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1. STUDY OBJECTIVES

A passenger journey is often composed of trips using different public transport (PT) network levels: passengers for example use the (inter)regional train network level, and transfer to the urban tram or bus network level. A large, non-recurrent disruption on the train network level can impose delayed, rerouted or cancelled train services, which in turn can result in passengers arriving later than scheduled at the transfer location to the urban PT network, or passengers adapting their route choice and arriving at a different transfer location. Consequently, this can result in missed connections, longer travel times and higher crowding levels. The impact of a disruption on the train network level can thus propagate over the multi-level public transport network, via the transfer hub to the urban PT network. Hence, an optimal holding control decision for urban services at the transfer location should account for the impact of a disruption on another PT network level. Previous studies have focused on quantifying the impact of unreliability and disruptions on passengers (e.g. Cats et al. 2016; Cats and Jenelius, 2014; Ma et al. 2014; Van Oort, 2016; Yap et al. 2018) and real-time control strategies (e.g. Van Oort et al., 2010; Cats et al. 2011; Nesheli and Ceder, 2015). However, none of these studies accounted for the impact of disruptions occurring on another PT network level in the control decision for urban PT services. Due to the hierarchical relation between the different PT network levels, this means a control decision is triggered by services which are not subject to this same control decision.

We first quantify the passenger impacts of disruption propagation resulting from an exogenous train network disruption to the urban PT network level. Thereafter, we develop a rule-based controller for holding urban PT services while taking into account predicted passenger delays and rerouting from the train network level.

2. METHODOLOGY

Table 1 introduces the indices and sets, variables and parameters used in the control problem formulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indices and sets:</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( s, S )</td>
<td>stop index, set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( l, L )</td>
<td>line index, set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( j, J )</td>
<td>passenger path index, set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_l )</td>
<td>set of stops on line ( l ), ( S_l \subseteq S )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_t )</td>
<td>set of transfer stops, ( S_t \subseteq S )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( l = {s_{l,1}, s_{l,2}, \ldots, s_{l,</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( j = {s_{j,1}, s_{j,2}, \ldots, s_{j,</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n, N )</td>
<td>passenger index, set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r, R )</td>
<td>run index, set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R_l )</td>
<td>set of runs on line ( l ), ( R_l \subseteq R )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r^+ )</td>
<td>run index of the subsequent run after the vehicle assigned to run ( r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r^- )</td>
<td>run index of the previous run before the vehicle assigned to run ( r )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_{st} )</td>
<td>run inbound to transfer stop ( s_t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( r_{ot} )</td>
<td>run outbound from transfer stop ( s_t )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( d )</td>
<td>disruption scenario</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables:</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( t_{ra} )</td>
<td>scheduled arrival time of run ( r ) at stop ( s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{rd} )</td>
<td>scheduled departure time of run ( r ) from stop ( s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{ar} )</td>
<td>arrival time of run ( r ) at stop ( s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{dr} )</td>
<td>departure time of run ( r ) from stop ( s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{hs} )</td>
<td>holding time of run ( r ) at stop ( s )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{ivt} )</td>
<td>passenger in-vehicle time of run ( r ) from stop ( s_t ) to ( s_{t+1} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1 Modelling framework

We develop a multi-level modelling framework to quantify the propagation of passenger disruption impacts between different network levels of the multi-level PT network (Figure 1). We assume a hierarchy, where control decisions are only applied in case disruptions occur on the same network level, or on a higher hierarchical network level. Urban control decisions can thus be taken following disruptions on the urban network level, or on the (inter)regional train network level. The system is illustrated in Figure 1 where an exogenous train network disruption causes rescheduling, rerouting and cancellation of train services, which can affect the arrival time, arrival platform and passenger flow transferring from train to urban PT network at each hub connecting these network levels. Incorporating transfer walking times at hubs between different train arrival platforms and urban PT departure platforms, results in different passenger transfer flows arriving at different locations and lines of the urban PT network. The urban controller incorporates the prediction of adjusted passenger transfer flows in the decision, aiming at minimizing passenger travel costs on the urban network.
2.2 Scenario design

We quantify the total passenger welfare $w_d$ for three different scenarios $d$, expressed as the generalized travel time over all passengers (Table 2). Equation 1 quantifies the passenger disruption propagation to the urban PT network in case no control decision is applied, whereas equation 2 quantifies the impact of the holding control strategy. Equation 3 describes the calculation of $w_d$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenarios</th>
<th>Control intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disruption scenario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_1$</td>
<td>Undisrupted scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No control intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_2$</td>
<td>Non-recurrent disruption scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No control intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_3$</td>
<td>Non-recurrent disruption scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holding control intervention</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\[
\Delta w = w_{d_2} - w_{d_1}
\]

\[
\Delta w = w_{d_3} - w_{d_2}
\]

\[
w_d = \sum_{n \in N} (\beta_1 \cdot \sum_{s \in S_n} t_{w,t}^s + \beta_2 \cdot \sum_{s \in S_n} t_{w,t}^s + \beta_3 \cdot \sum_{s \in S_n} t_{w,t}^s + \beta_4 \cdot |s_{t,n}|) \quad (3)
\]

### 2.3 Control problem description

The applied control strategy entails the decision whether to hold urban PT runs at multi-level transfer stops \(s_t\) for a certain holding time \(t_{h,s_t}\) in case a disruption occurs on the train network. The predicted welfare impacts on four different passenger segments are incorporated in this holding decision:

- (i) Upstream boarding and downstream alighting (through) passengers;
- (ii) Downstream boarding passengers;
- (iii) Reverse downstream boarding passengers;
- (iv) Transferring passengers at holding location.

A passenger-oriented decision rule (equation 5) is applied for the controller, where predicted costs of the control decision are deducted from the predicted control benefits (equation 4). Figure 2 shows the information flows for the short-term prediction algorithm for the urban network level.

\[
z(t_{h,s_t}) = w_{d_1}(t_{h,s_t}) + w_{d_2}(t_{h,s_t}) + w_{d_3}(t_{h,s_t}) + w_{d_4}(t_{h,s_t}) - \Delta t_{r \to p}(t_{h,s_t}) \quad (4)
\]

\[
t_{h,s_t} = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } z \leq 0 \\
\text{argmax}(z) & \text{if } z > 0 
\end{cases} 
\quad (5)
\]

**Figure 2.** Information flow short-term passenger prediction algorithm

Eq. 6-9 formulate the total passenger effect of holding run \(r\) for \(t_{h,s_t}\) on the four above-mentioned passenger segments, respectively. Eq. 6 is the direct extension of in-vehicle time at the holding stop of passengers who board upstream the holding location and alight downstream the holding location. The direct extension of waiting time of passengers waiting at a stop downstream the holding location is quantified using Eq. 7. Eq. 8 equals the
longer waiting time for boarding passengers at all stops of the line in the reverse direction, in case the time between the realized arrival time at the final stop of the line, \( t_{r,s_1}^{n} \), and the scheduled departure time from the terminal for the next run in the reverse direction \( t_{r,s_1}^{d} \) is smaller than the required minimum turnaround time \( \tau_{r,s_1} \). Eq. 9 is the reduced waiting time for passengers transferring at \( s_t \) due to the holding strategy, compared to having to wait for the next run. Eq. 10 calculates this passenger transfer flow as fraction of alighting passengers from the train network aiming for a transfer to the urban network, multiplied by the fraction making this connection given the required transfer walking time.

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta t_{r}^{\text{int},p} &= \sum_{s=t}^{l-1} \left( \left( q_{r,s}^{\text{in}} - q_{r,s}^{\text{out}} \right) + (t_{r,s}^{a} - \tau_{r,s_1} + t_{r,s}^{h}) \lambda_s + \sum_{r_i \in R_i} q_{r_i,s}^{\text{trans}} \right) * (t_{r,s}^{\text{int}} \lambda_s) \right) \\
&- \sum_{s=t}^{l-1} \left( q_{r,s}^{\text{in}} - q_{r,s}^{\text{out}} + (t_{r,s}^{a} - \tau_{r,s} + t_{r,s}^{h}) \lambda_s + \sum_{r_i \in R_i} q_{r_i,s}^{\text{trans}} \right) * (t_{r,s}^{\text{int}} \lambda_s) \\
&+ \sum_{s=t}^{l-1} \left( q_{r,s}^{\text{in}} - q_{r,s}^{\text{out}} - (t_{r,s}^{a} - \tau_{r,s} + t_{r,s}^{h}) \lambda_s + \sum_{r_i \in R_i} q_{r_i,s}^{\text{trans}} \right) * (t_{r,s}^{\text{int}} \lambda_s) \\
&- \sum_{s=t}^{l-1} \left( q_{r,s}^{\text{in}} - q_{r,s}^{\text{out}} - (t_{r,s}^{a} - \tau_{r,s} + t_{r,s}^{h}) \lambda_s + \sum_{r_i \in R_i} q_{r_i,s}^{\text{trans}} \right) * (t_{r,s}^{\text{int}} \lambda_s)
\end{align*}
\] (11)
\[ y_s = \min \left( \frac{q_{rs}^t}{\phi^t}, 1 \right) * \beta_5 \] (12)

\[ y_d = \max \left( \frac{q_{rs}^t - \psi^t}{\sigma_c^t}, 0 \right) * \beta_6 \] (13)

3. APPLICATION AND OUTLOOK

We apply our methodology to the multi-level PT network of The Hague, the Netherlands. We consider the full urban PT network of The Hague of 12 tram lines and 8 bus lines. Besides, all train services to/from The Hague from the directions Leiden, Gouda and Rotterdam are considered (Figure 3). We use BusMezzo, an agent-based dynamic simulation model for PT operations and passenger assignment, as evaluation tool to simulate a disruption on the train network between stations The Hague Central and Laan van NOI (Cats and Jenelius, 2014).

![Figure 3. Case study public transport network (yellow: train services / green: tram services / red: bus services). The red cross indicates the location of the simulated disruption.](image)

The scenario analysis is performed as part of an on-going work. For each scenario (Table 2) the total passenger welfare is calculated to show the propagation of disruption impacts from the train network to the urban network level, and to evaluate the impact of the holding control intervention for the simulated train network disruption. The analysis will include comparison of assignment results and the performance of the proposed controller. Conclusions, study implications and recommendations for future research will be shared in the conference presentation.
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