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#### Abstract

: In this research paper, we try to utilize a parallel network of in roads and divert some of the traffic from the major arterial road link to these links in order to compare the resulting delays and queue lengths with the originally normal traffic flow and find out if the peak hour travel times, delays and queue lengths can be reduced along the major road links by reassigning the traffic along the parallel routes. In this paper, we show that by diverting around 10 percent of traffic during peak hour, we can reduce the burden on the major road sections by a larger amount, and the parameters like vehicle travel times, delays and queue lengths see significant reduction along the major road links. For this, we use micro simulation software PTV VISSIM, and simulate the site conditions obtained through traffic volume survey, route choice survey etc. and compare the results of the simulation with and without redirection of traffic volume along the in roads. The section of road network considered is a part of AB Road, between LIG Square and Nawlakha Square with first traffic signal being at Palasiya Square and the last being GPO Square. The alternate in road sections run parallel to more than 3 quarters in length of this section, from Geeta Bhawan Square to GPO Square.


I Introduction

Indore is the largest city of Madhya Pradesh with a population of over 3 million and a metropolitan area of approx. 1200 sq km . It has the highest number of registered personal and commercial vehicles state-wide. As such a need for traffic management is very high, especially during peak hour period. This work is being carried out to find out whether it is feasible to reduce the vehicle travel times, delays and queue lengths at intersections during peak hour traffic period if some traffic volume is alternatively redirected to available less congested in roads.

## II Objective

- To study traffic flow pattern on selected network during peak hour period.
- To conduct vehicle count and record turning instances, to derive route choice behaviour of user.
- To use simulation software to calculate travel time, delay time, queuing length, average speed, vehicular occupancy rate on a traffic signal controlled road section.
- To suggest an alternate route for a major arterial road and recalculate travel times, delay times, queuing lengths, average speed and occupancy rate data.
- To compare the results and comment on the improvement in travel experience during peak hour period.
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## III Methodology

a) Site Selection:

The site selected is such that a major section of the network has a set of in roads running parallel to one of the major roads. The original traffic on the in-roads should be significantly lesser then the major road. The in-road should be accessible to major road via multiple access points. Based on above criteria, a section of AB Road (NH-3) from Palasiya Square to GPO was selected. The section length is 2.33 km , with 4 signalized intersections on main route and 1 on alternate route. There are 4 unsignalized intersections on the alternate route. The main route is 2-lane road in each direction while the alternate route is a single lane for most of the route.
The section of road is located between coordinates $22.724313442696857,75.88691387642193$ and $22.707046174254266,75.87885074843888$


Figure 1- Site Location
b) Data Collection:

- Traffic volume survey by videography:-

Field data of weekdays during 8a.m. to 8p.m. was taken to determine traffic volume, speed of different type of vehicles for free flow and other conditions, peak hour period was arrived at and peak hour volumes for buses, 3 wheelers, cars, bicycles and motorcycles are derived separately. The volume count of the same for each of signalled intersections is shown in table 1 to table 5.

- User Route Choice Survey:

An online survey was conducted wherein users were provided with two alternate routes and asked questions regarding their preferred route of travel which was then be segregated for different vehicle types, gender, and age group. It was observed that approximately $85 \%$ of the users preferred to use the main road irrespective of traffic conditions.
c) Input in PTV VISSIM:

This data was then given to PTV VISSIM as input along with all the signal cycle timings and simulation was carried out. The results for Vehicle travel time, vehicle delay time and queue lengths at various intersections was recorded. Afterwards, 10 percent of the traffic volume is redirected to alternate route and the simulation was carried out again.
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| GPO Leg |  | Left (MY) | Straight (Geeta Bhaawan) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Right1 (Police } \\ & \text { Line) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Right2 (Piplihana) | Total Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2W | 204 | 964 | 52 | 356 | 1576 |
|  | Bicycle | 16 | 96 | 20 | 28 | 160 |
|  | Car | 100 | 328 | 20 | 96 | 544 |
|  | 3W | 12 | 148 | 36 | 48 | 244 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 16 | 0 | 8 | 24 |
| Police Line LEG |  | Left (GPO) | Straight (MY) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Right1 } \\ \text { (piplihana) } \end{gathered}$ | Right2 (Geeta Bhawan) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 96 | 512 | 96 | 300 | 1004 |
|  | Bicycle | 36 | 52 | 28 | 32 | 148 |
|  | Car | 56 | 136 | 56 | 92 | 340 |
|  | 3W | 56 | 40 | 20 | 32 | 148 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Piplihana Leg |  | Left (Police Line) | Left 2 (GPO) | Straight (MY) | Right1 (Geeta Bhawan) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 76 | 124 | 944 | 176 | 1320 |
|  | Bicycle | 16 | 32 | 60 | 32 | 140 |
|  | Car | 36 | 36 | 248 | 156 | 476 |
|  | 3W | 20 | 28 | 128 | 28 | 204 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 0 | 32 | 8 | 40 |
| Geeta Bhawan Leg |  | Left1 (Piplihana) | Left 2 (police line) | Straight (GPO) | Right (MY) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 668 | 100 | 1128 | 396 | 2292 |
|  | Bicycle | 84 | 24 | 96 | 92 | 296 |
|  | Car | 240 | 48 | 352 | 216 | 856 |
|  | 3W | 16 | 16 | 164 | 136 | 332 |
|  | Bus | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| MY Leg |  | Left (Geeta <br> Bhawan) | Straight (piplihana) | Right 1 (Police Line) | Right 2 (GPO) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 388 | 456 | 320 | 140 | 1304 |
|  | Bicycle | 68 | 60 | 36 | 48 | 212 |
|  | Car | 164 | 188 | 132 | 188 | 672 |
|  | 3W | 36 | 88 | 84 | 84 | 292 |
|  | Bus | 8 | 8 | 20 | 60 | 96 |

Table-1: Peak Hour Volume Count Data of White Church Intersection.
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| Navlakha Leg | Vehicle type | Left (Chawni) | Straight (Whitechurch) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Right } \\ \text { (Residency) } \end{gathered}$ | Total Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2W | 876 | 1436 | 256 | 2568 |
|  | Bicycle | 36 | 60 | 28 | 124 |
|  | Car | 92 | 544 | 132 | 768 |
|  | 3W | 208 | 132 | 36 | 376 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 40 | 0 | 40 |
| Residency Leg |  | Left (Navlakha) | Straight (Chawni) | Right (Whitechurch) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 448 | 588 | 280 | 1316 |
|  | Bicycle | 76 | 60 | 44 | 180 |
|  | Car | 104 | 12 | 144 | 260 |
|  | 3W | 44 | 84 | 24 | 152 |
|  | Bus | 12 | 0 | 4 | 16 |
| Whitechurch Leg |  | Left (Residency) | Straight (Navlakha) | Right (Chawni) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 748 | 1080 | 104 | 1932 |
|  | Bicycle | 36 | 124 | 20 | 180 |
|  | Car | 232 | 480 | 64 | 776 |
|  | 3W | 84 | 112 | 32 | 228 |
|  | Bus | 12 | 32 | 0 | 44 |
| Chawni Leg |  | Left <br> (whitechurch) | Straight <br> (Residency) | Right (Navlakha) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 228 | 344 | 144 | 716 |
|  | Bicycle | 32 | 32 | 24 | 88 |
|  | Car | 28 | 48 | 48 | 124 |
|  | 3W | 44 | 84 | 64 | 192 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 8 | 8 | 16 |

Table-2: Peak Hour Volume Count Data of GPO Intersection.
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| Geeta Bhawan Leg |  | Left (Indraprasth) | Straight (LIG) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Right (Tilak } \\ \text { nagar) } \end{gathered}$ | Total Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2W | 720 | 1052 | 200 | 1972 |
|  | Bicycle | 124 | 92 | 24 | 240 |
|  | Car | 304 | 408 | 80 | 792 |
|  | 3W | 96 | 84 | 44 | 224 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tilak Nagar Leg |  | Left (Geeta bhawan) | Straight (Indraprasth) | Right (LIG) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 776 | 1024 | 168 | 1968 |
|  | Bicycle | 40 | 68 | 32 | 140 |
|  | Car | 176 | 228 | 120 | 524 |
|  | 3W | 36 | 72 | 32 | 140 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 |
| LIG Leg |  | Left (tilak Nagar) | Straight (Geeta Bhawan) | Right (Indraprasth) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 768 | 1080 | 956 | 2804 |
|  | Bicycle | 136 | 72 | 92 | 300 |
|  | Car | 216 | 276 | 208 | 700 |
|  | 3W | 124 | 148 | 136 | 408 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 8 | 12 | 20 |
| Indraprasth Leg |  | Left (LIG) | Straight (Tilak Nagar) | Right (Geeta Bhawan) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 880 | 972 | 372 | 2224 |
|  | Bicycle | 124 | 156 | 92 | 372 |
|  | Car | 224 | 208 | 244 | 676 |
|  | 3W | 124 | 108 | 88 | 320 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 |

Table-3: Peak Hour Volume Count Data of Palasiya Intersection.

| Whitechurch Leg |  | Left (Madhumilan) | Straight (Palasiya) | Right (Bengali) | Total Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2W | 844 | 1016 | 296 | 2156 |
|  | Bicycle | 104 | 96 | 20 | 220 |
|  | Car | 232 | 396 | 124 | 752 |
|  | 3W | 76 | 116 | 40 | 232 |
|  | Bus | 4 | 20 | 4 | 28 |
| Bengali Leg |  | Left <br> (Whitechurch) | Straight (Madhumilan) | Right (Palasiya) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 776 | 1024 | 168 | 1968 |
|  | Bicycle | 40 | 68 | 32 | 140 |
|  | Car | 176 | 232 | 92 | 500 |
|  | 3W | 36 | 72 | 32 | 140 |
|  | Bus | 0 | 16 | 0 | 16 |
| Palasiya Leg |  | Left (Bengali) | Straight (Whitechurch) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Right } \\ \text { (Madhumilan) } \end{gathered}$ | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 720 | 948 | 696 | 2364 |
|  | Bicycle | 84 | 120 | 44 | 248 |
|  | Car | 208 | 404 | 172 | 784 |
|  | 3W | 84 | 128 | 68 | 280 |
|  | Bus | 4 | 8 | 0 | 12 |
| Madhumilan Leg |  | Left( Palasiya) | Straight (Bengali) | Right (Whitechuch) | Total Count |
|  | 2W | 728 | 536 | 560 | 1824 |
|  | Bicycle | 32 | 52 | 32 | 116 |
|  | Car | 156 | 72 | 128 | 356 |
|  | 3W | 28 | 36 | 64 | 128 |
|  | Bus | 4 | 8 | 8 | 20 |

Table-4: Peak Hour Volume Count Data of Geeta Bhawan Intersection.

| Agri Clg Leg | $\begin{array}{l}\text { Vehicle } \\ \text { type }\end{array}$ | Left (Residency) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | \(\left.\begin{array}{l}Straight <br>

(Whitechurch)\end{array}\right)\)

Table-5: Peak Hour Volume Count Data of Alternate Route Intersection.
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IV Data Analysis
The data regarding average speed, occupancy rate, average travel time, average delay time, average queue length and maximum queue length were collected through simulations using PTV VISSIM before and after diverting 10 percent of traffic volume. The comparative analysis is tabulated in the following tables:

| S. No. | NAME OF APPROACH |  | Occupancy Rate (\%) |  | Avg speed (m/s) |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  | Before | After | Before |  |
| 1 | LIG - PALASIYA SQ | $69.13 \%$ | $68.12 \%$ | 17.65 | 17.74 |  |
| 2 | MG RD - PALASIYA SQ | $78.42 \%$ | $75.88 \%$ | 17.31 | 17.19 |  |
| 3 | TILAK NGR RD - PALASIYA SQ | $58.81 \%$ | $60.11 \%$ | 18.39 | 19.69 |  |
| 4 | GEETA BHAWAN - PALASIYA SQ | $48.33 \%$ | $49.75 \%$ | 15.73 | 16.69 |  |
| 5 | PALASIYA SQ - GEETA BHAWAN | $66.10 \%$ | $64.37 \%$ | 18.81 | 19.14 |  |
| 6 | CHURCH SQ - GEETA BHAWAN | $72.46 \%$ | $71.88 \%$ | 19.16 | 19.80 |  |
| 7 | THEATRE RD - GEETA BHAWAN | $64.65 \%$ | $62.88 \%$ | 20.54 | 20.30 |  |
| 8 | BENGALI SQ- GEETA BHAWAN | $86.66 \%$ | $85.50 \%$ | 22.95 | 21.09 |  |
| 9 | ALTERNATE RT | $28.34 \%$ | $41.51 \%$ | 17.24 | 15.44 |  |
| 10 | FROM AGRI CLG | $54.47 \%$ | $52.23 \%$ | 15.26 | 16.05 |  |
| 11 | TOWARDS AGRI CLG | $77.65 \%$ | $71.86 \%$ | 15.72 | 15.32 |  |
| 12 | GEETA BHAWAN - CHURCH SQ | $75.48 \%$ | $67.15 \%$ | 15.26 | 17.86 |  |
| 13 | GPO SQ - CHURCH SQ | $75.24 \%$ | $78.32 \%$ | 18.67 | 18.79 |  |
| 14 | AGRI CLG - CHURCH SQ | $33.51 \%$ | $30.84 \%$ | 15.07 | 15.57 |  |
| 15 | MY - CHURCH SQ | $76.80 \%$ | $74.88 \%$ | 20.79 | 19.30 |  |
| 16 | RESIDENCY - CHURCH SQ | $80.57 \%$ | $82.56 \%$ | 18.57 | 18.54 |  |
| 17 | RESIDENCY - GPO SQ | $4.55 \%$ | $4.25 \%$ | 19.47 | 18.18 |  |
| 18 | CHAWNI - GPO SQ | $42.42 \%$ | $41.84 \%$ | 14.87 | 14.08 |  |
| 19 | NAWLAKHA - GPO SQ | $48.69 \%$ | $48.38 \%$ | 20.73 | 20.70 |  |
| 20 | CHURCH SQ - GPO SQ | $45.02 \%$ | $39.61 \%$ | 15.04 | 16.18 |  |
|  | Table-6: Occupancy Rate in $\%$ and Average speed in $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ before | and | after redirecting | traffic |  |  |

Table-6: Occupancy Rate in $\%$ and Average speed in $\mathrm{m} / \mathrm{s}$ before and after redirecting traffic.
The above table shows the variation in occupancy rate and average speed of vehicles along different sections of the road network before and after redirecting 10 percent of traffic from main route to the alternate route.
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| S. No. | NAME OF APPROACH | Avg Queue length (m) |  | Max Queue Length (m) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Before | After | Before | After |
| 1 | LIG - PALASIYA SQ | 9.113 | 8.895 | 36.988 | 36.106 |
| 2 | MG RD - PALASIYA SQ | 14.976 | 12.173 | 58.022 | 47.161 |
| 3 | TILAK NGR RD - PALASIYA SQ | 11.091 | 11.102 | 58.583 | 58.638 |
| 4 | GEETA BHAWAN - PALASIYA SQ | 4.184 | 4.379 | 24.120 | 25.243 |
| 5 | PALASIYA SQ - GEETA BHAWAN | 24.220 | 21.605 | 102.648 | 91.564 |
| 6 | BENGALI SQ- GEETA BHAWAN | 24.322 | 29.423 | 66.452 | 80.387 |
| 7 | THEATRE RD - GEETA BHAWAN | 6.132 | 6.366 | 38.053 | 39.502 |
| 8 | CHURCH SQ - GEETA BHAWAN | 10.107 | 9.072 | 62.686 | 56.267 |
| 9 | MY - CHURCH SQ | 18.996 | 17.211 | 67.303 | 60.977 |
| 10 | AGRI CLG - CHURCH SQ | 21.179 | 21.223 | 55.930 | 56.047 |
| 11 | GEETA BHAWAN - CHURCH SQ | 69.237 | 55.301 | 567.779 | 453.499 |
| 12 | GPO SQ - CHURCH SQ | 25.421 | 19.117 | 77.640 | 58.387 |
| 13 | RESIDENCY - CHURCH SQ | 358.519 | 350.649 | 512.336 | 501.090 |
| 14 | CHAWNI - GPO SQ | 3.187 | 2.953 | 32.211 | 29.847 |
| 15 | RESIDENCY - GPO SQ | 7.590 | 8.798 | 63.351 | 73.434 |
| 16 | CHURCH SQ - GPO SQ | 2.710 | 1.473 | 31.720 | 17.235 |
| 17 | NAWLAKHA - GPO SQ | 3.950 | 4.237 | 31.928 | 34.244 |
| 18 | ALTERNATE RT | 227.091 | 287.114 | 397.235 | 502.229 |
| 19 | TOWARDS AGRI CLG | 38.801 | 19.380 | 243.568 | 121.658 |
| 20 | FROM AGRI CLG | 9.090 | 7.695 | 40.202 | 34.031 |

The above table shows the variation in average and maximum queue length of vehicles along different signal heads of the road network before and after redirecting 10 percent of traffic from main route to the alternate route.
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| $\begin{gathered} \text { S. } \\ \text { No. } \end{gathered}$ | ORIGIN \& DESTINATION | AVG TRAVEL TIME (S) |  | AVG DELAY TIME (S) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | BEFORE | AFTER | Before | After |
| 1 | PALASIYA SQ - GPO SQ | 556.00 | 503.56 | 379.33 | 311.14 |
| 2 | GPO SQ - PALASIYA SQ | 521.56 | 519.76 | 282.86 | 280.91 |
| 3 | MG RD - GPO SQ | 1360.62 | 1321.27 | 1083.59 | 1021.81 |
| 4 | THEATRE RD - GPO SQ | 407.14 | 370.39 | 231.00 | 191.18 |
| 5 | BENGALI SQ RD - GPO SQ | 444.25 | 425.27 | 271.84 | 249.11 |
| 6 | MY RD - GPO SQ | 264.25 | 282.36 | 147.18 | 168.05 |
| 7 | AGRI CLG RD - GPO SQ | 554.04 | 604.04 | 328.38 | 390.33 |
| 8 | MY RD - PALASIYA SQ | 329.92 | 340.43 | 152.02 | 161.86 |
| 9 | AGRI CLG RD - PALASIYA SQ | 587.74 | 573.93 | 369.78 | 352.61 |
| 10 | CHAWNI RD - PALASIYA SQ | 575.21 | 562.54 | 196.62 | 188.05 |
| 11 | RESIDENCY RD - PALASIYA SQ | 433.61 | 481.11 | 226.21 | 278.49 |
| 12 | THEATRE RD - PALASIYA SQ | 103.78 | 106.22 | 33.55 | 35.14 |
| 13 | BENGALI SQ RD - PALASIYA SQ | 229.30 | 252.35 | 132.39 | 160.34 |
| 14 | PALASIYA SQ - MG RD | 67.91 | 69.96 | 47.65 | 50.56 |
| 15 | PALASIYA SQ - TILAK NGR RD | 59.53 | 56.22 | 45.24 | 40.34 |
| 16 | PALASIYA SQ -THEATRE RD | 174.74 | 191.72 | 96.20 | 115.82 |
| 17 | PALASIYA SQ - BENGALI SQ RD | 164.50 | 155.58 | 94.87 | 84.86 |
| 18 | PALASIYA SQ - AGRI CLG RD | 799.57 | 766.28 | 434.29 | 398.89 |
| 19 | PALASIYA SQ - MY RD | 502.08 | 497.10 | 276.70 | 271.24 |
| 20 | GPO SQ - CHAWNI | 50.42 | 47.68 | 23.97 | 21.44 |
| 21 | GPO SQ - RESIDENCY RD | 87.73 | 92.77 | 34.22 | 38.26 |
| 22 | GPO SQ - AGRI CLG RD | 775.91 | 742.19 | 478.92 | 438.20 |
| 23 | GPO SQ - MY RD | 176.79 | 202.73 | 79.47 | 104.50 |
| 24 | GPO SQ - THEATRE RD | 349.57 | 343.95 | 169.94 | 164.52 |
| 25 | GPO SQ - BENGALI SQ RD | 438.56 | 423.64 | 231.21 | 215.75 |
| 26 | GPO SQ - TILAK NAGAR RD | 557.54 | 536.21 | 322.28 | 298.10 |
| 27 | GPO SQ - MG RD | 419.30 | 430.50 | 206.57 | 217.75 |

Table-8: Average travel time and average delay time between various O-D pairs before and after redirecting traffic
The above table shows the variation in average travel time of vehicles between different pairs of starting and ending locations (can be considered as local OD Pairs) of the road network before and after redirecting 10 percent of traffic from main route to the alternate route.

## V Results

After simulations were carried out, the following were the results obtained:
a) Average Speed:

It was observed that the average speed was increased by $17 \%$ on the main route while the same was reduced by $10 \%$ on the alternate route.
b) Occupancy Rate:

It was observed that occupancy rate was reduced by $11 \%$ on the main route while the same was increased by $46 \%$ on the alternate route.
c) Travel Time:

It was observed that average travel time was reduced by $9 \%$ on the main route while the same was increased by $9 \%$ on the alternate route.
d) Delay Time:

It was observed that average delay time was reduced by $18 \%$ on the main route while the same was increased by $19 \%$ on the alternate route.
e) Average Queue Length:

It was observed that average queue length was reduced by $20 \%$ on the main route while the same was increased by $26 \%$ on the alternate route.
f) Max. Queue Length:

It was observed that max queue length was reduced by $20 \%$ on the main route while the same was increased by $26 \%$ on the alternate route.

## VI Conclusion

It was observed that all the parameters were reduced by a somewhat satisfactory faction on the major road network. While the increase on alternate route is high, due to a low initial volume, the same can be considered to be manageable. This paper suggests that utilization of such alternative routes to redirect traffic in peak hour duration can be an effective way to manage peak hour congestion conditions.

## VII Future Scope

This work shows that in case traffic is regulated separately during peak hour, the majority of major route congestion issues can be addressed more effectively. We can further add to this work by adding commercial vehicles to the scope of network and increasing the size of this network. Using this work, an alternate peak hour traffic management system can be developed for entire cities. This method can be more cost effective in the long run as it can also consider a periodic increase in traffic volume.
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