Abstract

We develop deep learning predictors for modeling traffic flows. The challenge to modeling traffic flows arises from sharp nonlinearities due to transitions from free flow to breakdown and to congestion. Our methodology constructs a deep learning architecture to capture nonlinear spatio-temporal flow effects. We show how traffic flow data from road sensors can be predicted using deep learning. We illustrated our methodology on traffic data from Chicago's Interstate I-55 and we forecast traffic flows during two special events, a Chicago Bears football game and a snowstorm. Both examples lead to a sharp traffic flow regime which can occur very suddenly and we show how deep learning tackles short term traffic forecasting in an efficient manner. Finally, we discuss directions for future research.

arXiv:1604.04527v2 [stat.AP] 10 Oct 2016

Deep Learning Predictors for Traffic Flows

Nicholas G. Polson
Booth School of Business
University of Chicago[*]
Vadim O. Sokolov
Systems Engineering and Operations Research
George Mason University

First Draft: December 2015
This Draft: September 2016

1 Introduction

1.1 Traffic Flow Prediction

Traffic flow forecasting with real-time measurements of traffic flow speed is available from in-ground loop detectors or GPS probes. The main difference between sensors and GPS probes is the spatial distribution of measurements. Bing Maps relies on both sources of data, and uses probabilistic graphical modeling to predict speeds for each road segment **?**. We develop a near real-time forecasting model for a window of at most thirty five minutes with an efficient deep learning predictor. The challenge in forecasting large scale networks is modeling the dependency structure between a high dimensional set of exploratory variables and the sharp discontinuities in data. For example, the Chicago metropolitan area has 20,000 highway and major arterial road segments, and requires forecasts using tens of thousands of predictors in nearly real time.

To solve the predictor selection problem, we use a hierarchical sparse vector auto regressive technique **??**. Predictor selection in our deep learning formulation can also be performed using dropout **?**. To model the discontinuities in traffic flow we apply a deep learning model which forecasts traffic flow as a superposition of univariate non-linear activation functions with affine arguments. Both procedures are scalable and estimation follows traditional optimization techniques such as stochastic gradient descent.

The goal of our paper, then, is to capture nonlinear spatio-temporal effects in both recurrent and non-recurrent traffic congestions that arise due to conditions such as work zones, weather, special events, and traffic incidents. All of these factors introduce travel time uncertainty and require real-time forecasts. For example, traffic managers use model-based forecasts to regulate

[*]Polson is Professor of Econometrics and Statistics at the Chicago Booth School of Business. email: ngp@chicagobooth.edu. Sokolov is an assistant professor at George Mason University, email: vsokolov@gmu.edu

ramp metering, apply speed harmonization, and change road pricing as congestion mitigation strategies; whereas, the general public adjusts its decisions on departure times and travel route choices, among other things.

Layered hierarchical models, such as neural networks, are commonly used to develop short term traffic forecasts. Karlaftis et al. ? provide an overview of previously developed approaches. The simplest version of a neural network with no hidden layers, is a linear regression. ? shows that model training is computationally expensive, and frequent model updating is prohibitive. The main advantage of our procedure is that it leads to an efficient methodology for finding a sparse model that can be frequently updated in nearly real time.

Our model forecasts congestion propagation given a bottleneck location, and we provide forty minute speed forecasts for days with recurrent and non-recurrent traffic conditions. Deep learning predictors can incorporate data sources, such as weather forecasts and police reports to produce more accurate forecasts. We illustrate our methodology on traffic flows during special events, a Chicago Bears football game and a snow storm.

The rest of the paper is outlined as follows. Section 1.2 discusses connections with existing work. Section 1.3 reviews fundamentals of deep learning. Section 2 develops deep learning predictors for forecasting traffic flows. Section 3 discusses fundamental characteristics of traffic flow data and illustrates our methodology with study of traffic flow on Chicago's I-55. Finally, Section 4 concludes with directions for future research.

1.2 Connections with Existing Work

Short-term traffic flow predictions have a long history in the transportation literature. There are several approaches that rely on an analytical model of traffic flow ??????. These approaches can perform very well on filtering problems, such as state estimation. However, they are hard to implement on forecasting problems for large scale networks. One of the earliest applications of Bayesian methods was to inference of a network route flows ?. Travel time reliability for ambulances using noisy GPS for both path travel time and individual road segment travel time distributions was studied in ?. In ?, the authors develop a dynamic Bayesian network to model external intervention techniques to accommodate situations with suddenly changing traffic variables.

A comparison of several statistical and machine learning methods for traffic forecasting is presented in ?. A machine-learning algorithm was provided by ?, where the authors proposed a Bayes network algorithm for forecasting traffic flow. The idea is to derive the conditional probability of a traffic state on a given road, given states on topological neighbors on a road network. The resulting joint probability distribution is a mixture of Gaussians. Bayes networks for estimating travel times were suggested earlier by ?. This approach eventually became a commercial product that led to the start of Inrix, a traffic data company. ? provides a machine-learning method based on a support vector regression (SVR) to forecast travel-times and ? use a fuzzy neural-network approach to address the issue of traffic data generating processes being non-linear and used fuzzy logic to improve the interoperability of their model. On the other hand, ? argue that there is a linear relation between the future travel times and currently estimated conditions. They demonstrate that a regression model with time varying coefficients is capable of designing a travel time prediction scheme. Another class of forecasting models relies on classical time series modeling. For example, ? studies two classes of time series methods, auto-regressive mov-

ing average (ARIMA) and exponential smoothing (ES). The forecasts generated by ARIMA and ES models are used as inputs to neural networks, which aggregates those into a single forecast. ? also proposed combing an ARIMA model with a machine learning method, the Kohonen self-organizing map, which was used as an initial classifier. ? addresses a parameter estimation problem of real-time learning that can improve the quality of forecasts via an extended Kalman filter for incorporating data in real-time into a parameter learning process. ? proposes a method for estimating queue lengths at controlled intersections, based on the travel time data measured by GPS probes. The method relies on detecting discontinuities and changes of slopes in travel time data. Another data-mining based approach for queue state estimation was proposed in ?, who combined the traffic flow shockwave analysis with data mining techniques. ? argues that non-parametric methods produce better forecasts than parametric models due to their ability to better capture spatial-temporal relations and non-linear effects. An extensive recent review of literature on short-term traffic predictions presented in ?.

There are several issues that are not addressed in current literature that are described in ?. One of the issues is the predictions at a network level using data driven approaches. There are two situations, when data-driven approaches might be preferable to methodologies based on traffic flow equations. First, when estimating boundary conditions is a challenging task. Even in systems that rely on loop detectors as traffic sensors, it is typical not to have sensors installed on ramps. Missing data problems are usually addressed using sophisticated techniques of data imputation ? or via use of weak formulations of boundary conditions ?. Our empirical results show that a data driven approach can efficiently forecast without boundary measurements from ramps. Another challenge with physics-based approaches comes from their limited ability to model urban arterials. An example, when analytical approaches fail to provide good forecasts is presented in ?. Data driven approaches provide a flexible alternative to physical laws of traffic flows. Another challenge is to identify spatial and temporal relations in flow patters. In ? the authors note that even for well studied case of freeway traffic, it is still an open issue to properly capture such relations.

We address the issue of identifying spatial and temporal patterns in the pre-processing step by finding a regularized linear model. Furthermore, our deep learning model addresses the issue of non-linear and non-stationary relations between variables (speed measurements). Another challenge identified in ? is model selection and testing, in particular residual diagnostics. Model selection task tackled by penalizing the loss function and using cross-validation for hyper parameters selection. We also provide rigorous residual diagnostics for our resulting models.

Breiman ? argues that neural networks provide more flexibility than traditional statistical methods. Neural networks have been widely applied ? and shown to be particularly successful in traffic pattern recognition. Shallow neural networks for traffic applications were proposed in ?, where a memory efficient dynamic neural network based on resource allocating network (RAN) was developed with a single hidden layer with Gaussian radial basis function activation units. ? develops several one-hidden layer networks to produce a fifteen minute forecasts. Two types of networks, one with tanh activation function and one with a Gaussian radial basis function were modelled. Several forecasts were combined using a Bayes factors that calculates an odds ratio for each of the models dynamically. A state-space neural network was proposed in ? and a multiple hypothesis approach that relies on using several neural network models at the same time was given in ?. An approach that uses day of the week and time of day as inputs for a neural network was proposed in ?. Our work is related to ? which demonstrates that deep learning can effectively

be used for traffic forecasts. A stacked auto-encoder model was used to learn the spatial-temporal patterns in the traffic data and the model was and it is trained in a greedy layer-wise fashion. Our approach builds on this by showing an additional advantage of deeper hidden layers together with sparse autoregressive techniques.

1.3 Deep Learning

Deep learning is a machine learning based algorithm that fits high level abstract data structures by using a sequence of linear and non-linear transformations organized as a graphical structure. The nodes of the graph are called units and units are connected with links to propagate activation calculated at the origin unit to the destination unit. Each link has a weight which determines the relative strength and sign of the connection. Each unit then applies an activation function to all of the incoming weighted activations. The activation function is fixed and is either a hard threshold or a sigmoid function, such as tanh. A particular class of deep learning models uses a directed acyclic graph structure to represent the model and is called feed-forward neural network. The term deep means that the graph that models data transformations has a high maximum length between input nodes (data) and output nodes (dependent variable). Each layer of neurons of a deep neural network creates a representation of a data set in a different space. Such representations allow for capturing non-linear relations in the data. There is vast literature on this topic, one of the earlier works include **? ?**.

The class of deep learning predictors are constructed by composition. Let f be a given *univariate* activation function. A semi-affine activation rule is then defined by

$$f_{w_l,b_l}(x) = f\left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_l} w_{lj}x_j + b_l\right) = f(w_l^T x_l + b_l) \quad (l = 1,\ldots,n). \tag{1}$$

Our deep predictor, is the composite map

$$F(x) = \left(f_{w_n,b_n} \circ \ldots \circ f_{w_1,b_1}\right)(x).$$

that approximates an unknown function $F(x)$. We let z^l denote the l-th layer, and so $X = z^0$. The final output is the response y , which can be numeric or categorical. The explicit structure of a deep prediction rule is then

$$\begin{aligned} z^1 &= f(w_0^T x + b_0) \\ z^2 &= f(w_1^T z^1 + b_1) \\ &\cdots \\ z^q &= f(w_{q-1}^T z^{q-1} + b_{q-1}) \\ y(x) &= w_q^T z^q + b_q. \end{aligned}$$

Poincare and Hilbert showed that there exists an activation function that is a universal basis. The main advantage of using deep hidden layers is that the input variable, $x = (x_1 \ldots x_n)$ can be high dimensional even though the activation functions are univariate. This implicitly requires

the specification of the number of hidden units N_l for each layer l. We still need to solve the training problem of finding $(\hat{w}, \hat{b})$ and implicitly N_l, n – the so-called model selection problem.

Modern deep learning techniques are rooted in Kolmogorov–Arnold's representation theorem **?**. The theorem states that any continuous function of n variables $F(x)$, can be represented as $F(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} g_j \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} h_{ij}(x_i) \right)$, where g_j and h_{ij} are continuous functions, and h_{ij} is a universal basis, that does not depend on F. This remarkable representation implies that any continuous function can be represented using operations of summation and function composition. For a neural network, it means that any function of n variables can be represented as a neural network with one hidden layer and $2n+1$ activation units. The difference between theorem and neural network representations is that functions h_{ij} are not necessarily affine. Further, it is unclear how to find such a basis. In their original work, Kolmogorov and Arnold develop functions in a constructive fashion, making the theorem unusable for practical applications. **?** characterize projection pursuit functions for a specific types of input functions $F(x)$.

Deep learning allows for efficient modeling of nonlinear functional representations. For example, principal components analysis **??** for dimensionality reduction can be extended to a case when components are nonlinear functions of the data. Most of the recent improvements in large scale data analysis techniques come from applying scalable modern optimization and parallelization techniques, see **???**. Regularized Bayesian model fitting allows us to develop a parsimonious scalable model, that makes frequent updating feasible. Our methodology, provides an alternative to previously proposed time-series methods and traditional state-space models for forecasting.

2 Deep Learning for Traffic Flow Prediction

We now turn to the problem of developing a deep learning predictor for traffic flow analysis. For traffic flow model previously measured and possibly filtered traffic flow data given by $x^t = (x_{t-k}, \ldots, x_t)$ used as predictors. The goal in traffic flow forecasting is to build a model $x^t_{t+h} = \hat{y}(x^t)$, here $\hat{y}$ is a parametrized superposition of univariate non-linear functions with affine arguments and x^t_{t+h} is the forecast traffic flow speeds at time $t+h$, given measurements up to time t. For convenience, we will let $\hat{y}(x)$ denote a deep learning predictor.

Consider a neural network with q hidden layers. Let $l = 1, \ldots, q$ be then index for the layers. Let z^l denote the vector of inputs into a layer l and y^l denote the vector of outputs, then a feed-forward neural network model can be described as

$$z_i^{l+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \left(w_i^{l+1} y_i^l + b_i^{l+1} \right) \quad (i = 1, \ldots, N_{l+1})$$
$$y_i^{l+1} = f\left(z_i^{l+1} \right) \quad (i = 1, \ldots, N_{l+1}).$$

Here N_l is the number of activation units (neurons) at layer l and function f is called an activation function. Typical choices for an activation function include tanh and rectifier function $f(x) = \max(0, x)$. The forecast is given by $x^t_{t+h} = y^n = \left(f(z_1^n), \ldots, f(z_{N_n}^n) \right)$.

Suppose now that we wish to predict traffic flows 40 minutes in advance. The vector of

interest is

$$x^t_{t+40} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1,t+40} \\ \vdots \\ x_{L,t+40} \end{pmatrix},$$

where L is the number of locations on the network (loop detectors) and $x_{i,t}$ is the traffic flow speed at location i at time t.

To develop the forecast we use input vector $x^t \in \mathbb{R}^{TL}$, where T is the number of lagged measurements to be used and L is the number of locations on the network at which measurements available. Thus, x^t contains recent measurements from each location on the network

$$x^t = \text{vec} \begin{pmatrix} x_{1,t-40} & \cdots & x_{1,t} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{L,t-40} & \cdots & x_{L,t} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here, vec is the vectorization transformation, which converts the matrix into a column vector. In our application examined later in Section 3.1, we have twenty one road segments (i.e. $L = 21$) that span thirteen miles of a major corridor connecting Chicago's southwest suburbs to the central business district. The chosen length is consistent with several current transportation corridor management deployments **?**.

We develop a hierarchical linear vector autoregressive model to identify the spatio-temporal relations in the data. We consider the problem of finding sparse matrix, A, in the following model

$$x^t_{t+40} = Ax^t + v_t, \quad v_t \sim N(0, V);$$

where A is a matrix of size $L \times Lk$, and k is the number of previous measurements used to develop a forecast. In our example in Section 3.1 we have $L = 21$, however in large scale networks there are tens of thousands locations with measurements available.

Then problem of finding the spatio-temporal relations in the data is the predictor selection for linear models, such as vector autoregressive models. Estimation algorithms for finding sparse models rely on adding a penalty term to a loss function. A recent review by **?** considers several prominent scalar regularization terms to identify sparse vector auto-regressive models.

The predictors selected as a result of finding the liner model are then used to build a deep learning model. To find an optimal network (structure and weights) we used stochastic gradient descent (SGD) method implemented in the package `H2O`. Similar methods are available in `Python`'s `Theano` **?** or `TensorFlow` **?** framework. We use random search to find meta parameters of the deep learning mdoel. To illustrate our methodology we generated $N = 10^5$ Monte Carlo samples from the following space:

$$\begin{aligned} f &\in \{\tanh(x),\ \max(x, 0)\} \\ n &\in \{1, \ldots, 60\} \\ N_l &\in \{1, \ldots, 200\}^n \\ \lambda &\in [10^{-4},\ 10^{-2}] \\ x^t_{t+h} &= (f_n \circ \ldots \circ f_1)(x^t), \quad f_l = f(w_l^T x_l + b_l). \end{aligned}$$

We used out-of-sample model performance as a criteria for selecting our final deep learning architecture.

2.1 Training

At a fundamental level, we use a training set $(y_i, x_i)_{i=1}^N$ of input-output pairs, to train our deep learning model by minimizing the difference between training target y_i and our predictor $\hat{y}(x_i)$. To do this, we require a loss function, $l(y, \hat{y})$ at the level of the output signal which measures our goodness-of-fit. When we have a traditional probabilistic model $p(y \mid \hat{y})$ that generates the output y given the predictor $\hat{y}$, then we have the natural loss function $l(y, \hat{y}) = -\log p(y \mid \hat{y})$. For deep learning problems a typical ℓ_2 norm squared used as a loss function. It is common to add a regularization penalty $\phi(w, b)$ that will avoid over-fitting and stabilize our predictive rule. To summarize, given an activation function, the statistical problem is to optimally find the weights and biases $w = (w_0, \ldots, w_n)$, $b = (b_0, \ldots, b_n)$ that minimize the loss function with ℓ_2 separable regularization term given by


$$
\begin{aligned}
(\hat{w},\ \hat{b}) &\in \underset{w,b}{\operatorname{argmin}}\ \|y - \hat{y}_{w,b}(x)\|_2^2 + \lambda\phi(w, b) \\
\phi(w, b) &= \|w\|^2 + \|b\|^2 \\
\hat{y}_{w,b}(x) &= \left(f_n \circ \ldots \circ f_1\right)(x^t), \quad f_l(x) = f\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_l} w_{lj} x_j + b_l\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

here $w_l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l}$, $b_l \in \mathbb{R}$, and λ gages the overall level of regularization. Choices of penalties for $\phi(w, b)$ include the ridge penalty ℓ_2 or the lasso ℓ_1 penalty to induce sparsity in the weights. A typical method to solve the optimization problem is stochastic gradient descent with mini-batches. The caveat of this approach include poor treatment of multi-modality and possibly slow convergence. From our experiments with the traffic data, we found that using sparse liner model estimation to identify spatial-temporal relations between variables, yield better results, as compared to using drop-out or regularization terms for neural network loss function **??**.

In order to find optimal structure of the neural network (number of hidden layers n, number of activation units in each layer N_l and activation functions f) as well as hyper-parameters, such as ℓ_1 regularization weight, we used a random search. Though this technique can be inefficient for large scale problems, for the sake of exploring potential structures of the networks that deliver good results and can be scaled, this is an appropriate technique for small dimensions. Stochastic gradient descent used for training a deep learning model scales linearly with the data size. Thus the hyper-parameter search time is linear with respect to model size and data size. On a modern processor it takes about two minutes to train a deep learning network on 25,000 observations of 120 variables. To perform a hyper-parameter and model structure search we fit model 10^5 times. Thus the total wall-time was 138 days. An alternative to random search, that relies on genetic optimization algorithm for learning the network structure for traffic forecasts proposed in **?**.

2.2 Trend Filtering

One goal of traffic flow modeling is to filter noisy data from physical sensors and then to develop model-based predictors. Iterative exponential smoothing is a popular technique which is computationally efficient. It smoothers oscillations which occur on arterial roads with traffic signal



(a) exponential smoothing (b) median filter (c) loess filter

Figure 1: Results of three classical filtering techniques applied to traffic data from one of the work days.

controls, when measured speed is "flipping" between two values, depending whether the probe vehicle stopped at the light or not. Figure 1(a), however, shows that it does not work well for quickly switching regimes observed in highway traffic. Another approach is median filtering, which unlike exponential smoothing captures quick changes in regimes as shown on Figure 1(b). However, it will not perform well on an arterial road controlled by traffic signals, since it will be oscillating back and forth between two values. A third approach is to use a piecewise polynomial fit to filter the data. As shown on Figure 1(c) this method does perform well, however, the slopes might be underestimated. Thus, out of those three methods the median filter seems to be the most effective.

An alternative approach to filter the data is to assume that we observe data from the statistical model $v_i = f(x_i) + e_i$, where $f(x)$ is piecewise constant. The fused lasso **?** and ℓ_1 trend filtering **??** involves estimating $f(x) = (f(x_1), \ldots, f(x_n))$ at the input points by solving the optimization problem

$$\text{minimize} \quad (1/2)||y - f(x)||_2^2 + \lambda ||Df(x)||_1.$$

In fused lasso $D = D^{(1)}$ is the matrix encoding first differences in $f(x)$. In ℓ_1 trend filtering $D = D^{(2)}$ is the matrix encoding second differences in $f(x)$

$$D^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & & 0 & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -2 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & & 1 & -2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Applying $D^{(1)}$ to a vector is equivalent to calculating first order differences of the vector. This filter also called 1-dimensional total variation denoising **?**, and hence first order ℓ_1 trend filtering estimate $f(x)$ is piecewise constant across the input points $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. Higher orders difference operators $D^{(k)}$, $k > 1$, correspond to an assumption that the data generating process is modeled by a piece-wise polynomial of order k function.

The non-negative parameter, λ, controls the trade-off between smoothness of the signal and closeness to the original signal. The objective function is strictly convex and thus can be efficiently solved to find a unique minimizer x^{lt}. The main reason to use the trend filtering is that it produces a piece-wise linear function in t. There are integer times, $1 = t_1 < t_2, ..., < t_p = n$ for




Figure 2: ℓ_1 trend filtering based on quadratic loss and penalty that enforces a piecewise line fit.

which

$$x^{\text{lt}} = \alpha_k + \beta_k t, \;\; t_k \leq t \leq t_{k+1}, \;\; k = 1, \ldots, p-1$$

Piece-wise linearity is guaranteed by using the ℓ_1-norm penalty term. It guarantees sparseness of $Df(x)$ (the second-order difference of the estimated trend), i.e. it will have many zero elements, which means that the estimated trend is piecewise linear. The points $t_2, \ldots, t_{p-1}$ are called kink points. The kink points correspond to change in slope and intercept of the estimated trend and can be interpreted as points at which regime of data generating process changes. This function well aligns with the traffic data from an in-ground sensor. The regimes in data correspond to free flow, degradation, congestion and recovery. Empirically, the assumption that data is piecewise liner is well justified. Residuals of the filtered data $x^{\text{lt}} - y$ are typically low and show no patterns.

A trend filter is similar to a spline fitting method with one important difference. When we fit a spline (piece-wise continuous polynomial function) to the data, we need to provide knots (kinks) as inputs. Trend filtering has the advantage that the kinks and parameters of each line are found jointly.

Figure 2 shows results of applying ℓ_1 trend filter to a data measured from a loop-detector on I-55. A computationally efficient algorithms for trend filtering with differentiation operator of any order $D^{(k)}$ was recently proposed by **?**.

3 Chicago Traffic Flow During Special Events

To illustrate our methodology, we use data from twenty one loop-detectors installed on a north-bound section of Interstate I-55 . Those loop-detectors span 13 miles of the highway. Traffic flow data is available from the Illinois Department of Transportation, see Lake Michigan Interstate Gateway Alliance (*http://www.travelmidwest.com/*) formally the Gary-Chicago-Milwaukee Corridor (GCM). The data is measured by loop-detector sensors installed on interstate highways. Loop-detector is a simple presence sensors that measure when a vehicle is present and generate an on/off signal. There are over 900 loop-detector sensors that cover the Chicago metropolitan area. Since 2008, Argonne National Laboratory has been archiving traffic flow data every five minutes from the grid of sensors. Data contains averaged *speed*, *flow*, and *occupancy*. Occupancy is defined as percent of time a point on the road is occupied by a vehicle and flow is the number

of off-on switches. Illinois uses a single loop detector setting and speed is estimated based on the assumption of an average vehicle length.

A distinct characteristic of traffic flow data is an abrupt change of the mean level. Also we see a lot of variations on the speed measurements. Though, on Figure 1 it might seem that during congested period (6am – 9am) the speed variation is small, in reality the signal to noise ratio during congested regime is lower compared to a free flow regime. One approach to treat the noisy data is a probabilistic one. In ? the authors develop a hierarchical Bayesian model for tracking traffic flows and estimate uncertainty about state variables at any given point in time. However, when information is presented to a user, it has to be presented as a single number, i.e. travel time from my origin to my destination is 20 minutes. A straightforward way to move from a distribution over a traffic state variable (i.e traffic flow speed) to a single number is to calculate an expected value or a maximum a posteriori.

3.1 Traffic Flow on Chicago's Interstate I-55

One of the key attributes of congestion propagation on a traffic network is the spatial and temporal dependency between bottlenecks. For example, if we consider a stretch of highway and assume a bottleneck, then it is expected that the end of the queue will move from the bottleneck downstream. Sometimes, both the head and tail of the bottleneck move downstream together. Such discontinuities in traffic flow, called shock waves are well studied and can be modeled using a simple flow conservation principles. However, a similar phenomena can be observed not only between downstream and upstream locations on a highway. A similar relationship can be established between locations on city streets and highways ?. Figure 3 shows a time-space diagram of traffic flows on a 13-mile stretch of highway I-55 in Chicago. You can see a clear space-temporal patterns in traffic congestion propagation in both downstream and upstream directions.

Another important aspect of traffic congestion is that it can be "decomposed" into recurrent and non-recurrent factors. For example, a typical commute time from a western suburb to Chicago's city center on Mondays is 45 minutes. However, occasionally the travel time is 10 minutes shorter or longer. Figure 4 shows summarized data collected from the sensor located eight miles from the Chicago downtown on I-55 north bound, which is part of a route used by many morning commuters to travel from southwest suburbs to the city. Figure 4(a) shows average speed on the selected road segment for each of the five work days, we can see that there is little variation, on average, from one week day to another with travelers most likely to experience delays between 5 and 10am. However, if we look at the empirical probability distribution of travel speeds between 7 and 8 am on the same road segment on Figure 4(b), we see that distribution is bi-modal. In most cases, the speed is around 20 miles per hour, which corresponds to heavy congestion. The free flow speed on this road segment is around 70 miles per hour. Furthermore, the distribution has a heavy left tail. Thus, on many days the traffic is considerably worse, compared to an "average" day.

Figure 5(a) shows measurements from all non-holiday Wednesdays in 2009. The solid line and band, represent the average speed and 60% confidence interval correspondingly. Each dot is an individual speed measurement that lies outside of 98% confidence interval. Measurements are taken every five minutes, on every Wednesday of 2009, thus we have roughly 52 measurements for each of the five-minute intervals.






Figure 3: Time-Space diagram that shows traffic flow speed on a 12-mile stretch of I-55. Data measured on from 18 February 2009 (Wednesday). Red means slow speed and light yellow corresponds to free flow speed. The direction of the flow is from 0 to 13.




(a) Average speed on work days



(b) Empirical density for speed, on work days

Figure 4: Analysis of difference in traffic patterns on different days of the week. Left panel (a) shows average speed on work days. Right panel (b) shows Empirical density for speed, for five work days of the week. Calculated based on the data collected between 7 and 8am.



(a) Speed measured on Thursdays

(b) Example of one day speed profile


Figure 5: Recurrent speed profile. Both plots show the speed profile for a segment of interstate highway I-55. Left panel (a) shows the green line, which is the average speed for each of five minute intervals with 60% confidence interval. The red points are measurements that lie outside of 98% confidence interval. Left panel (b) shows an example of one day speed profile from May 14, 2009 (Thursday).

We see that in many cases traffic patterns are very similar from one day to another. However, there are also many days, when there are rises, both good and bad. A good surprise might happen, for example when schools are closed due to extremely cold weather. A bad surprise might happen due to non-recurrent traffic conditions, such as an accident or inclining weather.

Figure 5(b) illustrates a typical day's traffic flow pattern on Chicago's I-55 highway. This traffic pattern is recurrent, we can see a breakdown in flow speed during the morning peak period, followed by speed recovery. The free flow regimes are usually of little interest to traffic managers.


Figure 6 shows the impact of non-recurrent events. In this case, the traffic speed can significantly deviate from historical averages due to the increased number of vehicles on the road or due to poor road surface conditions. Our goal is to build a statistical model to capture the sudden regime changes from free flow to congestion and then the decline in speed to the recovery regime for both recurrent traffic conditions and non-recurrent ones.

As described above, the traffic congestion usually originates at a specific bottlenecks on the network. Therefore, given a bottleneck, our forecast predicts how fast it will propagate on the network. Figure 7, shows that the the spatial-temporal relations in traffic data is non linear.



(a) Chicago Bears football game (b) Snow weather

Figure 6: Impact of non-recurrent events on traffic flows. Left panel (a) shows traffic flow on a day when New York Giants played at Chicago Bears on Thursday October 10, 2013. Right panel (b) shoes impact of light snow on traffic flow on I-55 near Chicago on December 11, 2013. On both panels average traffic speed is red line and speed on event day is blue line.



(a) auto-correlation (b) cross-correlation

Figure 7: Space-time relation between speed measurements. Left panel (a) shows empirical density estimation for the (s_n^{10}, s_{n-8}^{10}) bivariate random variable, where s_n is the speed measured at sensor 10 at time n. Right panel (b) shows empirical density estimation for the (s_n^{10}, s_{n-8}^{20}) bivariate random variable.

We now show how to build a deep learning predictor that can capture the nonlinear nature, as well as spatial-temporal patterns in traffic flows.

3.2 Predictor Selection

Our deep learning model will estimate an input-output map $x^t_{t+h} = \hat{y}_{w,b}(x^t)$, where (w, b) index weights and parameters and x^t is the vector of measurements. Our prior assumption is that to predict traffic at a location we need to use recent from all other sensors on the network. We use previous 12 measurements from each sensor that corresponds to one hour period.

One caveat is that it is computationally prohibitive to use data from every road segment to develop a forecast for a given location and there is some locality in the casual relations between congestion patterns on different road segments. For example, it is unreasonable to assume that a congested arterial in a central business district is related to congestion in a remote suburb, sixty miles away. Thus, it might appear logical to select neighbor road segments as predictors. However, it leads to a large number of unnecessary predictors. For example, congestion in one direction (i.e. towards the business district) does not mean there will be congestion in the opposite direction, which leads to the possibility of using topological neighbors as predictors. The caveat is that by using topological neighbors, it is possible not to include important predictors. For example, when an arterial road is an alternative to a highway, whose roads will be strongly related, and will not be topological neighbors.

Methods of regularization on the other hand provide the researcher with an automated approach to select predictors. Least angle regression (LARS) is used to fit the ℓ_1 regularized loss function (LASSO) and to find a sparse linear model. Figure 8 shows the sparsity pattern of the resulting coefficient matrix.




Figure 8: Sparsity patterns of the coefficient matrix found by least angle regression (LARS)

Figure 9 shows the magnitude of the coefficients of the linear model for sensor 11. There are 120 predictors used for each of the locations that correspond to 6 lagged measurements from 20 sensors. We see that the largest coefficient is the one that corresponds to the most recent measurement from the sensor itself (white-colored rectangle). We also see that model does assign largest values to variables that are close to modeled variable in time and space. Most of the weight will be on the most recent measurement (lag of 35 minutes). The previous measurement, that corresponds to lag of 40 minutes, have negative weight. It means that the weighted difference between two consecutive measurements is used as a predictor. Intuitively, it means that the change in speed is the predictor rather then absolute value of speed. In a time series context, negative weights correspond to cyclic behavior in the data, see **?**.




Figure 9: Values of coefficients of the fitted linear model for predicting sensor 11.

Another way is to find a sparse neural network model is to apply a dropout operation. Suppose that we have an ℓ_2 objective

$$\underset{w,b}{\operatorname{argmin}} \; ||y - \hat{y}_{w,b}(x)||_2^2.$$

Due to the composite nature of the predictor, we can calculate derivative information $\nabla_{w,b}\, l(y, \hat{y}_{w,b}(x))$ using the chain rule via procedure known as backpropagation.

To perform model or variable selection, suppose that we dropout any input dimension in x with probability p. This replaces the input by $D \star x$ where $\star$ denotes element-wise products and D is a matrix of $Ber(p)$ random variables. Marginalize over the randomness, we have a new objective

$$(\hat{w}, \hat{b}) \in \underset{w,b}{\operatorname{argmin}} \; E_{D \sim \mathrm{Ber}(p)} \left(||y - \hat{y}_{D \star w,b}(x)||_2^2 \right),$$

which is equivalent to

$$(\hat{w}, \hat{b}) \in \underset{w,b}{\operatorname{argmin}} \; ||y - \hat{y}_{w,b}(x)||_2^2 + p(1-p)||\Gamma w||^2,$$

where $\Gamma = (\mathrm{diag}(X^\top X))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and X is the matrix of observed features. Therefore, the objective function dropout is equivalent to a Bayes ridge regression with a g-prior, see **?**.

The end model has minimal deviance for a validation data set. We used data from 180 days to fit and test the model, we used first half of the selected days for training and the remaining half for testing the models.

3.3 Chicago Highway Case Study Results

Having motivated our modeling approach and described general traffic flow patterns, we now evaluate predictive power of sparse linear vector autoregressive (VAR) and deep learning models. Using loop detector data from 21 sensors installed on Chicago's Interstate highway I-55 measure in the year of 2013. They cover a 13-mile stretch of a highway that connects southwest suburbs to

Table 1: In sample and out-of-sample metrics for different models. The abbreviations for column headers are as follows: DL = deep learning, VAR = linear model, M8 = media filter preprocessing, TF15 = trend filter preprocessing and L = sparse estimator (lasso). The abbreviations for row headers are as follows: IS = in-sample, MSE = mean squared error and OS = out-of-sample.

	DLL	DLM8L	DLM8	DLTF15L	DLTF15	VARM8L	VARTF15L
IS MSE	13.58	7.7	10.62	12.55	12.59	8.47	15
IS R^2	0.72	0.83	0.76	0.75	0.75	0.81	0.7
OS MSE	13.9	8.0	9. 5	11.17	12.34	8.78	15.35
OS R^2	0.75	0.85	0.82	0.81	0.79	0.83	0.74

Chicago's downtown. We treated missing data by doing interpolation on space, i.e. the missing speed measurement s_{it} for sensor i at time t will be amputated using $(s_{i-1t} + s_{i+1t})/2$. Data from days when the entire sensor network was down were excluded from the analysis. We also excluded public holidays and weekend days.

We compare the performance of the deep learning (DL) model with sparse linear vector autoregressive (VAR), combined with several data pre-filtering techniques, namely median filtering with a window size of 8 measurements (M8) and trend filtering with $\lambda = 15$ (TF15). We also tested performance of the sparse linear model, identified via regularization. We estimate the percent of variance explained by model, and mean squared error (MSE), which measures average of the deviations between measurements and model predictions. To train both models we selected data for 90 days in 2013. We further selected another 90 days for testing data set. We calculated R^2 and MSE for both in-sample (IS) data and out-of-sample (OS) data. Those metrics are shown in Table 1.

Sparse deep learning combined with the median filter pre-processing (DLM8L) shows the best overall performance on the out-of-sample data.

Figure 10 shows performance of both vector auto-regressive and deep learning models for normal day, special event day (Chicago Bears football game) and poor weather day (snow day). We compare our models against the naive constant filter, i.e forecast speed is the same as the current speed. The naive forecast is used by travelers when making route choices before departure. We achieve this by looking at current traffic conditions and assuming those will hold throughout duration of the planned trip.

Both deep learning (DL) and vector auto-regressive (VAR) models accurately predict the morning rush hour congestion on a normal day. However, the vector auto-regressive model mis-predicts congestion during evening rush hour. At the same time, deep learning model does predict breakdown accurately but miss-estimates the time of recovery. Both deep learning and liner model outperform naive forecasting, when combined with data pre-processing. However, when unfiltered data is used to fit deep learning combined with sparse linear estimator (DLL) model, their predictive power degrades and we out-performed by a naive forecast. Thus, showing the importance of using filtered data to develop forecasts.





Figure 10: Comparison of the forecasts. On all plots black solid line is the measured data, red dashed line is our model's forty minute forecast and dashed blue line is naive forecast. Green dashed horizontal line is the speed limit (55 mi/h) and vertical orange line is the morning peak hour (8am). First columns compares models for data from Thursday October 10, 2013, the day when Chicago Bears team played New York Giants. The game starts at 7pm and lead to an unusual congestion starting at around 4pm. Second column compares models for data from Wednesday December 11, 2013, the day of light snow. The snow leads to heavier congestion during both, the morning and evening rush hours. Third column compares models for data from Monday October 7, 2013. There were no special events, accidents or inclined weather conditions on this day.

Vector autoregressive model can show surprisingly good performance on capturing the non-linearity in the data, and yields an out-of-sample deviance, which is comparable with the one form a deep learning model. A deep learning predictor, however, produces better predictions for non-recurrent events, as shown for a Bears game and weather day forecasts.

Another visual way to interpret the results of prediction is via a heat plot. Figure 11 compares the original data and forecasted data. To produce forecast plot we replaced column 11 of the original data (mile post 6) with the forecast for this specific location.




(a) Original Data (b) Forecast

Figure 11: Heat plot for traffic spreads on Thursday October 10, 2013, the day of the bears game. Right panel (b) was produced by replacing column 11 (mile post 6) of the measured data with forecast for this location.

From Figure 11 we see that deep learning model properly captures both forward and backward shock wave propagation during morning and evening rush hours.

3.4 Residual Diagnostics

To assess the accuracy of a forecasting model we analyze the residuals, namely the difference between observed value and its forecast $r_i = y_i - \hat{y}_i$. Our goal is to achieve residuals that are uncorrelated with zero mean. In other words, there is no information left in residuals that can be used to improve the model. Though, models with the best residuals does not necessarily has the most forecasting power out of all possible models, but it is an important indicator of whether model uses all available information in the data.



(a) Time plot (b) Histogram (c) Autocorrelations


Figure 12: Residual diagnostics plots for both vector auto-regressive and deep learning models. All plots are for residuals for data from July 29, 2013 (Monday).

Figure 12 shows that both DLM8 and VARM8 models do not account for all available information, they have autocorrelations in the residuals, there is structure in the data, that is not exploited by the models. From the autocorrelations plots we can see that deep-learning model residuals are less correlated. A more-formal Box-Ljung test **?** for autocorrelation shows that both models produce autocorrelated residuals, however the Q-statistic, which is an aggregate measure of autocorrelation, is much higher for VAR model. Time plots show that deep learning residuals have less patterns and more uniform variance, compared to a VAR model. The histograms suggest that VAR residuals do not follow a normal distribution and DL do. Both of the models are biased, with mean residual for DL model being -2 and mean residual for VAR model being -7. Overall, the residual diagnostics shows that DL model is more efficient and leads to less biased and less correlated residuals. The fact that DL residuals are normally distributed would allow for accurate computation of the prediction intervals.

Another important finding is that the residuals are stationary for DL model and are non-stationary for VAR model. The formal Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) test produced p-value of 0.06 for DL model and 0.15 for VAR model, with alternative hypothesis being that data is stationary. Stationary residuals mean that the model correctly captures all of the trends in the data.

3.5 Comparison to a single layer neural network

Finally, deep learning is compared with a simple neural network model with one hidden layer. We used median filtering with a window size of 8 measurement (M8) as a preprocessing technique and predictors are pre-chosen using a sparse linear estimator. The in sample R^2 is 0.79 and MSE is 9.14. The out of sample metrics are 0.82 and 9.12.



(a) Time plot (b) Histogram (c) Autocorrelations

Figure 13: Residual diagnostics plots for neural network with one hidden layer. All plots are for residuals for data from July 29, 2013 (Monday).

The performance of the neural network model with one hidden layer is slightly worse then the one of the best liner model (VARM8L), the MSE is 4% higher and 14% higher when compared to the deep learning model (DLM8L). As shown in Figure 13, there excess correlation structure left in the residuals when compared to DLM8L. The model bias is comparable to deep learning model and equals to -2.1. A one-layer network model is less efficient and has less predictive power when compared to deep learning network for traffic data.

4 Discussion

Deep learning predictors are a multilayer feed-forward networks where each layer of nodes receives inputs from the previous layers.

The improvements in our understanding of short term traffic forecasts from deep learning are two fold. Firs, we demonstrate that a deep learning provides a significant improvement over linear models. Second, there are also other types of networks, that demonstrated superior performance for time series data. For example, the recurrent neural network (RNN) is a class of network where connections between units can form a directed cycle. This creates an internal state that allows to memorize previous data. In our approach, we mimic the behavior of a recurrent neural network by using lagged measurements as predictors. Another class of networks, that are capable of motorizing previous data are the long short term memory (LSTM) network, developed in **?**. It is an artificial neural network structure that addresses a problem of the vanishing gradient problem. In a sense, it allows for longer memory and it works even when there are long delays, and it can handle signals that have periodic components of different frequencies. Long short term memory and recurrent neural networks outperformed other methods in numerous applications, such as language learning **?** and connected handwriting recognition **?**.

Feed forward deep learning models assume that recent observations of traffic conditions (i.e. within last 40 minutes) are stronger predictors rather than historical values, i.e. measurements from 24 hours ago. In other words, future traffic conditions are more similar to current ones as compared to those from previous days. Thus, it allowed us to develop a powerful model by using recent observations as model features. We foresee that another class of neural networks, namely the recurrent neural networks can likewise be very applicable to traffic flow data. These models allow to build more temporally deep networks without much increase in the number of

parameters. They can learn temporal dynamics by mapping an input sequence to a sequence of hidden states and outputs via a recurrent relations

$$h_t = f(w^T[x_t, h_{t-1}] + b_h)$$
$$\hat{y}_t = f(w_{hz}^T h_t + b_z).$$

Compared to the feed-forward deep learning model, given by Equation 1, the hidden layers have an auto-regressive component $w_{hh}h_{t-1}$. It leads to a network topology in which each layer represents a time step. We switched to index t in order to highlight its temporal nature. The equations for a cell of an LSTM model given as follows

$$f_t = \sigma(w_f^T[h_{t-1}, x_t] + b_f)$$
$$i_t = \sigma(w_i^T[h_{t-1}, x_t] + b_i)$$
$$\bar{c}_t = \tanh(w_c^T[h_{t-1}, x_t] + b_c)$$
$$c_t = f_t \star c_{t-1} + i_t \star \bar{c}_t$$
$$h_t = o_t \star \tanh(c_t).$$

The key addition, compared to a recurrent neural network, is the cell state c_t, the information is added or removed from the memory state via gates defined via a sigmoid function $\sigma(x) = (1 + e^{-x})^{-1}$ and point-wise multiplication $\star$. The first gate $f_t \star c_{t-1}$, called the forget gate, allows to throw away some data from the previous cell state. The next gate $i_t \star \bar{c}_t$, called the input gate, decides which values will be updated. Then, the new cell state is a sum of the previous cell state, passed through the forgot gate selected components of the $[h_{t-1}, x_t]$ vector. Thus vector c_t provides a mechanism for dropping irrelevant information from the past, and adding relevant information from the current time step. The output is the result of the output gate $o_t \star \tanh(c_t)$, that returns tanh applied to the cell state, with some of the entries removed.

For example, **?** show that a long short term memory model might potentially improve predictors by utilizing data from the past by memorizing traffic patterns from previous weeks. The long short term memory model allows to automate the identification of the temporal relations in the data, at the cost of larger sets of parameters to be trained. We leave this for future research.

One of the drawbacks of deep learning models is low explanatory power. In a recent review of short term forecasting techniques **?**, model interpretability is mentioned as one of the barriers in adapting more sophisticated machine learning models in practice. Idea of a deep learning model is to develop representations of the original predictor vector so that transformed data can be used for liner regression. There is a large volume of literature on studying representations for different domain specific models. Perhaps, the more advanced research on that topic was done for Natural Language Processing problems **??**. One example of such representations are word embeddings, which are vectors associated with each word that contain latent features of the word and capture its syntactic and semantic properties. For example, Miklov and Zweig **?** show that if we calculate induced vector representation, "King - Man + Woman" on vector representation of the corresponding words, we get a vector very close to "Queen." In the context of traffic predictions, relating the representations of input vectors to the fundamental properties of traffic flow is an interesting and challenging problem which needs to be studied further.

References