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Abstract
The scheduling problem in Hurdle (1973) was formulated in a more general form than other
similar works in a sense of simultaneously concerning dispatching, circulating, fleet sizing,
and queueing. As a constrained variational problem, it is more difficult to solve and remains
not fully solved for decades. Relying on the technical prowess in graphic analysis, the author
unveiled the optimal solution for the dispatches, but only suggested the lower and upper bounds
of the optimal fleet size. Such graphic analysis is, however, unfriendly for the numerical
computations of any specific problems. In light of this, the paper proposes an analytic solution
approach that first relaxes the original problem to an unconstrained one and then attacks it
using calculus of variations. The corresponding Euler-Lagrange equation confirms the original
finding of the optimal peak-period dispatching rate. The optimal fleet size can also be solved.
Numerical examples demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach. This paper
completes the work of Hurdle (1973) by formalizing a solution method. Based on that, we
further make two extensions to the scheduling problem of a general bus line with multiple
origins and destinations and that of mixed-size or modular buses. New insights are uncovered.
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1. Introduction
Scheduling problem is one of the fundamental problems for scheduled transportation systems
such as buses, subways, railroads, airlines, shipping lines, and the postal system. The problem
is generally simple by description: to design the time schedule of bus/train/airplane/carryer
dispatches for certain level of service; and the fleet size can then be determined by considering
the circulation of vehicles in service. Such a problem, however, can be very challenging for
serving time-varying and oversaturated demand, of which some patrons/items have to wait in
queue for more than one arrivals of vehicles to get boarded/picked-up. The queueing interweaves the decisions of dispatches in distant times.

To facilitate the following discussion, we focus on the bus scheduling problem and start from a brief review on the major works that considered dynamic and/or queueing demand. Inspired the work by Bisbee et al. (1968), Newell (1971) firstly formulated an analytical model for a shuttle/feeder bus line to minimize the total patrons waiting time, in both a discrete form and a continuum approximation (CA) form. The closed-form solution of scheduling was unveiled, which insightfully states that the optimal dispatching rate (as a function of time) is proportional to the square root of patrons’ arrival rate. This seminal work, however, contains several limitations by ignoring the circulation of buses and not allowing queueing. Extensions had been made by a number of following studies, as summarized in Table 1. Considering a round-trip bus line, Salzborn (1972) firstly determined the fleet size by the peak-period demand, and then obtained the optimal dispatching rate by solving the waiting time minimization problem with the fleet size constraint via calculus of variations. Next major extension was made by Hurdle (1973), who formulated the problem as the minimization of the total cost for patrons’ waiting time and operator’s fleet and operation with fleet size constraint and dynamic queueing considered (see section 1.2 for details). Such a problem was complicated in the form of a constrained variational problem and attacked through graphic analysis. With technical prowess, the author obtained the solutions for the optimal dispatches and lower and upper bounds for the optimal fleet size, which was suggested to be findable via a trial-and-error method. Later on, the problem of scheduling for time-varying demand was mainly studied using discrete models partly due to the difficult in solving CA models. Examples include Sheffi and Sugiyama (1982), Ceder (1984), Niu and Zhou (2013), Niu et al. (2015), and Yin et al. (2017). Although with the promise of exact solutions, discrete models often require enormous efforts in model formulation and solution computation, and still lack success in jointly optimizing the dispatches and the fleet size. Little new insights can be drawn from these discrete models. Only most recently, CA method was reused to model the scheduling problem for a novel shuttle service with modular vehicles. The problem was, however, simplified using the upper limits of dispatches and vehicle capacity (i.e., the composition of modular units). The fleet sizing was also ignored.
### Table 1. Representative studies on scheduling problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Works</th>
<th>Major contributions</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newell (1971)</td>
<td>• Continuum approximations to discrete models&lt;br&gt;• Closed-form solution for dispatches</td>
<td>No fleet size; all below limitations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzborn (1972)</td>
<td>• Fleet size determined by the peak-period demand&lt;br&gt;• Closed-form solutions for peak and off-peak dispatches</td>
<td>No queues allowed; all below limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurdle (1973)</td>
<td>• Queues accounted for&lt;br&gt;• Closed-form solutions for peak and off-peak dispatches&lt;br&gt;• Lower, upper bounds of the optimal fleet size</td>
<td>Based on graphic analysis; no solution of the optimal fleet size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffi &amp; Sugiyama (1982)</td>
<td>• Discrete models accounting for multiple ODs, variable dwell times at stops, stochastic demand</td>
<td>Fleet size is given, fixed; no queues allowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen et al. (2020)</td>
<td>• Optimal dispatching policy for modular vehicles</td>
<td>No fleet size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>• Calculus of variations used to find the closed-form solution for peak dispatches&lt;br&gt;• Solution of the optimal fleet size and queueing profile&lt;br&gt;• Queues accounted for&lt;br&gt;• Two extensions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 The importance of Hurdle’s scheduling problem

We summarize the above survey and highlight the importance of Hurdle’s scheduling problem by three points as follows.

i. Hurdle’s scheduling problem is an open question that remains not fully solved for 47 years upon the time of writing. The graphic analysis in Hurdle (1973) is good for visualization and understanding but not well suited for solving particular problems and producing exact solutions. The optimal dispatching rate obtained via graphic analysis needs a rigorous proof. The optimal fleet size needs to be solved, without which the optimized dispatching rate is only a suboptimal solution.
ii. Hurdle’s scheduling problem is of theoretical importance even to this day. The analytically formulated problem with the promise of closed-form solution would unveil fundamental insights into the cause-and-effect relation between the optimal design (i.e., the dispatching schedule, fleet size, and queuing profile) and key factors including the demand profiles, patrons’ values of time, capital and operational costs of buses, etc. In addition, the modeling framework is in a very general form that welcome applications to broader and modern scheduling problems. For instance, the shuttle/feeder-service-oriented model can be extended to a general bus line with demand of multiple origins and destinations (see section 4 for demonstration) and then possibly to a network with multiple lines; the modeling of dispatches in terms of seats/places for patrons can be readily applied to mixed-size buses and futuristic modular buses by coupling different sizes of seat combinations according to the associated operation cost structure (see also section 4); and the consideration of buses’ circulation/round-trip time may also include that (involving a layover time for charging) of electric buses, which have been promoted to tackle the transportation-related environmental problems of the time in many cities around the world.

iii. The solution to Hurdle’s scheduling problem is of practical usefulness. Specific times of dispatches can be readily furnished (via integration of the dispatching rate) for implementation, and fine tunes can be made to satisfy further practical concerns (such as ‘clock headway’), without much deteriorating the system performance, because it is rather flat in the neighborhood of the global optimum (Daganzo, 1997).

Next we restate Hurdle’s scheduling problem and solution as the starting point for developing our analytic solution and extensions.

1.2 Hurdle’s scheduling problem restatement

Consider a single bus line of shuttle or feeder services (serving demand of one-to-one, many-to-one, or one-to-many patterns), where the demand is time-varying and expressed by a continuous function \( f(t) \) (patrons/hour) denoting the arrival rate of patrons at time \( t \). To serve the demand, buses of a fleet with total seats of \( M \) are dispatched at a rate of \( g(t) \), which is expressed in the unit of seats per hour. For each dispatch, \( \lambda \) cost per seat per hour (hours/seat-hour) is related for the operation of a round trip. For each seat in the fleet \( M \), a fixed cost \( \gamma \) (hours/seat) is associated to the purchase and maintenance. Given the operation period of a day \( E \) (hours) and the round-trip/cycle time of the line \( T \) (hours/cycle), the scheduling problem is
formulized to minimize the total costs for bus operation and patrons’ waiting time, as given below:

$$\text{minimize}_{g(t), M} J = \gamma M + \int_0^T [\lambda g(t) + w(t)] dt$$  \hspace{1cm} (1a)$$

subject to:

$$\int_{t-T}^t g(t) \, dt \leq M$$  \hspace{1cm} (1b)$$

$$w(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{cf(t)}{2g(t)}, & \text{if no queue exists at } t \\ \frac{c}{2} + \int_{t_q}^t f(s) - g(s) \, ds, & \text{if queue first forms at } t_q \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1c)$$

$$g(t) \geq 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (1d)$$

where (1b) is the fleet size constraint; \(w(t)\) (patron-hours/hour) in (1c) is the rate of the accumulation of patrons’ waiting time at \(t\); \(c\) is the size/capacity of each bus (seats/bus); \(t_q\) is the time a queue first forms at bus stop(s). Derivations of (1c) can be found in Hurdle (1973) and omitted here for brevity.

1.3 The optimal solutions

In Hurdle (1973), problem (1) was attacked separately for peak and off-peak periods, which were defined as the interval of \([t_q - T, t_d]\) and other times in \([0, E]\), where \(t_d\) is the time when the queue dissipates.

For the peak period, the optimal dispatching rate, \(g_p^*(t)\), was obtained via graphic analysis as expressed below:

$$g_p^*(t) = \begin{cases} f(t), & t \in [t_q - T, t_q) \\ g_p^*(t - T), & t \in [t_q, t_d] \end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2a)$$

For the off-peak period with no queue, constraint (1b) was ignored, and \(w(t)\) in (1c) was reduced to \(\frac{cf(t)}{2g(t)}\). Plugging back to (1a), the author then solved the problem via calculus of variations. The optimal off-peak dispatching rate, \(g_{op}^*(t)\), is:

$$g_{op}^*(t) = \max \left( \sqrt{\frac{cf(t)}{2\lambda}}, f(t) \right), t \in [0, E] \setminus [t_q - T, t_d]$$  \hspace{1cm} (2b)$$

The optimal fleet size \(M^*\) was, however, not provided in Hurdle (1973). Instead, the author shown the lower and upper bounds of \(M^*\), \(M_L \leq M^* \leq M_U\), where \(M_L\) is defined by that resulting in \(t_d - t_q = \gamma\) under the dispatching policy of (2a); and \(M_U\) is obtained by the no-queueing solution (2b), \(M_U \equiv \max_{t \in [0, E]} \int_{t-T}^t g_{op}^*(s) \, ds\).
2. Analytic solutions

This section advances Hurdle’s work by presenting an analytic approach for finding the optimal peak-period dispatching rate, \( g^*_p \), in section 2.1. The analytic approach allows us to find the optimal fleet size \( M^* \) in section 2.2. Notation used in this paper are mostly borrowed from Hurdle (1973) for the sake of consistency. Note that as indicated by Daganzo (2007), although phrased in terms of 'patrons', 'buses', and 'bus line/stops', the models apply to other transportation modes, e.g., subways, trains, airlines, and ships.

2.1 The optimal peak-period dispatching rate

For the pre-queueing interval \( t \in [t_q - T, t_q] \), construct a dispatching rate \( g(t) = f(t) + k(t) \), where \( k(t) \geq 0 \) represents an arbitrary path from time \( t_q - T \) to \( t_q \). Let \( T_q \equiv t_d - t_q \) be the duration that the queue exists, and \( I \equiv \lceil \frac{T_q}{T} \rceil \) be the number of the cycle time accounted in \( T_q \), where \( \lfloor \cdot \rfloor \) returns the closest integer no larger than the argument. The objective function of the peak-period optimization is expressed as:

\[
J = \gamma M + \int_{t_q - T}^{t_d} \lambda g(t) dt + \int_{t_q - T}^{t_d} w(t) dt
\]

Next we express (3) using \( k(t) \) and its cumulative function \( K(t) \equiv \int_{t_q - T}^{t} k(s) ds \). First, the 2\textsuperscript{nd} term at the right-hand-side (RHS) of (3) can be rewritten as:

\[
\int_{t_q - T}^{t_d} \lambda g(t) dt = \int_{t_q - T}^{t_q} \lambda [f(t) + k(t)] dt + \int_{t_q}^{t_d + T_q} \lambda g(t) dt
\]

Note that during the queueing interval \([t_q, t_q + T_q]\), a queue exists and buses are dispatched with zero storage, i.e., the cumulative number of dispatched seats \( G(t) \) satisfies the equation of \( G(t) = G(t - T) + M \). Thus, we know \( g(t) = g(t - T) \) for \([t_q, t_q + T_q]\).

Substituting into (4) yields,

\[
\int_{t_q - T}^{t_d} \lambda g(t) dt = \int_{t_q - T}^{t_q} \lambda [f(t) + k(t)] dt + \int_{t_q}^{t_d + T_q} \lambda g(t - T) dt
\]

Let \( s = t - T \), we have \( \int_{t_q}^{t_d + T_q} \lambda g(t - T) dt = \int_{t_q - T}^{t_d + T_q - T} \lambda g(s) ds = \int_{t_q - T}^{t_q} \lambda [f(t) + k(t)] dt + \int_{t_q}^{t_d + T_q - T} \lambda g(s - T) ds = \cdots \). Thus, (5) can be rewritten as:

\[
\int_{t_q - T}^{t_d} \lambda g(t) dt = \sum_{i=1}^{I+1} \int_{t_q - T}^{t_q} \lambda [f(t) + k(t)] dt + \int_{t_q - T}^{t_d + T_q - (I+1)T} \lambda [f(t) + k(t)] ds
\]

\(^{1}\) Hurdle (1973) defined a variable equivalent to the integral of \( k(t) \), interpreted as the cumulative number of departing vacant seats, but unfortunately did not exploit it to solve the problem.
Similarly, the \(3^{rd}\) term in (3) can be expressed in terms of \(k(t)\) and \(K(t)\) as follows.

\[
\int_{t_q-T}^{t} w(t)dt = \frac{c}{2} \int_{t_q-T}^{t} \frac{f(t)}{f(t)+k(t)} dt + \int_{t_q}^{t+\tau_q} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t) + K(t) - G(t) \right] dt
\]

where \(F(t) \equiv \int_{t_q-T}^{t} f(s)ds\) is the cumulative number of patron arrivals at \(t\); \(K(t_q)\) produces the cumulative vacant seats departed up to \(t_q\); and thus \(F(t) + K(t) - G(t)\) yields the cumulative number of queueing patrons at \(t \geq t_q\) (note that no empty seats can depart at stops after \(t_q\)).

Replacing \(G(t)\) by \(G(t-T) + M\) in the \(2^{nd}\) term at the RHS of (7) yields,

\[
\int_{t_q}^{t+\tau_q} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t) + K(t) - G(t - T) - M \right] dt
\]

\[
= \int_{t_q-T}^{t} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + T) + K(t) - G(t) - M \right] dt + \int_{t_q}^{t+\tau_q-T} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + 2T) + K(t) - G(t - T) - 2M \right] dt
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{2} \int_{\tau_q-T}^{t} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + iT) + K(t) - G(t) - iM \right] dt + \int_{t_q}^{t+\tau_q-2T} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + 2T) + K(t) - G(t - T) - 3M \right] dt
\]

\[
= \cdots
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{l} \int_{\tau_q-T}^{t} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + iT) + K(t) - G(t) - iM \right] dt + \int_{t_q}^{t+\tau_q-(l+1)T} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + (l + 1)T) + K(t) - G(t - (l + 1)T) - (l + 1)M \right] dt.
\]

By definition \(G(t) = F(t) + K(t)\) for \(t \in [t_q - T, t_q]\), (7) can then be rewritten as:

\[
\int_{t_q-T}^{t} w(t)dt = \frac{c}{2} \int_{t_q-T}^{t} \frac{f(t)}{f(t)+k(t)} dt
\]

\[
+ \sum_{i=1}^{l} \int_{\tau_q-T}^{t} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + iT) + K(t) - F(t) - K(t) - iM \right] dt
\]

\[
+ \int_{t_q-T}^{t+\tau_q-(l+1)T} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + (l + 1)T) + K(t) - F(t) - K(t) - (l + 1)M \right] dt
\]

Using the information from (6) and (8), we define \(F_1(t)\) and \(F_2(t)\) as below:

\[
F_1(t) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{l+1} \lambda [f(t) + k(t)] + \frac{c}{2} \int_{f(t)+k(t)}^{f(t)} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + iT) + K(t) - F(t) - K(t) - iM \right].
\]

\[
F_2(t) \equiv \lambda [f(t) + k(t)] + \left[ \frac{c}{2} + F(t + (l + 1)T) + K(t) - F(t) - K(t) - (l + 1)M \right].
\]

The original optimization problem can now be rewritten as the following equivalent one with respect to \(k(t), K(t)\), and \(M\) at the pre-queueing interval \([t_q - T, t_q]\):
minimize \( k(t), K(t), M \) \( f(k(t), K(t), M) \)
\[
= \gamma M + \int_{t_q-T}^{t_q+T_q-(l+1)T} [F_1(t) + F_2(t)] dt + \int_{t_q+T_q-(l+1)T}^{t_q} F_1(t) dt
\] (9)

Problem (9) has no constraint and can be solved using calculus of variations. The Euler-Lagrange Equation is:
\[
\frac{\partial[F_1(t) + F_2(t)]}{\partial K(t)} - \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial[F_1(t) + F_2(t)]}{\partial k(t)} \right) = 0 \text{ for } t \in [t_q - T, t_q + T_q - (I + 1)T] \tag{10a}
\]
\[
\frac{\partial F_1(t)}{\partial K(t)} - \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial F_1(t)}{\partial k(t)} \right) = 0 \text{ for } t \in [t_q + T_q - (I + 1)T, t_q] \tag{10b}
\]

Since \( K(t_q) = K(t) + \int_{t_q}^{t_q} k(t) dt \), we have \( \frac{dK(t_q) - K(t)}{dK(t)} = 0 \). The above conditions become,
\[
0 - \frac{d}{dt} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{l+2} \lambda - \frac{c}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial k(t)} \left( \frac{f(t)}{f(t)+k(t)} \right) \right) = 0 \text{ for } t \in [t_q - T, t_q + T_q - (I + 1)T] \text{ and}
\]
\[
0 - \frac{d}{dt} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{l+1} \lambda - \frac{c}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial k(t)} \left( \frac{f(t)}{f(t)+k(t)} \right) \right) = 0 \text{ for } t \in [t_q + T_q - (I + 1)T, t_q],
\]
which lead to

\[
\frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{c}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial k(t)} \left( \frac{f(t)}{f(t)+k(t)} \right) \right) = 0 \text{ for } t \in [t_q - T, t_q] \tag{11}
\]

It can be seen that the only way to satisfy (11) is \( k(t) = 0 \text{ for } t \in [t_q - T, t_q] \). In other words, the optimal peak-period dispatching rate is \( g^*_p(t) = f(t) \text{ and } G^*_p(t) = F(t) \text{ for } t \in [t_q - T, t_q] \). Note that the optimal peak-period dispatching rate is irrelevant to the operation cost parameter \( \lambda \text{ and the fixed cost parameter } \gamma \). These results are consistent with that of Hurdle (1973). The optimal off-peak dispatching rate remains the same with Hurdle’s (1973).

2.2 The optimal fleet size

The formulation of (9) allows us to find the optimal fleet size \( M^* \) by the first-order condition:
\[
\frac{dL}{dM} = \gamma = \int_{t_q-T}^{t_q} \sum_{i=1}^{l} i \ dt - \int_{t_q-T}^{t_q+T_q-(l+1)T} (I + 1) dt = 0,
\]
which can be reorganized as:

\[
\gamma = \frac{l(l+1)}{2} T + (I + 1)(T_q - IT)
\]
(12)

where \( I = \left\lfloor \frac{T_q}{T} \right\rfloor \) by definition.

The solution of \( T_q \) to (12) can be used to find the \( M^* \). To do so, we use the following two boundary conditions at time \( t_q \) and \( t_q + T_q \), respectively:
\[ G(t_q) - G(t_q - T) = M \quad (13a) \]
\[ F(t_q + T_q) = G(t_q + T_q) \quad (13b) \]

From the above result in section 2.1, we know \( G(t) = F(t) \) for \( t \in [t_q - T, t_q] \); thus, (13a) is rewritten as:
\[ F(t_q) - F(t_q - T) = M \quad (14) \]

In (13b), \( G(t_q + T_q) \) can be folded into the pre-queueing interval by \( G(t_q + T_q - T) + M = G(t_q + T_q - 2T) + 2M = \cdots = G(t_q + T_q - IT) + IM \), which can be further reformulated as:
\[ G(t_q) + \int_{t_q}^{t_q + T_q - IT} g(t)dt + IM \quad (15) \]

Replacing \( g(t) \) by \( g(t - T) \) at interval \( [t_q, t_q + T_q - IT] \), (15) yields,
\[ G(t_q) + \int_{t_q}^{t_q + T_q - IT} g(t - T)dt + IM = G(t_q) + \int_{t_q - T}^{t_q + T_q - (l+1)T} g(t)dt + IM \quad (16) \]

Again replacing \( G(t_q) \) with \( F(t_q) \) and \( g(t) \) with the optimal solution \( g^*(t) = f(t) \) at interval \( [t_q - T, t_q + T_q - (l+1)T] \), (16) gives us:
\[ F(t_q + T_q) = F(t_q) + \int_{t_q - T}^{t_q + T_q - (l+1)T} f(s)ds + IM \quad (17) \]

Now we have two equations (14, 17) and two unknown variables \( t_q, M \), which can be solved given \( T_q \). The solution may be remarkably straightforward: Typically, we have \( \gamma < T \) in reality; then (12) is reduced to \( \gamma = T_q \) with \( I = 0 \); and (17) is simplified to \( F(t_q + \gamma) = F(t_q) + \int_{t_q - T}^{t_q + \gamma - T} f(s)ds \), of which the solution of \( t_q^* \) is plugged into (14) yielding the optimal fleet size \( M^* \). For rare cases of \( \gamma > T \), we propose an iteration algorithm to solve equations (14, 17). The algorithm steps are summarized as follows.

Initialize: \( M^{(0)} \) and set iteration variable \( n = 1 \)

Step 1: Compute \( T_q \) by (12).

Step 2: Compute \( t_q^{(n)} \) by (17) with \( M^{(n-1)} \).

Step 3: Compute \( M \) by (14).

Step 4: Update \( M^{(n)} = M^{(n-1)} + \frac{M - M^{(n-1)}}{n} \).

Step 5: Stop if \( |M^{(n)} - M^{(n-1)}| \leq \varepsilon \), where \( \varepsilon \) is a predefined small value, e.g., \( \varepsilon = 10^{-6} \); otherwise, let \( n = n + 1 \) and go to Step 2.
Note that our solution of $M^*$ for $\gamma < T$ is the same with the lower bound $M_L$ defined by Hurdle (1973); and when $\gamma$ is negligibly small, $T_q$ approaches zero, and the optimal $M^*$ equals the upper bound $M_U$ of Hurdle (1973). The $M^*$ for cases of $\gamma > T$ will be larger than Hurdle’s $M_L$. This is true because $T_q$ is typically a decreasing function of $M$: larger fleet size reduces the time that the queue lasts, and smaller fleet size enlarges the queueing duration. Its inverse function is also a decreasing function. Since (12) has the solution satisfying $T_q < \gamma$ for $\gamma > T^2$, the relation of $M^*(T_q) > M_L \equiv M^*(\gamma)$ holds. The above results confirm Hurdle’s (1973) findings via graphic analysis.

Ultimately, the fleet size in terms of vehicles can be determined by $\left\lceil \frac{M^*}{c} \right\rceil$, where $\lceil \cdot \rceil$ rounds the argument to the closest integer.

3. Numerical examples

For the sake of illustration, we make up the following arrival pattern for patrons:

$$f(t) = D \cdot T \mathcal{N} \left( \mu, \sigma^2, 0, E \right)$$

where $D$ is the total trips during the study period of $E$ hours; $\mu$, $\sigma$ denote the mean and standard deviation of the normal distribution of the number of arrivals; and $T \mathcal{N} \left( \cdot, 0, E \right)$ represents the probability density function of the normal distribution truncated by the interval $[0, E]$. Demand of (18) has one peak (at time $\mu$) that is used to represent a morning or evening peak.

The select values for the parameters used in the above models are given in Table 2. Two $\gamma$ values (i.e., 30 and 90 mins as opposed to $T = 60$ mins) are chosen to denote a normal and a costly-fleet scenario, respectively. Other parameter values are set to generally represent the realistic situations.

---

2 Proof by contradiction: For $\gamma > T$, if the solution to (11) has $T_q \geq \gamma$, we have:

$$\frac{f(t+1)}{2} T + (1 + 1)(T_q - IT) \geq \frac{f(t+1)}{2} T + (1 + 1)(\gamma - IT) = \frac{f(t+1)}{2} T + IT - (1 + 1)IT + \gamma = IT - \frac{(t+1)IT}{2} + \gamma$$

$$\gamma = T \left( I T - \frac{(t+1)IT}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) > T \left( I T - \frac{(t+1)IT}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) = T \left( \frac{(t+1)IT}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) \geq \gamma,$$

of which the strict inequality holds. This contradicts the equation relation in (11). Therefore, we must have $T_q < \gamma$ if $\gamma > T$. Proof is completed.
Table 2. Parameter values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Baseline values</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Baseline values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D) (patrons)</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>(E) (mins)</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T) (mins)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(c) (patrons/bus)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu) (mins)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(\sigma) (mins)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\gamma) (mins/seat)</td>
<td>{30, 90}</td>
<td>(\lambda) (mins/seat-hour)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The optimal solutions to the scheduling problem are depicted in Figure 1. Figures 1a, b are the optimal dispatching rate and the cumulative number of dispatches under the normal scenario with \(\gamma = 30\) mins. As seen, the queueing time starts at 75 mins and lasts \(T_q = 30\) mins. During the time, the optimal fleet size \(M^* = 640\) seats binds. Figures 1c, d are for the costly-fleet scenario. It is observed that the queueing starting time moves forward to 59 mins and the lasting time extends to \(T_q = 75\) mins, which covers more than one \(T\) periods. The resulting optimal fleet size becomes \(M^* = 477\) seats.
a. Dispatching rate with $\gamma = 90$ mins/seat  
b. Cumulative dispatches with $\gamma = 90$ mins/seat

**Figure 1. Visualization of the optimal solutions**

The high computation efficiency of the above model allows us to conduct parameter analysis. Figure 2 shows the results of the changes in $M^*$ and $t_q$ with respect to various $\gamma \in [5,50]$ mins/seat. While both decrease with rising $\gamma$ values, the queueing starting time $t_q$ diminishes in a linear manner.

a. Changes in $M^*$  
b. Changes in $t_q$

**Figure 2. Changes of the optimal solutions with respect to varying $\gamma$**

Sensitivity analysis is also done to $\sigma$ that represents the temporal aggregation of patrons’ arrivals: Smaller/larger $\sigma$ values indicate high/low-level aggregation, which, as expected, are found to require more and few fleet sizes, respectively.
4. Extensions

This section demonstrates two possible extensions to Hurdle’s scheduling problem.

4.1 Scheduling for demand with multiple origins and destinations

Consider a bus line with multiple stops indexed by \( j \in J \equiv \{0, 1, \ldots, j\} \), where \( J \) is the total number of stops. Patrons originate and designate between pairs of stops. Let the arrival rate of patrons at stop \( j \) at time \( t + \tau_j \) be \( f_j(t) \equiv f_j(t + \tau_j) \) and the cumulative \( F_j(t) \equiv \int f_j(s)ds \), where \( \tau_j \) is the average travel time of buses traversing from the depot (indexed by 0 and \( J \)) to the \( j \)th stop and is assumed to be deterministic, fixed, and identical to all buses (imagine the case of bus lines with exclusive lane). Define \( \beta_{od}(t) \equiv \frac{f_{od}(t + \tau_o)}{f_o(t + \tau_o)} \) (patrons/hour) as the ratio of demand traveling from stop \( o \) to stop \( d \), where \( f_{od}(t + \tau_o) \) is the demand between the stop pair, \( o, d \in J \). Then, the waiting time at every stop can be formulated respectively as below.

\[
w_j(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{cf_j(t)}{2g(t)}, & \text{if no queue exists at stop } j \text{ for dispatch time } t \\ \frac{c}{2} + \int_{t_{a,j}}^{t} [f_j(s) - b_j(s)] ds, & \text{if queue first forms at } t_{a,j} \end{cases} \quad j \in J \tag{19}
\]

where \( b_j(s) \) (patrons/hour) is the actual boarding rate at stop \( j \) for the dispatch time \( t \), which is given by:

\[
b_j(s) = \min\{e_j(s), f_j(s)\} \tag{20a}
\]

\[
e_j(s) = \frac{g(t)}{c} \left[ c - \frac{c}{g(s)} \left( \sum_{o=0}^{j-1} (b_o(s) - h_o(s)) - h_j(s) \right) \right] \tag{20b}
\]

where \( e_j(s) \) in (20a) denotes the arrival rate of vacant seats at stop \( j \), and is defined by (20b); \( \min\{\cdot\} \) in (20a) returns the minimum value of the arguments, i.e., the actual boarding rate per hour. In (20b), \( h_j(s) \equiv \sum_{o=0}^{j-1} b_o(s) \beta_{oj}(s) \) (patrons/hour) means the actual alighting rate at stop \( j \); the term in bracket means the vacant seats per arriving vehicle, multiplying by \( \frac{g(t)}{c} \) (i.e., the arrival rate of vehicles) yields the definition of \( e_j(s) \).

With (19,20) in hand, the scheduling problem is rewritten as:

\[
\text{minimize}_{g(t), M} J = \gamma M + \int_0^T \left[ \lambda g(t) + \sum_{j} w_j(t) \right] dt \tag{21}
\]

subject to:

\[(1b,1d), \text{ and } (19,20).
\]

4.1.1 Optimal dispatching rate

Without loss of generality, let stop \( j \) be the critical stop where the queue forms at the earliest time \( t_{a,j} \). Let \( r_j(t) \equiv \left( \sum_{o=0}^{j-1} (b_o(t) - h_o(t)) - h_j(t) \right) \) denote the cross-sectional flux at the
entrance of stop $j$, and the cumulative function be $R_j(t) = \int r_j(s)ds$. Thus, we have $g(t) = e_j(s) + r_j(t)$ and the relation among the corresponding cumulative functions is $G(t) = E_j(t) + R_j(t)$; and for the queueing interval $[t_{a,j}, t_{d,j}]$, $G(t) = G(t - T) + M$ and $E_j(t) = E_j(t - T) + M - R_j(t) + R_j(t - T)$ hold.

Construct a dispatching profile $g(t) = f_j(t) + r_j(t) + k(t)$ and $e_j(s) = f_j(t) + k(t)$ for $t \in [t_{q,j} - T, t_{q,j}]$. Then, the waiting time at stop $j$ can be expressed by:

$$\int_{t_{q,j} - T}^{t_{d,j}} w_j(t) dt = \frac{c}{2} \int_{t_{q,j} - T}^{t_{d,j}} f_j(s) + r_j(s) + k(s) dt$$

$$+ \int_{t_{q,j}}^{t_{d,j}} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + E_j(t) + \left( E_j(t_{q,j}) - F_j(t_{q,j}) \right) - E_j(t) \right] dt$$

(22)

where $\left( E_j(t_{q,j}) - F_j(t_{q,j}) \right)$ yields the cumulative vacant seats departed from stop $j$ upon $t_{q,j}$, which is identical to $K(t_{q,j}) = \int_{t_{q,j} - T}^{t_{d,j}} k(t) dt$ here.

In a similar manner as that in section 2, we can rewrite (22) using $k(t)$, $K(t)$ at interval $[t_{q,j} - T, t_{q,j}]$ as below:

$$\int_{t_{q,j} - T}^{t_{d,j}} W_{1,j}(t) dt + \int_{t_{q,j} - T}^{t_{d,j} - (l_j + 1)T} W_{2,j}(t) dt$$

(23)

where $W_{1,j}(t)$ and $W_{2,j}(t)$ are defined at interval $[t_{q,j} - T, t_{q,j}]$ as follows.

$$W_{1,j}(t) \equiv \frac{c}{2} \frac{f_j(t)}{f_j(t) + r_j(t) + k(t)}$$

$$+ \sum_{i=1}^{l_j} \left[ \frac{c}{2} + E_j(t + iT) + \left( E_j(t_{q,j}) - F_j(t_{q,j}) \right) - E_j(t) - iM + \left( R_j(t + iT) - R_j(t) \right) \right]$$

(24a)

$$W_{2,j}(t) \equiv \frac{c}{2} + E_j(t + (l_j + 1)T) + \left( E_j(t_{q,j}) - F_j(t_{q,j}) \right) - E_j(t) - \left( l_j + 1 \right)M + \left( R_j(t + (l_j + 1)T) - R_j(t) \right)$$

(24b)

where $l_j = \left[ \frac{t_{d,j} - t_{q,j}}{T} \right]$. Note that at the pre-queueing interval $[t_{q,j} - T, t_{q,j}]$, $E_j(s) = F_j(t) + K(t)$ by definition; thus, we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial K(t)} \left( E_j(t_{q,j}) - E_j(t) \right) = 0$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial K(t)} W_{1,j}(t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial K(t)} W_{2,j}(t) = 0$. The only term of (23a, b) left in Euler-Lagrange Equation will be

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial K(t)} \left( \frac{c}{2} \frac{f_j(t)}{f_j(t) + r_j(t) + k(t)} \right).$$

For other stops, we first consider the stops $o \neq j \in J$ where no queue forms during the queueing interval $[t_{q,j}, t_{d,j}]$. Their waiting time is:
\[
\sum_{o} \int_{t_{o,j}}^{t_{o,j}+\tau} w_d(t) \, dt = \sum_{o} \left[ \int_{t_{o,j}+\tau}^{t_{o,j}} \frac{f_o(t)}{g(t)} \, dt + \int_{t_{o,j}}^{t_{o,j}+\tau} \frac{f_o(t)}{g(t)} \, dt \right] \\
= \int_{t_{o,j}}^{t_{o,j}+\tau} \left[ \sum_{i=o}^{j} \frac{\delta_{o,i} f_o(t + i \tau) + \delta_{o,i+1} \sum_{o} f_o(t + (i + 1) \tau)}{2} f_j(t + \tau) + \frac{c \sum_{o} f_o(t + (i + 1) \tau)}{2} f_j(t) + \frac{c f_j(t + \tau)}{2} \right] \, dt 
\]

(25)

Define \( \tilde{f}(t) = \sum_{i=o}^{j} \delta_{o,i} f_o(t + i \tau) + \delta_{o,i+1} \sum_{o} f_o(t + (i + 1) \tau) \), where \( \delta_{o,i} = 1 \) if stop \( o \) witnesses no queue at \( t + i \tau \in [t_{q,j}, t_{d,j}] \) for \( t \in [t_{q,j} - T, t_{q,j}] \) and \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, i \); otherwise \( \delta_{o,i} = 0 \). The meaning of \( \tilde{f}(t) \) is the demand of patrons that experience no queueing during the entire peak period \([t_{q,j} - T, t_{d,j}]\). Thus, the terms of (25) left in Euler-Lagrange Equation will be in the form of \( \frac{\partial}{\partial k(t)} \left( \frac{\tilde{f}(t)}{2} \right) \).

Next, for stops \( d \in J \setminus \{j, o\} \) where queues form at \( t_{q,d} \geq t_{q,j} \) and dissipate at \( t_{d,d} \leq t_{d,j} \), their waiting time is expressed by:

\[
\sum_{d} \int_{t_{d,j}+\tau}^{t_{d,j}} w_d(t) \, dt = \sum_{d} \left[ \int_{t_{d,j}+\tau}^{t_{d,j}} \frac{f_d(t)}{g(t)} \, dt + \int_{t_{d,j}}^{t_{d,j}+\tau} \frac{f_d(t)}{g(t)} \, dt \right] \\
+ \int_{t_{d,j}}^{t_{d,j}+\tau} \left( \frac{c}{2} f_j(t) + \frac{c}{2} \right) \, dt 
\]

(26a)

By definition of \( \tilde{f}(t) \), (26a) can be rewritten as:

\[
\sum_{d} \int_{t_{d,j}+\tau}^{t_{d,j}} w_d(t) \, dt = \int_{t_{d,j}+\tau}^{t_{d,j}} \frac{\tilde{f}(t)}{2} \, dt \\
+ \int_{t_{d,j}}^{t_{d,j}+\tau} \left( \frac{c}{2} f_j(t) + \frac{c}{2} \right) \, dt 
\]

(26b)

In (26b), \( E_d(t) = G(t) - R_d(t) = E_j(t) + R_j(t) - R_o(t) \), thus the 2\textsuperscript{nd} term in RHS of (26b) can also be folded into the pre-queueing interval of \([t_{q,j} - T, t_{q,j}]\) by repeatedly expressing \( E_j(t) \) with \( E_j(t - T) \). Since \( \frac{\partial}{\partial k(t)} \left( E_j(t_{q,o}) - E_j(t) \right) = 0 \) still holds in the pre-queueing interval, we also have \( \frac{\partial}{\partial k(t)} \left( E_d(t_{q,d}) - E_d(t) \right) = 0 \); and the only term of (26b) left in Euler-Lagrange Equation is also in the form of \( \frac{\partial}{\partial k(t)} \left( \frac{c}{2} \tilde{f}(t) \right) \).

Lastly, for the stops \( l \in J \setminus \{o, d, j\} \) where queues last beyond \( t_{d,j} \) until \( t_{d,l} \), we can just reset the critical stop as \( l \) and extend the peak period to \( t_{d,l} \), during which \( f_j(t) \) of previous critical stop \( j \) will be included in the non-queueing demand \( \tilde{f}(t) \). The waiting time at the new critical stop \( l \), i.e., \( \int_{t_{d,l}}^{t_{d,l}+\tau} \left[ \frac{c}{2} f_l(t) + E_l(t_{q,l}) - E_l(t_{q,l}) - E_l(t) \right] \, dt \), contributes a zero to Euler-Lagrange Equation, since \( \frac{\partial}{\partial k(t)} \left( E_l(t_{q,l}) - E_l(t) \right) = 0 \) when rolled into the pre-queueing interval.
Overall, the Euler–Lagrange Equation to (21) can be reduced to the following condition:

\[ \frac{d}{dt} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial k(t)} \left( \sum_{j} \frac{f_j(t) + \dot{f}_j(t)}{2 f_j(\dot{j} + r_j(t) + s_j)} \right) \right) = 0, \]

where \( j \) indicates the critical stop(s) (27)

By observing (27), we find that the solution has to be \( f_j(t) + r_j(t) + k^*(t) = g^*(t) = f_j(t) + \dot{f}_j(t) \), where the critical stop \( j \) can be successively updated according to the dissipation and emergence of queues at stops over the study period. The meaning of the optimal \( g^*(t) \) can be interpreted as the overall arrival rates of patrons at any stops where they experience no queue under the dispatch profile determined at the pre-queueing interval. Note that the solution to the original Hurdle’s scheduling problem becomes a special case of the above result when operating shuttle or feeder transit services. Interestingly, an observable difference exists between Hurdle’s and our dispatching strategies: In the former, no vacant seats would be observed at stop(s) during the entire peak period (i.e., \([t_q - T, t_d]\)) whereas under the latter vacant seats would be observed at all stops during the pre-queueing time (i.e., \([t_{q,j} - T, t_{q,j}]\)). To check, see the fact \( g^*(t) = f_j(t) + \dot{f}_j(t) > f_j(t) \). It is also not surprising to witness vacant seats at some unsaturated stops during the queueing period (i.e., \([t_{q,j}, t_{d,i}]\)).

4.1.2 The optimal fleet size

Under the optimal \( g^*(t) \) profile, the solution of \( M^* \) to (21) can be found in a similar manner to that in section 2.2. Specifically, we will have \( 2N + 1 \) unknown variables, i.e., \( M, \{t_{q,j}, t_{d,j}, t_{q,d}, t_{d,a}, t_{q,i}, t_{d,i}\} \), where \( N \) is the total number of stops where queues form during the (extended) queueing period \([t_{q,j}, t_{d,i}]\). They must satisfy the boundary conditions (28a-b) and (28c) as the optimal condition.

\[ G(t_{q,n}) - G(t_{q,n} - T) = M, n \in \{j, d, l\} \]

\[ F_j(t_{d,n}) = E_j(t_{d,n}) = G(t_{d,n}) - R_j(t_{d,n}), n \in \{j, d, l\} \]

\[ \frac{df_j}{dt} = 0 \]

where variables, e.g., \( F(\cdot), G(\cdot), R(\cdot), T, \) are known. Solving the above \( 2N + 1 \) equations (28a-c) will produce the optimal fleet size, \( M^* \), as well as the queueing profiles at each oversaturated stop.

4.2 Scheduling with mixed-size or modular buses

The cost parameters of \( \gamma \) and \( \lambda \) may not be constant but depend on the size of bus \( c \) (seats/vehicle). On realizing the economies of scale in transit industry, researchers had
introduced functions describing the costs related to bus sizes. For instance, a commonly used one is in the following form (adapted to the unit of cost per seat) (Chang and Schonfeld, 1991; Kim and Schonfeld, 2019):

\[
y = \frac{\gamma_0(c_0 + ac)}{c} \text{ and } \lambda = \frac{\lambda_0(c_0 + ac)}{c}
\]

(29)

where \(c_0, \gamma_0, \lambda_0, \) and \(\alpha\) are known parameters.

Substituting (29) in (1a) yields the new objective function with respect to \(c\):

\[
J = \frac{\gamma_0(c_0 + ac)M}{c} + \int_0^E \left[ g(t) \lambda_0(c_0 + ac) + w(t) \right] dt
\]

(30)

From the optimal condition to minimizing \(J\), \(\frac{dj}{dc} = 0\), we have:

\[
- \frac{\gamma_0c_0M + \lambda_0c_0}{c^2} \int_0^E g(t) dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T q \int_0^f f(t) dt + \frac{T_q}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^E f(t) dt = 0
\]

(31)

Solving (31) yields,

\[
\bar{c} = \sqrt{\frac{2(\gamma_0c_0M + \lambda_0c_0 \int_0^E g(t) dt)}{\int_0^T q \int_0^f f(t) dt + \int_0^E f(t) dt}}
\]

(32)

Observing (32) reveals some insights: Larger-sized buses are preferred for cases where purchasing and operating buses are relatively more expensive (i.e., \(\gamma_0, \lambda_0, c_0\) have large values); in contrast, smaller-sized vehicles will be favored for higher level of demand (which represents larger \(\frac{f(t)}{g(t)}\) approaching to 1 and longer queueing duration \(T_q\)).

Considering practical reasons, the bus size is oftentimes constrained in a range of [\(c, \bar{c}\)], where \(c, \bar{c}\) are the smallest and largest limits, respectively. Ultimately, we have the optimal bus size solution to be \(c^* = \min(\max(\bar{c}, c), \bar{c})\).

With mixed-size fleet or modular buses, we are free to separately determine the optimal bus sizes for different time periods of the day. For instance, during the no-queueing periods the fleet size does not bind, and flexible bus sizes can be determined for subdivided intervals \([E_{i-1}, E_i]\) by the optimal condition, \(- \frac{\lambda_0c_0}{c^2} \int_0^E g(t) dt + \frac{1}{2} \int_{E_{i-1}}^{E_i} f(t) dt = 0\), which yields,

\[
\bar{c}_i = \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda_0c_0 \int_{E_{i-1}}^{E_i} g(t) dt}{\int_{E_{i-1}}^{E_i} f(t) dt}}
\]

(33)

For the queueing period, (34a) or further subdivided (34b) should function well:

\[
\bar{c}_q = \sqrt{\frac{2(\gamma_0c_0M + \lambda_0c_0 \int_q q g(t) dt + T_q q g(t) dt)}{T_q}}
\]

(34a)
\[
\tilde{c}_{q,i} = \sqrt{\frac{2\left(\gamma_0c_0M + \lambda_0c_0f_{tq}^{tq+TR}g(t)dt\right)}{T}}
\] (34b)

The results in (32-34) can be fine-tuned to fit possible combinations of fix-sized bus modules (as suggested in Chen et al., 2020). Other cost functions that exist in the literature, e.g., \(\gamma = \gamma_0(c_0 + c^\alpha)/c\) and \(\lambda = \lambda_0(c_0 + c^\alpha)/c\) where \(\alpha < 1\) (Chen et al., 2020), may also be applied to the above solution procedure. Although closed-form solution is not guaranteed, numerical solution could be readily found by solving the first-order optimal condition as higher-degree polynomial equations.

5. Conclusions

This paper completes the work of Hurdle (1973) by proposing an analytic solution approach for the general form of scheduling problem. The original variational problem is relaxed to an unconstrained one and solved using calculus of variations. Hurdle’s finding of the peak-period optimal dispatching rate is confirmed by the Euler-Lagrange equation of the relaxed problem. The unsolved optimal fleet size is now solved. A useful by-product is the queueing profile under the optimal schedule design. Accordingly, proper measures can be conducted to manage/guide the queue. Numerical examples demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach. Based on these, we make two extensions to the scheduling problems considering a general bus line with multiple origins and destinations and one with mixed-size or modular buses. New insights are uncovered. For instance, the pre-queueing optimal dispatching rate of the general line depends on not only the demand at the critical stop (where the earliest queue will form) but also that of any other stops where no queues will be experienced during the entire peak period. And in contrast to Hurdle’s results, vacant seats should be dispatched before the queueing time as a service storage for the up-coming demand at undersaturated stops.

Of note, the above modeling of the schedule problems still has many limitations. For instance, the current service of interest is still limited to a single line. The pre-given and fixed cycle time may vary in real world for different times of the day, depend on the number of boarding and alighting patrons, and even be a stochastic variable due to random influential factors (e.g., signals and drivers’ behaviors). Last but not least, patrons’ behaviors are much simplified, which would be not well justified in cases having common lines, alternative travel modes, heterogeneous patrons with respect to their values of times, etc. Some of these limitations promise extensions. Select topics are under exploration.
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