations appears to be related to the number of nodes in the underlying network rather than the number of constraints in the NLP problem. Increasing the number of nodes by a factor of 6 doubled the number of iterations; this suggests that the algorithm probably would be efficient for problems as large as several hundred nodes.

CONCLUSION

The primary significance of the solution technique developed in this paper is that it requires only the solution of a sequence of shortest route problems (computing time

Table 2. Sequence of vectors of flow on the 76 arcs of Fig. 2 (computer output)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Norm of X Sub 1 Minus X Sub 0 Equals 49.18 Maximum percentage change of components is 67.8 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.2 | 21.5 | 15.9 | 9.4 | 2.9 | 14.5 | 14.1 | 9.4 | 17.4 | 14.6 | 16.1 | 14.9 | 16.9 | 12.7 | 19.4 | 26.4 | 25.2 | 12.8 | 21.0 | |
| 13.1 | 8.8 | 7.1 | 5.4 | 11.8 | 14.6 | 7.3 | 10.6 | 9.4 | 14.0 | 13.8 | 11.6 | 19.2 | 23.7 | 10.3 | 12.7 | 10.6 | 16.0 | 11.1 | |
| 17.2 | 21.5 | 15.9 | 9.4 | 2.9 | 14.5 | 14.2 | 9.4 | 17.4 | 14.6 | 16.1 | 14.9 | 16.9 | 12.7 | 19.4 | 26.4 | 25.2 | 12.8 | 21.0 | |
| 13.1 | 8.8 | 7.1 | 5.4 | 11.8 | 14.6 | 7.3 | 10.6 | 9.4 | 14.0 | 13.8 | 11.6 | 19.2 | 23.7 | 10.3 | 12.7 | 10.6 | 16.0 | 11.1 | |
| Norm of X Sub 2 Minus X Sub 1 Equals 30.42 Maximum percentage change of components is 46.6 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21.3 | 22.2 | 18.9 | 8.8 | 3.4 | 16.7 | 14.6 | 17.6 | 18.5 | 23.6 | 16.2 | 11.2 | 12.7 | 9.5 | 21.6 | 28.6 | 21.1 | 9.7 | 24.3 | |
| 12.1 | 11.8 | 12.8 | 6.0 | 14.6 | 18.2 | 10.2 | 11.7 | 11.3 | 11.0 | 10.4 | 11.6 | 20.5 | 17.9 | 12.6 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 12.1 | 16.1 | |
| 21.4 | 22.2 | 18.9 | 8.8 | 3.4 | 16.7 | 14.6 | 17.6 | 18.5 | 23.6 | 16.2 | 11.2 | 12.7 | 9.5 | 21.6 | 28.6 | 21.1 | 9.7 | 24.3 | |
| 12.1 | 11.8 | 12.8 | 6.0 | 14.6 | 18.2 | 10.2 | 11.7 | 11.3 | 11.0 | 10.4 | 11.6 | 20.5 | 17.9 | 12.6 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 12.1 | 16.1 | |
| Norm of X Sub 3 Minus X Sub 2 Equals 15.87 Maximum percentage change of components is 39.4 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 21.9 | 26.4 | 17.2 | 9.6 | 4.4 | 16.8 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 20.4 | 24.1 | 15.9 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 9.2 | 19.8 | 26.8 | 25.0 | 10.8 | 22.3 | |
| 12.2 | 10.4 | 11.0 | 6.4 | 14.8 | 18.5 | 10.1 | 12.2 | 11.1 | 10.4 | 12.3 | 10.2 | 18.4 | 15.3 | 10.7 | 10.0 | 13.2 | 10.3 | 13.8 | |
| 21.9 | 26.4 | 17.2 | 9.6 | 4.4 | 16.8 | 15.0 | 20.0 | 20.4 | 24.1 | 15.9 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 9.2 | 19.8 | 26.8 | 25.0 | 10.8 | 22.3 | |
| 12.2 | 10.4 | 11.0 | 6.4 | 14.8 | 18.5 | 10.1 | 12.2 | 11.1 | 10.4 | 12.3 | 10.2 | 18.4 | 15.3 | 10.7 | 10.0 | 13.2 | 10.3 | 13.8 | |
| Norm of X Sub 4 Minus X Sub 3 Equals 21.05 Maximum percentage change of components is 50.0 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19.9 | 25.7 | 20.0 | 11.9 | 7.1 | 19.7 | 16.3 | 21.5 | 17.4 | 20.3 | 20.8 | 10.8 | 8.1 | 9.4 | 20.6 | 28.3 | 21.7 | 7.2 | 23.3 | |
| 12.2 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 7.9 | 15.5 | 16.0 | 9.5 | 11.6 | 12.6 | 10.5 | 8.9 | 12.0 | 14.4 | 13.5 | 14.3 | 13.3 | 8.8 | 9.9 | 11.1 | |
| 19.9 | 25.7 | 20.0 | 12.0 | 7.1 | 19.8 | 16.3 | 21.5 | 17.4 | 20.3 | 20.8 | 10.8 | 8.1 | 9.4 | 20.6 | 28.3 | 21.7 | 7.2 | 23.3 | |
| 12.2 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 8.0 | 15.5 | 16.0 | 9.5 | 11.5 | 12.6 | 10.5 | 8.9 | 12.0 | 14.4 | 13.5 | 14.3 | 13.3 | 8.8 | 9.9 | 11.1 | |
| Norm of X Sub 5 Minus X Sub 4 Equals 13.71 Maximum percentage change of components is 32.1 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20.4 | 25.8 | 18.1 | 12.1 | 6.9 | 19.7 | 17.3 | 22.9 | 20.7 | 22.6 | 19.7 | 10.5 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 19.2 | 26.2 | 22.1 | 10.6 | 21.0 | |
| 12.6 | 9.9 | 9.4 | 7.3 | 13.7 | 16.0 | 8.3 | 11.8 | 12.1 | 9.7 | 10.9 | 10.8 | 13.9 | 11.8 | 11.8 | 11.6 | 11.7 | 8.1 | 13.0 | |
| 20.5 | 25.8 | 18.1 | 12.2 | 6.9 | 19.7 | 17.3 | 22.9 | 20.7 | 22.6 | 19.7 | 10.5 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 19.2 | 26.2 | 22.0 | 10.6 | 21.0 | |
| 12.6 | 9.9 | 9.5 | 7.3 | 13.7 | 16.0 | 8.3 | 11.8 | 12.1 | 9.7 | 10.9 | 10.8 | 13.9 | 11.8 | 11.7 | 11.6 | 11.7 | 8.2 | 13.0 | |
| Norm of X Sub 6 Minus X Sub 5 Equals 21.28 Maximum percentage change of components is 100.0 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16.4 | 26.4 | 23.4 | 10.1 | 6.0 | 22.0 | 17.5 | 21.7 | 17.0 | 18.7 | 19.2 | 9.3 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 20.4 | 28.7 | 18.4 | 5.3 | 24.6 | |
| 12.3 | 12.3 | 8.9 | 7.0 | 15.5 | 15.0 | 11.6 | 10.4 | 11.4 | 10.2 | 7.1 | 11.2 | 14.5 | 11.7 | 8.3 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 10.7 | 11.5 | |
| 16.4 | 26.4 | 23.4 | 10.1 | 6.0 | 22.1 | 17.5 | 21.7 | 17.0 | 18.7 | 19.2 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 20.5 | 28.7 | 18.4 | 5.3 | 24.6 | |
| 12.3 | 12.3 | 8.9 | 7.0 | 15.5 | 15.0 | 11.6 | 10.4 | 11.4 | 10.2 | 7.1 | 11.2 | 14.5 | 11.7 | 8.3 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 10.7 | 11.5 | |
| Norm of S Sub 7 Minus X Sub 6 Equals 12.44 Maximum percentage change of components is 41.1 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.2 | 25.9 | 20.7 | 10.9 | 6.4 | 21.2 | 16.9 | 22.0 | 20.5 | 19.9 | 18.8 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 18.5 | 27.1 | 18.4 | 9.0 | 21.8 | |
| 11.4 | 10.7 | 8.1 | 7.0 | 14.1 | 15.1 | 9.9 | 10.3 | 10.6 | 10.7 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 13.2 | 11.3 | 8.7 | 9.9 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 12.9 | |
| 17.2 | 25.9 | 20.7 | 10.9 | 6.4 | 21.2 | 16.9 | 22.1 | 20.5 | 19.9 | 18.8 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 18.5 | 27.1 | 18.4 | 9.0 | 21.8 | |
| 11.4 | 10.7 | 8.1 | 7.1 | 14.1 | 15.1 | 9.9 | 10.2 | 10.6 | 10.7 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 13.2 | 11.3 | 8.7 | 9.9 | 9.0 | 9.1 | 12.9 | |
| Norm of X Sub 8 Minus X Sub 7 Equals 9.04 Maximum percentage change of components is 21.6 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.4 | 26.0 | 19.3 | 11.3 | 6.9 | 19.1 | 17.2 | 23.2 | 18.9 | 18.8 | 20.5 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 18.5 | 25.9 | 19.4 | 9.4 | 20.6 | |
| 12.3 | 10.1 | 8.2 | 7.2 | 13.3 | 14.6 | 8.5 | 10.5 | 9.9 | 9.2 | 11.0 | 10.7 | 11.9 | 10.8 | 11.1 | 10.6 | 8.7 | 9.2 | 11.2 | |
| 17.4 | 25.4 | 19.3 | 11.3 | 6.9 | 19.1 | 17.2 | 23.3 | 19.5 | 18.8 | 20.5 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 7.9 | 18.5 | 25.9 | 19.4 | 9.4 | 20.6 | |
| 12.3 | 10.1 | 8.2 | 7.3 | 13.4 | 14.5 | 8.5 | 10.5 | 9.9 | 9.1 | 11.0 | 11.2 | 11.9 | 10.8 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 8.7 | 9.2 | 11.2 | |
| Norm of X Sub 9 Minus X Sub 8 Equals 9.68 Maximum percentage change of components is 35.4 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.6 | 24.5 | 18.4 | 10.3 | 6.3 | 16.9 | 16.5 | 22.8 | 20.6 | 19.1 | 18.8 | 8.9 | 7.2 | 7.6 | 17.2 | 25.0 | 20.6 | 9.6 | 20.7 | |
| 12.2 | 11.3 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 14.7 | 13.7 | 10.2 | 9.3 | 10.5 | 8.7 | 10.4 | 10.0 | 12.9 | 11.1 | 8.2 | 11.2 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 12.3 | |
| 16.7 | 25.8 | 18.3 | 10.3 | 6.3 | 17.1 | 16.7 | 22.8 | 19.3 | 19.1 | 18.8 | 8.9 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 17.2 | 25.1 | 20.8 | 9.6 | 20.8 | |
| 12.3 | 11.1 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 14.7 | 13.7 | 10.2 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 8.4 | 10.3 | 8.8 | 12.9 | 11.1 | 8.2 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 9.5 | 12.3 | |
| Norm of X Sub 10 Minus X Sub 9 Equals 6.10 Maximum percentage change of components is 16.3 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.6 | 25.1 | 19.3 | 10.6 | 6.1 | 17.0 | 16.7 | 22.8 | 19.3 | 19.6 | 19.0 | 8.9 | 8.5 | 7.3 | 18.8 | 25.6 | 19.9 | 9.3 | 21.8 | |
| 12.1 | 10.6 | 7.8 | 6.7 | 13.8 | 15.0 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 9.9 | 9.0 | 10.2 | 9.8 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 9.0 | 10.6 | 9.4 | 8.6 | 11.8 | |
| 17.6 | 24.8 | 19.0 | 10.7 | 6.1 | 17.3 | 16.7 | 22.6 | 19.4 | 19.5 | 19.3 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 7.4 | 18.4 | 25.3 | 20.1 | 8.9 | 21.4 | |
| 12.1 | 10.6 | 7.8 | 6.8 | 13.8 | 15.1 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 9.9 | 8.8 | 10.4 | 10.5 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 9.2 | 11.2 | 9.4 | 8.6 | 11.6 | |
| Norm of X Sub 11 Minus X Sub 10 Equals 9.42 Maximum percentage change of components is 25.0 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.6 | 25.9 | 17.2 | 11.9 | 7.6 | 15.1 | 16.1 | 23.3 | 20.8 | 19.1 | 19.7 | 8.8 | 7.3 | 6.8 | 17.4 | 24.8 | 19.6 | 9.6 | 20.0 | |
| 11.9 | 11.1 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 14.6 | 14.4 | 8.7 | 8.6 | 9.5 | 8.3 | 10.1 | 10.8 | 11.3 | 9.4 | 11.0 | 10.5 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 11.4 | |
| 17.6 | 26.7 | 16.8 | 11.9 | 7.6 | 15.5 | 16.7 | 23.2 | 19.8 | 19.0 | 19.7 | 8.8 | 7.3 | 6.7 | 17.2 | 24.6 | 18.0 | 9.7 | 19.8 | |
| 12.4 | 11.5 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 14.6 | 14.4 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 9.7 | 9.6 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 11.3 | 9.4 | 11.0 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 8.7 | 11.3 | |
| Norm of X Sub 12 Minus X Sub 11 Equals 5.42 Maximum percentage change of components is 16.0 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.3 | 25.7 | 18.1 | 11.9 | 7.2 | 15.8 | 16.3 | 22.8 | 19.6 | 19.1 | 19.4 | 8.8 | 8.2 | 7.3 | 18.5 | 24.7 | 19.1 | 8.8 | 20.9 | |
| 12.0 | 10.3 | 7.8 | 7.4 | 13.8 | 14.2 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 9.3 | 9.0 | 9.9 | 10.1 | 11.7 | 9.8 | 10.1 | 10.4 | 8.9 | 9.0 | 11.5 | |
| 17.4 | 25.8 | 18.2 | 12.0 | 7.2 | 15.8 | 16.4 | 22.8 | 19.4 | 19.0 | 19.6 | 8.7 | 8.2 | 7.5 | 18.3 | 24.5 | 18.9 | 8.9 | 20.7 | |
| 12.1 | 10.8 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 13.8 | 14.2 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 9.5 | 9.2 | 10.2 | 10.0 | 11.6 | 9.7 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 9.2 | 9.0 | 11.3 | |
| Norm of X Sub 13 Minus X Sub 12 Equals 4.62 Maximum percentage change of components is 13.9 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.3 | 24.5 | 17.9 | 11.4 | 6.7 | 15.1 | 16.2 | 22.9 | 19.3 | 18.9 | 19.4 | 8.8 | 7.5 | 7.2 | 17.8 | 24.3 | 19.2 | 9.2 | 20.7 | |
| 12.1 | 11.4 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 14.2 | 13.8 | 9.1 | 9.7 | 10.1 | 8.8 | 11.5 | 9.7 | 11.8 | 9.9 | 9.3 | 11.1 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 11.9 | |
| 17.1 | 24.7 | 17.8 | 11.4 | 6.8 | 15.2 | 16.2 | 22.5 | 19.2 | 18.7 | 19.4 | 8.7 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 17.7 | 24.3 | 19.2 | 9.1 | 20.7 | |
| 12.2 | 9.9 | 7.7 | 7.2 | 14.3 | 14.0 | 9.2 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 8.8 | 10.0 | 9.6 | 12.2 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 11.0 | 8.6 | 9.2 | 11.9 | |
| Norm of X Sub 14 Minus X Sub 13 Equals 3.93 Maximum percentage change of components is 9.6 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.9 | 25.1 | 18.4 | 11.3 | 6.6 | 15.3 | 16.1 | 22.6 | 18.8 | 19.3 | 19.6 | 8.8 | 8.3 | 7.0 | 18.9 | 24.9 | 19.1 | 8.7 | 21.4 | |
| 12.0 | 10.9 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 13.7 | 14.8 | 8.6 | 9.3 | 9.7 | 8.9 | 10.6 | 9.5 | 11.8 | 9.9 | 9.4 | 10.7 | 8.4 | 8.3 | 11.7 | |
| 17.9 | 25.1 | 18.3 | 11.3 | 6.8 | 15.5 | 16.2 | 22.3 | 18.8 | 19.0 | 19.7 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 7.0 | 18.6 | 24.6 | 19.4 | 8.7 | 21.2 | |
| 12.2 | 10.6 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 13.8 | 14.9 | 8.7 | 8.9 | 9.3 | 8.5 | 10.5 | 9.9 | 12.1 | 10.2 | 9.7 | 10.7 | 8.5 | 8.5 | 11.5 | |
| Norm of X Sub 15 Minus X Sub 14 Equals 4.48 Maximum percentage change of components is 11.4 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.6 | 25.4 | 18.2 | 11.0 | 6.4 | 14.6 | 16.0 | 22.4 | 19.2 | 19.0 | 19.5 | 8.7 | 7.8 | 7.9 | 17.2 | 23.4 | 19.0 | 9.2 | 20.4 | |
| 11.8 | 10.7 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 14.1 | 14.6 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 9.5 | 8.9 | 9.7 | 10.4 | 12.2 | 10.4 | 9.0 | 10.2 | 8.3 | 8.9 | 11.8 | |
| 17.8 | 25.4 | 17.8 | 10.9 | 6.5 | 14.9 | 16.2 | 22.5 | 20.2 | 18.8 | 19.6 | 8.7 | 8.0 | 6.9 | 18.1 | 24.5 | 18.7 | 9.0 | 21.0 | |
| 12.0 | 11.0 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 14.1 | 14.4 | 9.1 | 8.7 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 9.6 | 10.3 | 12.1 | 10.2 | 9.0 | 10.2 | 8.4 | 8.4 | 12.0 | |
| Norm of X Sub 16 Minus X Sub 15 Equals 3.21 Maximum percentage change of components is 7.7 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.5 | 25.2 | 18.6 | 11.0 | 6.4 | 14.9 | 16.0 | 22.5 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 19.7 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 7.7 | 18.4 | 23.8 | 19.1 | 8.7 | 21.1 | |
| 11.9 | 10.4 | 7.5 | 6.8 | 13.6 | 14.5 | 8.8 | 8.8 | 9.4 | 8.7 | 10.5 | 10.1 | 11.8 | 10.1 | 9.5 | 10.4 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 11.6 | |
| 17.8 | 25.4 | 18.3 | 10.9 | 6.6 | 15.1 | 16.0 | 22.4 | 19.3 | 18.5 | 19.8 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 7.1 | 19.0 | 24.5 | 18.9 | 8.6 | 21.4 | |
| 12.0 | 10.5 | 7.4 | 7.0 | 13.6 | 14.3 | 8.6 | 9.0 | 9.4 | 8.9 | 10.4 | 9.8 | 11.9 | 10.1 | 9.5 | 10.4 | 8.3 | 8.6 | 11.7 | |

Table 2 (Contd)

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|
| Norm of X Sub 17 Minus X Sub 16 Equals 4.15 Maximum percentage change of components is 11.2 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.5 | 25.2 | 17.6 | 10.7 | 6.8 | 14.4 | 16.0 | 22.7 | 20.1 | 18.8 | 19.5 | 8.7 | 8.1 | 7.4 | 17.9 | 23.7 | 18.4 | 9.1 | 20.5 |
| 12.0 | 10.9 | 7.5 | 7.3 | 14.0 | 14.3 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 9.6 | 9.2 | 9.6 | 9.3 | 11.9 | 10.0 | 9.1 | 10.2 | 8.2 | 8.9 | 12.0 |
| 17.8 | 25.2 | 18.1 | 11.2 | 6.3 | 14.4 | 15.8 | 22.7 | 19.6 | 18.5 | 19.6 | 8.7 | 7.9 | 8.0 | 17.4 | 23.0 | 19.3 | 8.9 | 20.5 |
| 11.9 | 10.9 | 7.5 | 6.7 | 13.9 | 14.1 | 9.2 | 8.5 | 9.5 | 8.4 | 10.5 | 10.3 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 9.2 | 10.4 | 8.3 | 8.8 | 11.8 |
| Norm of X Sub 18 Minus X Sub 17 Equals 2.73 Maximum percentage change of components is 7.9 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.5 | 25.2 | 18.0 | 10.7 | 6.6 | 14.6 | 15.9 | 22.5 | 19.4 | 18.3 | 19.7 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 7.3 | 18.6 | 24.0 | 18.8 | 8.7 | 20.9 |
| 11.9 | 10.9 | 7.5 | 7.1 | 13.6 | 14.3 | 8.5 | 8.6 | 9.6 | 8.9 | 10.4 | 10.1 | 12.0 | 10.1 | 9.2 | 10.4 | 8.3 | 9.0 | 11.7 |
| 17.5 | 25.2 | 18.3 | 11.0 | 6.3 | 14.6 | 15.9 | 22.5 | 18.9 | 18.2 | 19.7 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 7.8 | 18.1 | 23.5 | 18.8 | 8.7 | 20.8 |
| 12.0 | 10.6 | 7.4 | 6.8 | 13.6 | 14.2 | 8.8 | 8.3 | 9.3 | 8.9 | 10.1 | 10.1 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 9.2 | 10.4 | 8.2 | 8.9 | 11.7 |
| Norm of X Sub 19 Minus X Sub 18 Equals 3.00 Maximum percentage change of components is 8.2 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.5 | 25.5 | 18.0 | 10.5 | 6.3 | 14.2 | 15.8 | 22.8 | 19.3 | 18.3 | 19.5 | 8.7 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 18.1 | 23.8 | 19.2 | 8.9 | 21.0 |
| 11.8 | 10.1 | 7.5 | 6.9 | 14.0 | 14.1 | 9.2 | 8.1 | 9.0 | 8.4 | 10.2 | 9.4 | 12.0 | 10.0 | 8.9 | 9.9 | 8.2 | 8.9 | 12.0 |
| 17.5 | 25.0 | 18.1 | 10.7 | 6.2 | 14.3 | 16.1 | 22.6 | 19.6 | 18.2 | 19.5 | 8.7 | 8.0 | 7.4 | 17.7 | 23.5 | 19.2 | 9.1 | 20.8 |
| 12.1 | 11.1 | 7.4 | 6.8 | 14.0 | 14.2 | 9.3 | 8.8 | 9.8 | 8.3 | 11.0 | 9.9 | 12.1 | 10.0 | 8.9 | 10.3 | 8.1 | 8.9 | 12.0 |
| Norm of X Sub 20 Minus X Sub 19 Equals 2.38 Maximum percentage change of components is 6.9 per cent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 17.4 | 24.9 | 18.1 | 10.5 | 6.3 | 14.5 | 15.9 | 22.7 | 19.1 | 18.1 | 19.6 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 7.2 | 18.4 | 23.8 | 18.9 | 8.6 | 21.1 |
| 11.9 | 10.5 | 7.5 | 6.8 | 13.7 | 14.1 | 8.8 | 8.4 | 9.1 | 8.5 | 10.3 | 10.1 | 11.7 | 10.0 | 9.4 | 10.6 | 8.2 | 9.0 | 11.8 |
| 17.5 | 25.1 | 18.4 | 10.7 | 6.2 | 14.4 | 16.0 | 22.6 | 19.0 | 18.0 | 19.6 | 8.7 | 8.3 | 7.3 | 18.4 | 23.8 | 18.9 | 8.9 | 21.2 |
| 12.0 | 10.8 | 7.6 | 6.7 | 13.7 | 14.1 | 9.0 | 8.5 | 9.5 | 8.5 | 10.5 | 9.9 | 11.8 | 10.0 | 9.4 | 10.4 | 8.0 | 9.0 | 11.8 |

Table 3. Test problem characteristics and solution times

| Problem | Nodes | | Conservation of Flow Constraints | Variables (non-negativity Constraints) | Iterations for 5% Accuracy | Computing Time (Seconds) |
|---------|-------|------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Nodes | Arcs | | | | |
| 1 | 4 | 10 | 12 | 40 | 10 | 1 |
| 2 | 24 | 76 | 552 | 1824 | 20 | 9 |

for the one dimensional searches being insignificant). The computing time for finding an approximate solution to the equilibrium problem was less than that required by the simplex method by orders of magnitude even on a fairly small network. For larger problems the savings would be even greater, since for multi-commodity network problems the number of constraints grows as the square of the number of nodes in a network. At no time are any of the conservation of flow and non-negativity constraints used explicitly in this technique. It is well known that shortest route problems on networks with several hundred nodes can be efficiently solved. Also, preliminary computational results indicate that the number of shortest route subproblems (i.e. the number of iterations) for a network equilibrium problem with several hundred nodes will not be excessive. Thus the solution approach appears very promising for large network equilibrium problems.

Acknowledgement—The authors wish to thank M. Sakarovitch for many suggestions which improved the presentation of this paper.

REFERENCES

Beckmann M., McGuire C. B. and Winsten C. (1956) *Studies in the Economics of Transportation*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Bruynooghe M., Gibert A. and Sakarovitch M. (1968) Une Méthode d'affectat iondu traffic. Paper presented at the Fourth International Symposium on the Theory of Traffic Flow, Karlsruhe.

Comsis Corporation (1972) *Traffic Assignment: Methods-Applications-Products*. Prepared for Urban Planning Division, Office of Planning, Federal Highway Administration, Preliminary—Subject to Review.

Dreyfus S. E. (1969) An appraisal of some shortest path algorithms, *Operations Research* 394-412.

Hershendorfer A. M. (1960) Predicting the equilibrium of supply and demand: location theory and transportation network flow models. *Transportation Research Forum Papers*. 131-143.

LeBlanc L. J. (1973) *Mathematical Programming Algorithms for Large Scale Network Equilibrium and Network Design Problems* Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Industrial Engineering and Management Sciences, Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Illinois.

Luenberger D. G. (1973) *Introduction to Linear and Nonlinear Programming*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass.

Michaels R. M. (1960) Driver tension response generated on urban streets, *Public Roads* 30, 53-58, 71.

Michaels R. M. (1962) The effects of expressway design on driver tension response. *Public Roads* 31, 107-112.

Michaels R. M. (1965) Attitudes of driver determine choice between alternate highways, *Public Roads* 34, 225-236.

Wardrop J. G. (1952) Some theoretical aspects of road traffic research, *Proc. Inst. Civ. Eng.* 1 Part II, 325-378.

Zangwill W. I. (1969) *Nonlinear Programming: A Unified Approach*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.