$\begin{array}{c} \text{N93-29543} \\ S_{2.7-6.7} \\ \text{ONTROL} \\ 161827 \end{array}$

DISTRIBUTED TRAFFIC SIGNAL CONTROL USING FUZZY LOGIC

Stephen Chiu

p. 9

Rockwell International Science Center 1049 Camino Dos Rios Thousand Oaks, CA 91360, USA

ABSTRACT

We present a distributed approach to traffic signal control, where the signal timing parameters at a given intersection are adjusted as functions of the local traffic condition and of the signal timing parameters at adjacent intersections. Thus, the signal timing parameters evolve dynamically using only local information to improve traffic flow. This distributed approach provides for a fault-tolerant, highly responsive traffic management system.

The signal timing at an intersection is defined by three parameters: cycle time, phase split, and offset. We use fuzzy decision rules to adjust these three parameters based only on local information. The amount of change in the timing parameters during each cycle is limited to a small fraction of the current parameters to ensure smooth transition. We show the effectiveness of this method through simulation of the traffic flow in a network of controlled intersections.

1. INTRODUCTION

With the steady increase in the number of automobiles on the road, it has become ever more important to manage traffic flow efficiently to optimize utilization of existing road capacity. High fuel cost and environmental concerns also provide important incentives for minimizing traffic delays. To this end, computer technology has been widely applied to optimize traffic signal timing to facilitate traffic movement.

Traffic signals in use today typically operate based on a preset timing schedule. The most common traffic control system used in the United States is the Urban Traffic Control System (UTCS), developed by the Federal Highway Administration in the 1970's. The UTCS generates timing schedules off-line on a central computer based on average traffic conditions for a specific time of day; the schedules are then downloaded to the local controllers at the corresponding time of day. The timing schedules are typically obtained by either maximizing the bandwidth on arterial streets or minimizing a disutility index that is generally a measure of delay and stops. Computer programs such as MAXBAND [1] and TRANSYT-7F [2] are well established means for performing these optimizations.

The off-line, global optimization approach used by UTCS cannot respond adequately to unpredictable changes in traffic demand. With the availability of inexpensive microprocessors, several real-time adaptive traffic control systems were developed in the late 70's and early 80's to address this problem. These systems can respond to changing traffic demand by performing incremental optimizations at the local level. The most notable of these are SCATS [3,4,5], developed in Australia, and SCOOT [5,6], developed in England. SCATS is installed in several major cities in Australia, New Zealand, and parts of Asia; recently the first installation of SCATS in the U.S. was completed near Detroit, Michigan. SCOOT is installed in over 40 cities, of which 8 are outside of England.

Both SCATS and SCOOT incrementally optimize the signals' cycle time, phase split, and offset. The cycle time is the duration for completing all phases of a signal; phase split is the division of the cycle time into periods of green signal for competing approaches; offset is the time relationship between the start of each phase among adjacent intersections. SCATS organizes groups of intersections into subsystems. Each subsystem contains only one critical intersection whose timing parameters are adjusted directly by a regional computer based on the average prevailing traffic condition for the area. All other intersections in the subsystem are always coordinated with the critical intersection, sharing a common cycle time and coordinated phase split and offset. Subsystems may be linked to form a larger coordinated system when their cycle times are nearly equal. At the lower level, each intersection can independently shorten or omit a particular phase based on local traffic demand; however, any time saved by ending a phase early must be added to the subsequent phase to maintain a common cycle time among all intersections in the subsystem. The basic traffic data used by SCATS is the "degree of saturation", defined as the ratio of the effectively used green time to the total available green time. Cycle time for a critical intersection is adjusted to maintain a high degree of saturation for the lane with the greatest degree of saturation. Phase split for a critical intersection is adjusted to maintain equal degrees of saturation on competing approaches. The offsets among the intersections in a subsystem are selected to minimize stops in the direction of dominant traffic flow. Technical details are not available from literature on exactly how the cycle time and phase split of a critical intersection are adjusted. It seems that SCATS does not explicitly optimize any specific performance measure, such as average delay or stops.

SCOOT uses real-time traffic data to obtain traffic flow models, called "cyclic flow profiles", on-line. The cyclic flow profiles are then used to estimate how many vehicles will arrive at a downstream signal when the signal is red. This estimate provides predictions of queue size for different hypothetical changes in the signal timing parameters. SCOOT's objective is to minimize the sum of the average queues in an area. A few seconds before every phase change, SCOOT uses the flow model to determine whether it is better to delay or advance the time of the phase change by 4 seconds, or leave it unaltered. Once a cycle, a similar question is asked to determine whether the offset should be set 4 seconds earlier or later. Once every few minutes, a similar question is asked to determine whether the fixed incremented or decremented by a few seconds. Thus, SCOOT changes its timing parameters in fixed increments to optimize an explicit performance objective.

It is problematic that a specific performance objective will be appropriate for all traffic conditions. For example, maximizing bandwidth on arterial streets may cause extended wait time for vehicles on minor streets. On the other hand, minimizing delay and stops generally does not result in maximum bandwidth. This problem is typically addressed by the use of weighting factors; the TRANSYT optimization program provides user-selectable link-to-link flow weighting, stop weighting factors, and delay weighting factors. A traffic engineer can vary these weighting factors until the program produces a good (by human judgement) compromise solution. Perhaps a performance index should be a function of the traffic condition; it may be appropriate to emphasize an equitable distribution of movement opportunities when traffic volume is low and emphasize overall network efficiency when the traffic is congested. In view of the uncertainty in defining a suitable performance measure, the reactive type of control provided by SCATS, where there is no explicit effort to optimize any specific performance measure, appears to have merit. We believe implementing this type of control using fuzzy logic decision rules can further enhance the appropriateness of the control actions, increase control flexibility, and produce performance characteristics that more closely match human's sensibility of "good" traffic management.

In past work performed by Pappis and Mamdani [7], fuzzy logic was applied to control an intersection of two oneway streets. It was assumed that vehicle detectors were placed sufficiently upstream from the intersection to inform the controller about future arrival of vehicles at the intersection. It is then possible to predict the the number of vehicles that will cross the intersection and the size of the queue that will accumulate if no change to the the signal state takes place in the next N seconds, for N = 1,2,...10. The predicted outcomes are evaluated by fuzzy decision rules to determine the desirability of extending the current state for N more seconds. Each of the possible extensions is assigned a degree of confidence by the rules, and the extension with maximum confidence is selected for implementation. Before the extended period ends, the rules are applied again to see if further extensions are desirable.

Here we apply fuzzy logic to the general problem of controlling multiple intersections in a network of two-way streets. We propose a highly distributed architecture in which each intersection independently adjusts its cycle time, phase split, and offset using only local traffic data collected at the intersection. This architecture provides for a fault-tolerant traffic management system where traffic can be managed by the collective actions of simple microprocessors located at each intersection; hardware failure at a small number of intersections should have minimal effect on overall network performance. By requiring only local traffic data for operation, the controllers can be installed individually and incrementally into an area with existing signal controllers. Each intersection uses an identical set of fuzzy decision rules to adjust its timing parameters. The rules for adjusting the cycle time and phase split follow the same general principles used by SCATS: cycle time is adjusted to maintain a good degree of saturation and phase split is adjusted to achieve equal degrees of saturation on competing approaches. The offset at each intersection is adjusted incrementally to coordinate with the adjacent upstream intersection to minimize stops in the direction of dominant traffic flow. Through simulation of a small network of streets, the distributed fuzzy control system has shown to be effective in rapidly reducing delay and stops.

2. FUZZY RULE-BASED CONTROL

For completeness, a brief introduction to fuzzy rule-based control is presented in this section. At the basis of fuzzy logic is the representation of linguistic descriptions as *membership functions* [8]. The membership function indicates the degree to which a value belongs to the class labeled by the linguistic description. For example, the linguistic description BIG may be represented by the membership function BIG(x) shown in Fig. 1, where the abscissa is an input value and the ordinate is the degree to which the input value can be classified as BIG. In this example, the degree to which the number 80 is considered BIG is 0.5, i.e., BIG(80) = 0.5.

Fuzzy decision rules are typically expressed in the following form:



Fig. 1. Membership function defines a linguistic description.

If
$$X_1$$
 is $A_{i,1}$ and X_2 is $A_{i,2}$ then U is B_i .

where X_1 and X_2 are the inputs to the controller, U is the output, A's and B's are membership functions, and the subscript *i* denotes the rule number. For example, a rule for engine control may state "If the speed_error is negative_small and the speed_error_change is positive_big, then the throttle_change is positive_small." Given input values of x_1 and x_2 , the degree of fulfillment (DOF) of rule *i* is given by the minimum of the degrees of satisfaction of the individual antecedent clauses, i.e.,

$$DOF_i = Min \{A_{i,1}(x_1), A_{i,2}(x_2)\}$$
.

We compute the output value by

$$u = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\text{DOF}_i) B_i^d}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (\text{DOF}_i)}$$

where B_i^d is the *defuzzified* value of the membership function B_i , and n is the number of rules. The defuzzified value of a membership function is the single value that best represents the linguistic description; typically, we take the abscissa of a membership function's centroid as its defuzzified value. In essence, each rule contributes a conclusion weighted by the degree to which the antecedent of the rule is fulfilled. The final control decision is obtained as the weighted average of all the contributed conclusions. Although there are several variant methods of fuzzy inference computation, the above method has gained popularity in control applications due to its computational and analytical simplicity.

3. TRAFFIC CONTROL RULES

A set of 40 fuzzy decision rules was used for adjusting the signal timing parameters. The rules for adjusting cycle time, phase split, and offset are decoupled so that these parameters are adjusted independently; this greatly simplifies the rule base. Although independent adjustment of these parameters may result in one parameter change working against another, no conflict was evident in simulations under various traffic conditions. Since incremental adjustments are made at every phase change, a conflicting adjustment will most likely be absorbed by the numerous successive adjustments.

3.1 CYCLE TIME ADJUSTMENT

Cycle time is adjusted to maintain a good degree of saturation on the approach with highest saturation. We define the degree of saturation for a given approach as the actual number of vehicles that passed through the intersection during the green period divided by the maximum number of vehicles that can pass through the intersection during that period. Hence, the degree of saturation is a measure of how effectively the green period is being used. The primary reason for adjusting cycle time to maintain a given degree of saturation is not to ensure efficient use of green periods, but to control delay and stops. When traffic volume is low, the cycle time must be reduced to maintain a given degree of saturation; this results in short cycle times that reduce the delay in waiting for phase changes. When the traffic volume is high, the cycle time must be increased to maintain the same degree of saturation; this results in long cycle times that reduce the number of stops.

The rules for adjusting the cycle time are shown in Fig. 2 and the corresponding membership functions are shown in Fig. 5. The inputs to the rules are: (1) the highest degree of saturation on any approach (denoted as "highest_sat" in the rules), and (2) the highest degree of saturation on its competing approaches (denoted as "cross_sat"). The output of the rules is the amount of adjustment to the current cycle time, expressed as a fraction of the current cycle time. The maximum adjustment allowed is 20% of the current cycle time. The rules basically adjust the cycle time in proportion to the deviation of the degree of saturation from the desired saturation value. However, when the highest saturation is high and the saturation on the competing approach is low, we can let the phase split adjustments alleviate the high saturation. It should be noted that the "optimal" degree of saturation to be maintained by the controller is only 0.55, whereas SCATS typically attempts to maintain a degree of saturation of 0.9. This discrepancy arises from the method of calculating the maximum (saturated) flow value. We derive the maximum flow value based on a platoon of vehicles with no gaps moving through the intersection at the speed limit, while SCATS uses calibrated, more realistic values.

if highest_sat is none then cycl_change is n.big; if highest_sat is low then cycl_change is n.med; if highest_sat is slightly low then cycl_change is n.sml; if highest_sat is good then cycl_change is zero; if highest_sat is high & cross_sat is not high then cycl_change is p.sml; if highest_sat is high & cross_sat is high then cycl_change is p.med; if highest_sat is saturated then cycl_change is p.big;



3.2 PHASE SPLIT ADJUSTMENT

Phase split is adjusted to maintain equal degrees of saturation on competing approaches. The rules for adjusting the phase split is shown in Fig. 3 and the corresponding membership functions are shown in Fig. 5. The inputs to the rules are: (1) the difference between the highest degree of saturation on the east-west approaches and the highest degree of saturation on the north-south approaches ("sat_diff"), and (2) the highest degree of saturation on any approach ("highest_sat"). The output of the rules is the amount of adjustment to the current east-west green period, expressed as a fraction of the current cycle time. Subtracting time from the east-west green period is equivalent to adding an equal amount of time to the north-south green period. When the saturation difference is large and the highest degree of saturation. When the highest degree of saturation is how, the green period is adjusted by only a small amount to avoid excessive reduction in the degree of saturation.

3.3 OFFSET ADJUSTMENT

Offset is adjusted to coordinate adjacent signals in a way that minimizes stops in the direction of dominant traffic flow. The controller first determines the dominant direction from the vehicle count for each approach. Based on the next green time of the upstream intersection, the arrival time of a vehicle platoon leaving the upstream intersection can be calculated. If the local signal becomes green at that time, then the vehicles will pass through the local if sat_diff is p.big & highest_sat is saturated then green_change is p.big; if sat_diff is p.big & highest_sat is high then green_change is p.big; if sat_diff is p.big & highest_sat is not high then green_change is p.med; if sat_diff is n.big & highest_sat is saturated then green_change is n.big; if sat_diff is n.big & highest_sat is high then green_change is n.big; if sat_diff is n.big & highest_sat is not high then green_change is n.med; if sat_diff is p.med & highest_sat is not high then green_change is n.med; if sat_diff is p.med & highest_sat is saturated then green_change is p.med; if sat_diff is p.med & highest_sat is high then green_change is p.med; if sat_diff is p.med & highest_sat is not high then green_change is p.sml; if sat_diff is n.med & highest_sat is saturated then green_change is n.med; if sat_diff is n.med & highest_sat is not high then green_change is n.med; if sat_diff is n.med & highest_sat is not high then green_change is n.med; if sat_diff is n.med & highest_sat is not high then green_change is n.med; if sat_diff is n.med & highest_sat is not high then green_change is n.med; if sat_diff is n.med & highest_sat is not high then green_change is n.sml; if sat_diff is p.sml then green_change is p.sml; if sat_diff is n.sml then green_change is n.sml; if sat_diff is n.sml then green_change is n.sml; if sat_diff is zero then green_change is zero;

Fig. 3. Rules for adjusting phase split.

intersection unstopped. The required local adjustment to the time of the next phase change is calculated based on this target green time. Fuzzy rules are then applied to determine what fraction of the required adjustment can be reasonably executed in the current cycle. The rules for determining the allowable adjustment are shown in Fig. 4 and the corresponding membership functions are shown in Fig. 5. The inputs to the rules are: (1) the normalized difference between the traffic volume in the dominant direction and the average volume in the remaining directions ("vol_diff"); and (2) the required time adjustment relative to the adjustable amount of time ("req_adjust"), e.g., the amount by which the current green phase is to be ended early divided by the the current green period. The output of the rules is the allowable adjustment, expressed as a fraction of the required amount of adjustment. These rules will allow a large fraction of the adjustment to be made if there is a significant advantage to be gained by coordinating the flow in the dominant direction and that the adjustment can be made without significant disruption to the current schedule.

if vol_diff is none then allow_adjust is none; if req_adjust is very.high then allow_adjust is none; if vol_diff is very.high & req_adjust is none then allow_adjust is very high; if vol_diff is very.high & req_adjust is low then allow_adjust is very high; if vol diff is very.high & req adjust is medium then allow adjust is high; if vol diff is very.high & req adjust is high then allow adjust is medium; if vol_diff is high & req_adjust is none then allow_adjust is very high; if vol_diff is high & req_adjust is low then allow_adjust is very high; if vol_diff is high & req_adjust is medium then allow adjust is high; if vol diff is high & req adjust is high then allow adjust is low; if vol_diff is medium & req_adjust is none then allow_adjust is very high; if vol_diff is medium & req_adjust is low then allow_adjust is high; if vol diff is medium & req_adjust is medium then allow_adjust is medium; if vol_diff is medium & req_adjust is high then allow adjust is low; if vol diff is low & req_adjust is none then allow adjust is high; if vol_diff is low & req_adjust is low then allow_adjust is medium; if vol_diff is low & req_adjust is medium then allow_adjust is low; if vol_diff is low & req_adjust is high then allow_adjust is low;

Fig. 4. Rules for adjusting offset.



Fig. 5. Membership functions used in rules.

4. SIMULATION RESULTS

Simulation was performed to verify the effectiveness of the distributed fuzzy control scheme. We considered a small network of intersections formed by six streets, shown in Fig. 6. A mean vehicle arrival rate is assigned to each end of a street. At every simulation time step, a random number is generated for each lane of a street and compared with the assigned vehicle arrival rate to determine whether a vehicle should be added to the beginning of the lane. Some simplifying assumptions were used in the simulation model: (1) unless stopped, a vehicle always moves at the speed prescribed by the speed limit of the street, (2) a vehicle cannot change lane, and (3) a vehicle cannot turn. Vehicle counters are assumed to be installed in all lanes of a street at each intersection. When the the green phase begins for a given approach, the number of vehicles passing through the intersection during the green period is counted. The degree of saturation for each approach is then calculated from the vehicle count and the length of the green period. At the start of each phase change, the controller computes the time of the next phase change using its current cycle time and phase split values. The fuzzy decision rules are then applied to adjust the time of the next phase change according to the offset adjustment rules; the adjusted cycle time and phase split values are used only in the subsequent computation of the next phase change time.

Figure 7 shows the average waiting time per vehicle per second spent in the network as a function of time. Figure 8 shows the number of stops per minute encountered by all vehicles. For the first 30 minutes of this simulation, all intersections have a fixed cycle time of 40 seconds, a green duration of 20 seconds, and start their phases at the same time. At the end of 30 minutes, intersections A, B, and C shown in Fig. 6 were allowed to adapt their timing parameters according to the fuzzy decision rules. At the end of 60 minutes, all intersections were allowed to adapt. We see that the improvement in waiting time is minimal when only 3 intersections are adaptive. Furthermore, when only 3 intersections are adaptive, the minor improvement in waiting time was obtained at the expense of



Fig. 6. Network of streets used in simulation.

greatly increased number of stops. This is because the cycle time chosen by the adaptive intersections (around 20 sec) is widely different from the cycle time for the fixed intersections (40 sec). The mismatch of cycle times resulted in a complete lack of coordination between the adaptive intersections and the fixed intersections, where timing adjustments to facilitate local traffic movement can adversely affect the overall traffic movement. When all intersections were allowed to adapt, all intersections attained similar cycle times (around 20 sec), and significant reductions in both waiting time and number of stops were achieved.



Fig. 7. Average waiting time for the case in which all intersections have an initial cycle time of 40 seconds.



Fig. 8. Number of stops for the case in which all intersections have an initial cycle time of 40 seconds.

Figures 9 and 10 show the results of a simulation performed using the same sequence of events, but with an initial cycle time of 20 seconds and green duration of 10 seconds for all intersections. In this case, significant reductions in both waiting time and number of stops were achieved even when only 3 intersections are adaptive. This is because the cycle time for the fixed intersections closely matches that chosen by the adaptive intersections. Sharing a common cycle time has enabled the 3 adaptive intersections to have immediate positive effect on overall system performance.



Fig. 9. Average waiting time for the case in which all intersections have an initial cycle time of 20 seconds.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We have investigated the use of fuzzy decision rules for adaptive traffic control. A highly distributed architecture was considered, where the timing parameters at each intersection are adjusted using only local information and coordinated only with adjacent intersections. Although this localized approach simplifies incremental integration of the fuzzy controller into existing systems, simulation results show that the effectiveness of a small number of "smart"



Fig. 10. Number of stops for the case in which all intersections have an initial cycle time of 20 seconds.

intersections is limited if they operate at a cycle time widely different from the rest of the system. In this case, constraining the controller to maintain a fixed cycle time that matches the existing system may provide better overall performance. For the case in which all intersections are adaptive, we need to investigate whether better performance is achieved by constraining all intersections to share a common variable cycle time.

There is much that can be done to further improve the present fuzzy controller, such as including queue length as an input and using trend data for predictive control. The flexibility of fuzzy decision rules greatly simplifies these extensions.

REFERENCES

- J. Little, M. Kelson, and N. Gartner, "MAXBAND: A Program for Setting Signals on Arteries and Triangular Networks," *Transportation Research Record* 795, National Research Council, Washington, D.C., pp. 40-46, 1981.
- [2] C. Wallace, et. al., TRANSYT-7F User's Manual (Release 6), prepared for FHWA by the Transportation Research Center, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, 1988.
- [3] A. Sims, "The Sydney Coordinated Adaptive Traffic System," Proc. ASCE Engineering Foundation Conference on Research Priorities in Computer Control of Urban Traffic Systems, pp. 12-27, 1979.
- [4] P. Lowrie, SCATS A Traffic Responsive Method of Controlling Urban Traffic, sales information brochure published by Roads & Traffic Authority, Sydney, Australia, 1990.
- [5] J. Luk, "Two traffic-responsive area traffic control methods: SCATS and SCOOT," Traffic Engineering and Control, pp. 14-20, 1984.
- [6] D. Robertson and R. D. Bretherton, "Optimizing networks of traffic signals in real time the SCOOT method," *IEEE Trans. on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 11-15, February 1991.
- [7] C. Pappis and E. Mamdani, "A fuzzy logic controller for a traffic junction," *IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybern.,* vol. SMC-7, no. 10, October 1977.
- [8] L. Zadeh, "Outline of a new approach to the analysis of complex systems and decision processes," *IEEE Trans.* Syst., Man, Cybern., vol. SMC-3, no. 1, pp. 28-44, 1973.