

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **GENETIC FUZZY LOGIC APPROACH TO LOCAL RAMP METERING CONTROL USING MICROSCOPIC TRAFFIC SIMULATION**

A thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

Master of Engineering  
in  
Mechatronics

at  
Massey University,  
Auckland, New Zealand

Yu Xue Feng

June 2009

## **Abstract**

Ramp metering, one of the most effective solutions for improving motorway traffic flows, is playing increasingly important role in traffic management systems. Because of its capability to handle nonlinear and non-stationary problems, fuzzy logic based ramp metering algorithms have been always considered as an extremely suitable control measures to handle a complex nonlinear traffic system. This thesis proposes a genetic fuzzy approach to design a traffic-responsive ramp control algorithm for an isolated on-ramp. For a local ramp meter algorithm, the problem could be described as the inflow optimization of on-ramp, based on the evaluation of motorway traffic condition. If the inflow of on-ramp is considered as the decision variable, the ramp control problem could be treated as a nonlinear optimization problem of maximizing the evaluation function. The adaptive genetic fuzzy approach is actually a control approach to maximize the inflow of on-ramp under the restriction of evaluation function.

In this thesis, a well-known fuzzy logic based ramp metering algorithms developed by Bogenberger is introduced and implemented with an on-ramp congestion model of Constellation Drive Interchange in a stochastic microscopic traffic simulator, Aimsun. To improve the performance of fuzzy control system, genetic algorithm is applied to tune the parameterized membership function of each fuzzy input to maintain the flow density of motorway blow the estimated congestion density. The performances of the genetic fuzzy logic control ramp metering are compared with FLC (fuzzy logic control) ramp metering by means of the percentage change of TTT (Total Travel Time) based on no control condition in Aimsun. The simulation results show the genetic fuzzy ramp metering has a more significant improvement on TTT and more strong stability to maintain system flow density than FLC ramp metering.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank all my supervisors, especially Prof. Peter Xu and Dr. Frakhul Alam, for their support throughout the duration of the project. Without their guidance and persistent help, this thesis would not have been possible. Thanks also to Dr. Johan Potgieter and Dr. Clara Fang for their suggestions, patience and encouragement, which makes me finally brave enough to start this academic journey from a very beginning level.

I would also like to thank my friends Ben Lin and Van Cao for their advices and help. The spectacle of we collecting field data in the rain would be the most precious picture in my memory.

Finally, I want to thank my parents:

谢谢你们在我辞掉工作后的支持，谢谢你们永远尊重我选择生活的权利。



## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

### **CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Freeway congestion.....	1
1.2 Ramp Metering.....	2
1.3 Objectives.....	4
1.4 The thesis contribution .....	4

### **CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW**

2.1 Fixed time ramp metering algorithm.....	5
2.2 Local traffic responsive ramp metering algorithm.....	5
2.2.1 Demands-Capacity Control Strategy.....	7
2.2.2 Percent-Occupancy Control Strategy.....	8
2.2.3 ALINEA.....	9
2.3 Coordinated traffic responsive ramp metering algorithm.....	10
2.3.1 Competitive algorithms.....	10
2.3.2 Cooperative algorithms.....	11
2.3.3 Integral ramp metering algorithms.....	11
2.4 The development of FLC based ramp control approaches.....	12
2.3.1 Advantages of FLC based ramp control approaches.....	12
2.3.2 The developing trend of FLC based ramp control approaches.....	12
2.5 Conclusion.....	15

### **CHAPTER 3 – FUZZY RAMP METERING ALGORITHM**

3.1 Overview of fuzzy logic control.....	17
3.2 Fuzzy logic control based ramp metering algorithm .....	18
3.2.1 Fuzzyfication .....	19
3.2.2 Inference.....	25
3.2.3 Defuzzyfication.....	27
3.3 Conclusion.....	27

### **CHAPTER 4 - GENETIC FUZZY RAMP METERING ALGORITHM**

4.1 The framework of genetic fuzzy ramp metering algorithm.....	28
4.2 Genetic fuzzy tuning algorithm.....	29
4.2.1 Overview of genetic algorithm.....	29
4.2.2 The application of genetic algorithm.....	31

4.2.2.1 Initialization.....	31
4.2.2.2 Objective function.....	35
4.2.2.3 Selection.....	38
4.2.2.4 Crossover.....	40
4.2.2.5 Mutation.....	42
4.2.2.6 Encoding and Decoding.....	44
4.3 Investigating GA Parameters.....	45
4.4 Conclusion.....	47

## **CHAPTER 5 – SIMULATION STUDY**

5.1 Aimsun 6 simulation environment.....	48
5.2 Simulator enhancements.....	49
5.3 Study area and model assumption.....	51
5.3.1 Road section information.....	51
5.3.2 Vehicle information.....	52
5.3.3 Detector information.....	53
5.3.4 Traffic flow assumption.....	54
5.3.5 The calculation of the objective function in Aimsun.....	57
5.4 Simulation results and analysis.....	58
5.4.1 The simulation results and analysis of Table 5.2.....	59
5.4.2 The simulation results and analysis of Table 5.3.....	69
5.4.3 The simulation results and analysis of Table 5.4.....	78
5.4.4 The simulation results and analysis of Table 5.5.....	87
5.4.5 Overall results analysis.....	96
5.5 Sensitivity analysis.....	96
5.6 Conclusion.....	98

## **CHAPTER 6 – CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

6.1 Conclusion.....	99
6.2 Recommendation.....	100

## **REFERENCES**

## **APPENDICES**

- Appendix A: Fuzzy logic control coding for ramp metering
- Appendix B: Genetic fuzzy control coding for ramp metering
- Appendix C: Simulation Results-The change of system flow density

## LIST OF FIGURE

Figure 1.1 Density-Flow relationship in Greenshield's Model.....	1
Figure 1.2 the Fundamental Diagram .....	3
Figure 2.1 A typical local traffic-responsive ramp meter system.....	6
Figure 2.2 Demands-Capacity Control Strategy.....	7
Figure 2.3 Percent-Occupancy Control Strategy.....	8
Figure 2.4 ALINEA.....	9
Figure 2.5 Bottleneck Flow Charts.....	10
Figure 2.6 the Genetic Fuzzy Model.....	14
Figure 2.7 the Neuro-Fuzzy Model.....	15
Figure 3.1 a typical fuzzy rule-based system.....	17
Figure 3.2 the layout of FLC ramp metering.....	18
Figure 3.3 Fuzzy sets for the upstream speed.....	20
Figure 3.4 Fuzzy sets for the upstream occupancy.....	21
Figure 3.5 Fuzzy sets for the upstream flow rate.....	21
Figure 3.5 the fuzzy set for the downstream volume-capacity ratio.....	22
Figure 3.6 the fuzzy set for the downstream speed.....	22
Figure 3.7 the fuzzy set for the check-in occupancy.....	23
Figure 3.8 the fuzzy set for the queue occupancy.....	23

Figure 3.9 Fuzzy sets for the metering rates.....	24
Figure 3.10 Fuzzy sets for the scaled metering rates.....	24
Figure 3.11 Fundamental diagrams.....	26
Figure 4.1 Genetic fuzzy systems.....	28
Figure 4.2 the framework of genetic fuzzy ramp metering algorithm.....	29
Figure 4.3 the layout of standard genetic algorithm.....	30
Figure 4.4 the layout of generating an initial population.....	32
Figure 4.5 the sample fuzzy sets of local speed.....	33
Figure 4.6 the programming layout of generating a feasible individual.....	34
Figure 4.7 a freeway on-ramp model.....	35
Figure 4.8 the layout of calculating a fitness value.....	37
Figure 4.9 the flow chart of Selection.....	39
Figure 4.10 Single Point Crossover.....	40
Figure 4.11 the flow chart of Crossover.....	41
Figure 4.12 the flow chart of Mutation.....	43
Figure 4.13 Results from GA test in Microsoft C++.....	46
Figure 5.1 Aimsun environment.....	48
Figure 5.2 Conceptual structure of Aimsun API application.....	49
Figure 5.3 Interactions between Aimsun and Aimsun API.....	50

Figure 5.4 the southbound on-ramp of Constellation interchange in Aimsun.....	51
Figure 5.5 the geometric information of the on-ramp of Constellation Dr in Aimsun...	51
Figure 5.6 Vehicle parameters.....	52
Figure 5.7 the distribution layout of detectors.....	53
Figure 5.8 Greenshield's macroscopic stream model.....	57
Figure 5.9 the percentage change of TTT when ramp demand is 1600 vehs/h.....	65
Figure 5.10 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5200 vehs/h.....	66
Figure 5.11 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5400 vehs/h.....	67
Figure 5.12 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5600 vehs/h.....	67
Figure 5.13 the percentage change of TTT when ramp demand is 1400 vehs/h.....	75
Figure 5.14 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5000 vehs/h.....	76
Figure 5.15 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5200 vehs/h.....	76
Figure 5.16 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5400 vehs/h.....	77
Figure 5.17 the percentage change of TTT when ramp demand is 1200 vehs/h.....	84
Figure 5.18 the change of average flow density when total demand is 4800 vehs/h.....	85
Figure 5.19 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5000 vehs/h.....	85
Figure 5.20 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5200 vehs/h.....	86
Figure 5.21 the percentage change of TTT when ramp demand is 1000 vehs/h.....	93
Figure 5.22 the change of average flow density when total demand is 4800 vehs/h.....	94

Figure 5.23 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5000 vehs/h.....	94
Figure 5.24 the change of average flow density when total demand is 5200 vehs/h.....	95
Figure 5.25 % change of TTT vs. the positions of the upstream detector.....	97
Figure 5.26 % change of TTT vs. the positions of the downstream detector.....	97

## **List of tables**

Table 2.1 Total time spent (TTS) in system.....	14
Table 3.1 Input and output fuzzy sets.....	20
Table 3.2 Rule base for fuzzy ramp metering.....	25
Table 4.1 the fuzzy parameters to be tuned.....	31
Table 4.2 the test of GA parameters.....	45
Table 5.1 Basic road information.....	52
Table 5.2 Traffic demand data when average ramp demand is 1600vehicles/h.....	54
Table 5.3 Traffic demand data when average ramp demand is 1400vehicles/h.....	55
Table 5.4 Traffic demand data when average ramp demand is 1200vehicles/h.....	55
Table 5.5 Traffic demand data when average ramp demand is 1000vehicles/h.....	56
Table 5.6 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3000~1600).....	59
Table 5.7 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3200~1600).....	60
Table 5.8 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3400~1600).....	61
Table 5.9 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3600~1600).....	62
Table 5.10 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3800~1600).....	63
Table 5.11 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (4000~1600).....	64
Table 5.12 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3200~1400).....	69
Table 5.13 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3400~1400).....	70
Table 5.14 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3600~1400).....	71
Table 5.15 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3800~1400).....	72
Table 5.16 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (4000~1400).....	73
Table 5.17 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (4200~1400).....	74
Table 5.18 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3200~1200).....	78

Table 5.19 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3400~1200).....	79
Table 5.20 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3600~1200).....	80
Table 5.21 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3800~1200).....	81
Table 5.22 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (4000~1200).....	82
Table 5.23 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (4200~1200).....	83
Table 5.24 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3200~1000).....	87
Table 5.25 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3400~1000).....	88
Table 5.26 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3600~1000).....	89
Table 5.27 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (3800~1000).....	90
Table 5.28 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (4000~1000).....	91
Table 5.29 General measures of Effectiveness at traffic demand (4200~1000).....	92