

An Effort-Based Model for Pedestrian Route Choice Behaviour

By

Fatma Saleh Salem Al-Widyan

Thesis submitted as a requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

School of Electrical, Mechanical and Mechatronic Systems
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology

University of Technology Sydney (UTS)

July 2018

Certificate

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged.

Also, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Signature of Student

Fatma Saleh Al-Widyan

Date: 27/8/2018

Production Note:

Signature removed prior to publication.

27/8/2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank my supervisor, A/Prof Robert Fitch, for supporting my research with admirable enthusiasm. Being critical, but at the same time ready to help me find solutions to topical issues in my research. The wise direction and generosity, you showed during my research made the dissertation more than I could have done by myself. Secondly, I wish to acknowledge my sincere appreciation to my project supervisor Dr Nathan Kirchner for his personal, mathematical, and scientific support.

I also would like to extend my gratitude to the team members of the transportation project, Dr Alen Alempijevic, Dr Michelle Zeibots, Julien Collart and Alexander Virgona, who had a great effect in achieving the benefit and taking the time to provide very useful suggestions for improvement.

Finally, a special thanks and love go to my beloved family and friends for their unfailing support, being there for me when I needed them.

Fatma Saleh Al-Widyan

To my beloved son, Yamen

People choose the paths that grant them the greatest rewards for the least amount of effort

David shore

ABSTRACT

This research proposes a novel effort-based theoretical framework for the pedestrian route choice problem to discover principles that pedestrians use to select their routes. A pedestrian chooses their route by optimising certain criteria, such as distance, time, and effort. Several possible criteria that could be used to predict the route choices of a pedestrian are re-assessed. In most cases, the common criteria of a pedestrian route choice are route length and travel time. Effort is proposed as an additional criterion, which indicates metabolic energy expenditure.

The basic principle and a methodology are proposed for route choice based on the least effort that a pedestrian may consume during travel between destinations. The followed deterministic approach assumes that the perceived utility of a route is deterministic and that pedestrians will only choose the route that features minimum average cost.

A mathematical formulation for solving the pedestrian route choice problem utilising the concept of physical effort is introduced. We compare our effort-based model against time and distance based models and validate against the Brisbane dataset. We demonstrate that our method has higher performance efficiency than the models that exist in the state-of-the-art and thereby the model justifies optimal pedestrian behaviour when choosing a route in a congested environment.

Our discussion concludes with an overview of how our approach could be used by rail service providers to optimise operations and improve customer experience. It is contended that the entire behaviour of an individual is subject to effort minimization. Hence, the pedestrian route choice problem is formulated as a constrained non-linear optimization problem whose objective function is the effort consumed while moving from current position to destination over the route.

This doctoral research is a part of research project entitled “Integrated Passenger Behaviour, Train Operations Diagnostics, and Vehicle Condition Monitoring System”, which aims to consolidate foundation technology for the sensing and perception functions of a system that can monitor passenger behaviour and operational characteristics of passenger trains as they arrive at crowded stations using low-cost multi-sensor network. The Brisbane Central Rail Train Station is selected for a case study for validation of the developed model.

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATION

PLE: Principle of least effort

PRC: Pedestrian route choice

SHP: Sensing Hardware Platform

MTC: Minimum time criteria

MDC: Minimum distance criteria

MEC: Minimum effort criteria

V: The walking speed (m/s)

P: Metabolic power (Watts)

L: Length of the route (m)

X: The external load (N)

W: The individual weight (N)

μ : The terrain factor defined as 1 for free walking

G: The grade (%)

s_0 : Initial position

s_f : Final position

t_0 : Initial time (s)

t_f : Final time (s)

x_0 : Initial point at x-axis

x_f : The final point at x-axis

y_0 : Initial point at y-axis

y_f : The final point at the y-axis

$\|v\|$: The magnitude of velocity (m/s)

T: Time (s)

D: Distance (m)

O: Origin

D: Destination

\dot{E} : Energy rate (Watt)

\dot{x} : X Component of the velocity (m/s)

\dot{y} : Y Component of the velocity (m/s)

E: Energy (Joul)

\vec{p} : Position vector

(x_0, y_0) : Initial coordinate, Origin

(x_f, y_f) : Final coordinate, Destination

$q(t)$: Number of passengers in the queue

$n(t)$: The rate of passengers existing from the bottleneck

$m(t)$: Passenger rate departing from the train at a time, t

C: Escalator capacity (Ped/s)

O-D pair: Origin-destination

M: metabolic rate (Watts)

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| CHAPTER 1 | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 SCOPE AND MOTIVATION..... | 3 |
| 1.2 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE..... | 4 |
| 1.3 RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS..... | 4 |
| 1.4 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY..... | 5 |
| 1.5 ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION..... | 6 |
| 1.6 PUBLICATIONS ARISING DIRECTLY FROM THE PHD RESEARCH..... | 9 |
| CHAPTER 2 | 10 |
| LITERATURE REVIEW OF PEDESTRIAN BEHAVIOUR | 10 |
| 2.1 ROUTE CHOICE..... | 11 |
| 2.1.1 <i>Route Choice Definition</i> | 11 |
| 2.1.2 <i>Route Choice Models</i> | 13 |
| 2.1.3 <i>Factors Influencing Route Choice</i> | 15 |
| 2.2 WALKING BEHAVIOUR..... | 18 |
| 2.2.1 <i>Walking Behavior Models</i> | 18 |
| 2.3 CONGESTION..... | 19 |
| 2.3.1 <i>Influence of Congestion Occurrence on Route Choice</i> | 21 |
| 2.3.2 <i>Pedestrian Bottleneck</i> | 28 |
| 2.4 PRINCIPLE OF LEAST EFFORT..... | 29 |
| 2.4.1 <i>Metabolic Energy</i> | 32 |
| 2.5 CONCLUSIONS..... | 35 |
| CHAPTER 3 | 36 |
| EFFORT-BASED THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR PEDESTRIAN ROUTE CHOICE | 36 |
| 3.1 PROBLEM STATEMENT..... | 39 |
| 3.2 EFFORT-BASED FORMULATION OF PRC PROBLEM..... | 42 |
| 3.2.1 <i>The Euler-Lagrange Equations</i> | 43 |
| 3.2.2 <i>Constraint-Free Pedestrian Walk</i> | 44 |
| 3.3 EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED EFFORT FORMULATION; CLIMBING STAIRS VS RIDING ESCALATOR..... | 48 |
| 3.4 EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSED EFFORT FORMULATION; ESCALATOR WITH DIFFERENT LEVELS OF CONGESTION..... | 51 |
| 3.5 CONCLUSIONS..... | 53 |
| CHAPTER 4 | 54 |
| COMPARISON BETWEEN DIFFERENT CRITERIA FOR PEDESTRIAN ROUTE CHOICE | 54 |
| 4.1 ROUTE COST IN TERMS OF DISTANCE, TIME AND PHYSICAL EFFORT..... | 54 |
| 4.1.1 <i>Route Cost in Terms of Distance</i> | 55 |
| 4.1.2 <i>Route Cost in Terms of Time</i> | 56 |
| 4.1.3 <i>Route Cost in Terms of Physical Effort</i> | 56 |
| 4.2 A COMPARISON BETWEEN CRITERIA..... | 57 |
| 4.3 EXAMPLE 1:..... | 60 |
| 4.4 EXAMPLE 2:..... | 64 |
| 4.5 CONCLUSIONS..... | 68 |
| CHAPTER 5 | 69 |
| EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS OF A BOTTLENECK INVESTIGATION AT THE BRISBANE CENTRAL TRAIN STATION | 69 |
| 5.1 DATA COLLECTION TECHNIQUES..... | 69 |
| 5.2 CASE STUDY 1: STAIRS OR ESCALATOR..... | 71 |
| 5.3 CASE STUDY 2: ESCALATOR ENTRY BOTTLENECK..... | 79 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| 5.3.1 Bottleneck and Queuing..... | 80 |
| 5.3.2 Bottleneck Capacity..... | 81 |
| 5.3.3 Model Formulation Escalator Entry Bottleneck | 82 |
| 5.3.4 Experimental Results | 86 |
| 5.4 CONCLUSIONS..... | 87 |
| CHAPTER 6..... | 90 |
| CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK..... | 90 |
| 6.1 SUMMARY | 90 |
| 6.2 MAIN FINDINGS..... | 91 |
| 6.3 FUTURE WORK | 93 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | | |
|-------------|--|----|
| Figure 2.1 | Levels of pedestrian behaviour | 10 |
| Figure 2.2 | A route as a chain of nodes from origin to destination | 11 |
| Figure 2.3 | Congestion at the Brisbane central rail train station | 20 |
| Figure 2.4 | Comparison between two routes (with and without congestion) | 24 |
| Figure 2.5 | Illustration of the key direction of moving congestion | 25 |
| Figure 2.6 | Human beings utilise a path of least effort | 31 |
| Figure 3.1 | Possible routes between two destinations | 40 |
| Figure 3.2 | Route description | 41 |
| Figure 3.3 | A characteristic curve of power P | 45 |
| Figure 3.4 | Trajectories $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ | 48 |
| Figure 3.5 | Route choice between the platform and concourse | 49 |
| Figure 4.1 | The shortest route between points A and B | 55 |
| Figure 4.2 | Shows the surface of effort E versus the time T and the length L | 58 |
| Figure 4.3 | The relation between the velocity V and the effort E | 59 |
| Figure 4.4 | Comparison between two routes | 61 |
| Figure 4.5 | Illustration of the key direction of route choice possibilities | 61 |
| Figure 4.6 | The relation between route length and time | 62 |
| Figure 4.7 | The relation between effort and time | 63 |
| Figure 4.8 | Comparison between two Routes | 65 |
| Figure 4.9 | Comparison between walk through mud path (more resistance) and least resistance path at the right side in real life. | 65 |
| Figure 5.1 | Queensland rail field layout for Brisbane central rail station Feb-2015, (Box 4) | 71 |
| Figure 5.2 | Escalator and stairs, in Brisbane central rail station | 72 |
| Figure 5.3 | Our SHP located at Brisbane central rail station | 72 |
| Figure 5.4 | Number of pedestrians over time on the escalator at Queensland rail for Brisbane central station Feb-2015 | 73 |
| Figure 5.5 | Percentage of passengers walking up escalator/stairs without congestion | 74 |
| Figure 5.6 | Route choice behaviour passengers' based on the congestion state | 75 |
| Figure 5.7 | Congestion occurrence prediction with numbers and percentages of passengers who travelling over stairs and escalator | 77 |
| Figure 5.8 | Train station layout | 83 |
| Figure 5.9 | Case A, no congestion | 84 |
| Figure 5.10 | Case B, the number of passengers travelling over an escalator equal escalator capacity | 84 |
| Figure 5.11 | Case C, high- level congestion occurs | 85 |
| Figure 5.12 | The sensing (SHP) located at Brisbane central rail station. | 86 |
| Figure 5.13 | Bottlenecks in a peak hour situation at Brisbane central rail station. | 87 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|-----------|---|----|
| Table 1.1 | Overview of the dissertation organisations | 8 |
| Table 2.1 | Summary of metabolic energy formula proposed in literature | 34 |
| Table 3.1 | Route cost in terms of length, time and effort without considering the congestion | 50 |
| Table 3.2 | Route O-B with different terrain and velocities in congested infrastructure | 52 |
| Table 4.1 | Route cost in terms of time, distance and effort | 63 |
| Table 4.2 | An overview of route usage | 67 |
| Table 5.1 | A comparison of effort with a different state of congestion | 78 |