



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

**Valuing travel time variability:
Characteristics of the travel time
distribution on an urban road**

Fosgerau, Mogens and Fukuda, Daisuke

Technical University of Denmark, Tokyo Institute of Technology

2010

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/49149/>
MPRA Paper No. 49149, posted 20 Aug 2013 11:08 UTC

Valuing travel time variability: Characteristics of the travel time distribution on an urban road

Mogens Fosgerau^{a,b}, Daisuke Fukuda^{*,c}

^aTechnical University of Denmark, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

^bCentre for Transport Studies, Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

^cTokyo Institute of Technology, O-okayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, Japan

Abstract

Fosgerau and Karlström [The value of reliability. *Transportation Research Part B*, Vol. 43 (8–9), pp. 813–820, 2010] presented a derivation of the value of travel time variability (VTTV) with a number of desirable properties. This definition of the VTTV depends on certain properties of the distribution of random travel times that require empirical verification. This paper therefore provides a detailed empirical investigation of the distribution of travel times on an urban road. Applying a range of nonparametric statistical techniques to data giving minute-by-minute travel times for a congested urban road over a period of five months, we show that the standardized travel time is roughly independent of the time of day as required by the theory. Except for the extreme right tail, a stable distribution seems to fit the data well. The travel time distributions on consecutive links seem to share a common stability parameter such that the travel time distribution for a sequence of links is also a stable distribution. The parameters of the travel time distribution for a sequence of links can then be derived analytically from the link level distributions.

Key words: value of travel time variability, travel time distribution, nonparametrics, stable distributions

1. Introduction

Travel time variability (TTV) is increasingly recognized as an important issue in the economic appraisal of transport infrastructure investment as well as transport policies such as road pricing. The importance of reducing TTV on urban and interurban roads is considered a major objective

*Corresponding author. Address: Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 2-12-1, O-okayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo, 152-8552 Japan. Tel.: +81 3 5734 2577; fax: +81 3 5734 3578.

Email addresses: mf@transport.dtu.dk (Mogens Fosgerau), fukuda@plan.cv.titech.ac.jp (Daisuke Fukuda)
Preprint submitted to Transportation Research Part C *August 7, 2010*

5 of transport policy. The traveler's marginal value of TTV, often called the value of travel time
6 variability (VTTV), should therefore play a significant role in project evaluation. This paper
7 contributes to this aim by investigating the empirical validity of assumptions underlying a recent
8 theoretical derivation of the VTTV based on scheduling costs.

9 There are two broad modeling approaches to the travelers' valuation of TTV. The first is
10 commonly referred to as the mean–variance approach. This approach incorporates the effects of
11 TTV into utility or cost functions of travelers simply by taking the standard deviation or some
12 other measure of the scale of travel time variability as an argument, jointly with mean travel time.
13 Because of its simplicity, the mean–variance approach has been widely used ([Small et al. 2005](#);
14 [Brownstone and Small 2005](#); [Lam and Small 2001](#), among others). The mean–variance approach
15 has however been criticized on various grounds. A main criticism is that it does not take that shape
16 of the travel time distribution into account. Another important criticism is that the standard
17 deviation of travel time is not an outcome of a trip. Economic theory generally defines utility
18 directly over outcomes.

19 The main alternative is the scheduling approach, originally proposed by [Small \(1982\)](#) and
20 extended to random travel times by [Noland and Small \(1995\)](#), [Noland \(1997\)](#) and [Noland et al.
21 \(1998\)](#). The scheduling approach defines travel cost directly over outcomes, which is an advantage
22 relative to the mean–variance approach. The scheduling approach assumes that the travelers' cost
23 function depends in a certain way on travel time and on the arrival time relative to a preferred
24 arrival time. Given knowledge of departure time, the distribution of travel times and the preferred
25 arrival time, it is possible to evaluate a measure of expected travel cost that includes scheduling
26 considerations. However, direct application of the scheduling cost function requires knowledge of
27 the departure time and the preferred arrival time, which may be unavailable.

28 The assumption that travelers choose departure time optimally may replace the information
29 on departure time and preferred arrival time. The resulting measure of expected travel cost was
30 derived for a few special travel time distributions by [Bates et al. \(2001\)](#) and [Noland and Polak
31 \(2002\)](#) when the travel time distribution does not depend on the departure time. It turns out that
32 the scheduling model becomes equivalent to the mean–variance approach in these cases. These
33 results depend, however, on specific and unrealistic assumptions concerning the distribution of
34 random travel time.

35 Recently, Fosgerau and Karlström (2010) generalized these earlier results to the case where the
36 distribution of travel times is arbitrary. Fosgerau and Karlström (2010) proved that the minimized
37 expected cost of commuters is linear in the mean travel time and a scale measure of the travel time
38 distribution, irrespective of the shape of the travel time distribution, provided that the travel
39 time distribution does not depend on the departure time. Under the assumptions of their model
40 (henceforth the FK model), the VTTV is given in terms of travelers' marginal cost of schedule delay
41 and the average time late under the optimal departure time. The average time late is determined
42 by the travelers' preferences and the distribution of travel times. The FK measure of VTTV may
43 remain a good approximation when the mean and the scale of the travel time distribution depends
44 on the time of day. Starting with observations of travel time, subtracting the mean and dividing
45 by the scale of the travel time distribution at each time of day leaves the standardized travel time
46 distribution. FK extended their result as an approximation when the standardized travel time
47 distribution does not depend on the departure time.

48 This background motivates the present paper, which aims to carry out a check of the empirical
49 validity of the FK assumptions regarding the distribution of travel times. It should be noted
50 that Fosgerau and Engelson (forthcoming) have developed an alternative approach to modeling
51 the VTTV. This approach is based on another specification of scheduling preferences, derived from
52 Vickrey (1973). The Fosgerau–Engelson measure of VTTV is not sensitive to the shape of the travel
53 time distribution, but like FK it does require that the travel time distribution is independent of
54 the time of day. Furthermore, the choice between the FK model and the Fosgerau–Engelson model
55 should be based on which formulation of scheduling preferences is thought to be the best description
56 of the scheduling preferences of travelers. Hence the investigation of this paper remains relevant
57 in the light of the Fosgerau–Engelson result.

58 The first empirical question investigated in this paper is the validity of the FK assumption that
59 the standardized travel time can be considered to be independent of the travelers' departure time.
60 Independence of the standardized travel time of the time of day is also a great simplification since
61 it becomes unnecessary to account for different travel time distributions at different times of day.
62 In this case, all the variation in the travel time distribution over the day is captured by the mean
63 and the scale of the travel time distribution. If independence does not hold then neither FK nor
64 the Fosgerau – Engelson result is applicable.

65 The next empirical question regards the distribution of standardized travel times. It is use-
66 ful to be able to assume that the travel time distribution belongs to a known parametric family.
67 [Fosgerau and Karlström \(2010\)](#) found in their empirical work on a single road link that the empir-
68 ical distribution of the standardized travel times is asymmetric and fat right-tailed, and far from
69 normal. Furthermore, knowledge of the travel time distribution may facilitate the aggregation of
70 the VTTV from the link level to a sequence of links. A detailed investigation of the distributional
71 properties of standardized travel times has not been carried out. Such an investigation is a further
72 contribution of this paper.

73 We investigate these empirical questions using a large data set comprising observations of travel
74 times on an urban road. We use minute-by-minute observations of average travel times on four
75 consecutive links of a major radial road in Copenhagen, collected over a period of five months.

76 The distribution of travel times on the urban road is analyzed using a range of nonparametric
77 techniques, including mean regression, quantile regression and kernel based estimation of con-
78 ditional distributions. Nonparametric mean regression and quantile regression are employed for
79 computing standardized travel times. The conditional distribution of standardized travel time is
80 estimated to check whether it is independent of time of day.

81 We anticipate that stable distributions (see [Zolotarev \(1986\)](#) and [Nolan \(in press\)](#) for example)
82 describe the distribution of travel times well. The family of stable distributions includes the normal
83 as a special case. In general, this family allows distributions with skewness and heavy tails, as
84 observed in empirical travel time distributions. Stable distributions have two important features.
85 First, they arise as limits in the generalized central limit theorem. Second, the sum of independent
86 stable random variables with a common stability parameter is again stable with the same stability
87 parameter. As explained below, these two features are very attractive in relation to the FK model.
88 In the paper we fit a stable distribution to standardized travel times and estimate the parameters
89 that characterize the stable distribution. The goodness-of-fit for the estimated stable distribution
90 is assessed in various ways and we examine whether the estimated stable distributions for different
91 road links share a common stability parameter.

92 The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides a brief description of the FK model. Section 3
93 explains the methodology used to investigate the statistical properties of travel time distributions.
94 Section 4 presents our data. The empirical analysis is presented in Section 5, while Section 6

95 discusses the empirical results. Finally, Section 7 concludes.

96 2. Overview of the scheduling model

97 This section describes the Fosgerau and Karlström (2010) result concerning travelers' departure
98 time choice under travel time uncertainty and the corresponding measure of VTTV. Consider a
99 traveler about to undertake a certain trip. Without loss of generality, his preferred arrival time at
100 the destination is taken to be zero. The traveler's scheduling cost is defined in terms of random
101 travel time T and head start D . The head start is the duration from the departure time to the
102 preferred arrival time and so the traveler departs at time $-D$.

The traveler is assumed consider a cost function, which depends on travel time, the head start and the lateness of arrival. A monetary travel cost is omitted for simplicity. The cost function is

$$C(D, T) = \eta D + \lambda(T - D)^+ + \omega T,$$

103 where η , λ and ω are parameters, all expected to be positive, and $(T - D)^+ = \max(T - D, 0)$ is
104 the amount of time the traveler arrives late. The first term is the cost associated with departing
105 earlier. The second term is the cost of being late and the third time is the cost of travel time per
106 se.¹ The traveler is assumed to choose head start D to minimize the expected cost.

107 Express the travel time T in the convenient form $T = \mu(t) + \sigma(t)X$, where $\mu(t)$ and $\sigma(t)$ are
108 smooth functions of the departure time t , describing the location and scale of the travel time
109 distribution at this time. We take the location variable μ as the mean travel time. We use the
110 interquartile range as the scale variable σ since this does not require the variance of travel time
111 to exist. We will be considering stable distributions, which generally do not have variance. Define
112 X as standardized travel time with probability density function ϕ and corresponding cumulative
113 distribution function Φ . The standardized travel time distribution ϕ is assumed to be independent
114 of D .

115 Fosgerau and Karlström (2010) first analyzed the case of constant μ and σ , and then extended
116 to the case where they are variable. In the simple case, the expected cost becomes linear in μ and

¹The present formulation is equivalent to the often used α, β, γ formulation, see Fosgerau and Karlström (2010), but is arguably more intuitive in that it has a cost of departing early rather than a cost of arriving early at the destination.

117 σ when travelers choose departure time to minimize expected cost. Thus, the scheduling model
 118 is equivalent to the mean–variance model. In the more general case where both μ and σ depend
 119 linearly on D , the expected cost is more complicated. Even so, the result of the first simple case
 120 can still be used as an approximation of the second case. This is briefly described in the next two
 121 subsections.

122 2.1. Constant mean and scale of travel times

123 First, we consider the case where μ and σ are constant. The traveler selects D to minimize
 124 expected cost.

$$EC^* = \min_D EC(D, T) = \min_D \left[\eta D + \lambda \int_{\frac{D-\mu}{\sigma}}^{\infty} (\mu + \sigma x - D) \phi(x) dx + \omega \mu \right]. \quad (1)$$

125 Because the expected cost function is globally concave, the optimization problem (1) has a unique
 126 minimum and the optimal head start is given by

$$D = \mu + \sigma \Phi^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\lambda} \right). \quad (2)$$

Thus the optimal head start is linear in the location μ and the scale σ of the travel time distribution.
 The minimal expected cost is found by substituting (2) into (1) as

$$EC^* = (\eta + \omega) \mu + \lambda \sigma \int_{1-\frac{\eta}{\lambda}}^1 \Phi^{-1}(\nu) d\nu.$$

127 Now, define the functional H as:

$$H \left(\Phi, \frac{\eta}{\lambda} \right) = \int_{1-\frac{\eta}{\lambda}}^1 \Phi^{-1}(\nu) d\nu. \quad (3)$$

128 Note that σH is the mean lateness, such that H is the mean lateness in standardized travel time.

129 We can rewrite the minimal expected cost as

$$EC^* = (\eta + \omega) \mu + \lambda H \left(\Phi, \frac{\eta}{\lambda} \right) \sigma. \quad (4)$$

130 The minimal expected cost is also linear in μ and σ for a given $H(\cdot)$. The H can be computed for
 131 a given standardized travel time distribution Φ and a traveler's scheduling preference η/λ .

132 The first term in (4) represents the cost of the mean travel time and the coefficient $(\eta + \omega)$ is
 133 the value of travel time. The second term represents the cost caused by the TTV and the VTTV
 134 is $\lambda H \left(\Phi, \frac{\eta}{\lambda} \right)$. The VTTV depends on the scheduling preference parameters (η and λ) and on the

135 standardized distribution of travel time Φ . The expected cost is linear in the mean and scale of
136 travel time for *any* fixed standardized travel time distribution Φ . This is a highly desirable property
137 for empirical application of the FK model as it makes it very easy to compute the expected cost
138 of trips subject to travel time risk.

139 *2.2. Time-varying mean and scale of travel times*

140 The assumption that the mean and the scale of the travel time distribution are constant over
141 the time of day is not true in general. There is often pronounced systematic variation in travel
142 times over the day caused by systematic variation in traffic demand. This means that both μ and
143 σ will depend on the time of day. This does not exclude the possibility that the standardized travel
144 time distribution is independent of the time of day. Fosgerau and Karlström (2010) extended the
145 constant mean and scale model to the case where the mean travel time μ and the scale σ vary
146 linearly with the time of day D . The distribution of the standardized travel time is still required
147 to be independent of the time of day. In this case they found that the value of travel time is
148 exactly the same as in the simple case but the expression for the VTTV is more complicated.
149 They also showed that the VTTV for the case of a linearly varying mean and scale of travel time
150 distribution can be approximated well using the VTTV for the case of constant mean and scale.
151 They demonstrated in their empirical example, using the same data set as in the present paper,
152 that the approximation error of the VTTV is relatively small. This result implies that it is still
153 possible to use the result based on the constant mean and the scale of travel time to measure
154 approximately the VTTV for time-varying mean and scale of travel times.

155 *2.3. Remarks on the use of the theoretical model in empirical applications*

156 The FK model is useful to define and compute the VTTV because it applies for any standardized
157 travel time distribution. It is, however, important to note that the FK model requires that the
158 standardized travel time distribution is constant over the time of day.² With this assumption,
159 the VTTV for the time-varying mean and scale of travel times can be approximated. Hence, it is
160 important to check empirically whether this independence assumption holds for actual travel time
161 distributions.

²It is not ruled out that it is possible to establish a similar result that relaxes this condition but it has not been done.

162 Trips generally cover a sequence of links whereas travel time data are often recorded at the
163 link level. So another issue in the application of the FK model in practice arises from the need for
164 aggregating the VTTV from link to route level. This can be achieved in a simple way, if additional
165 distributional assumptions on standardized travel times are satisfied. First, independence of travel
166 times across links is very convenient. Second, we conjecture that standardized travel times can be
167 described by stable distributions as explained in the next section. If this distributional assumption
168 is plausible and if one parameter for a stable distribution is common across different road links,
169 then addition of TTV across links becomes simple. We examine these issues empirically in the
170 following sections.

171 3. Analytical framework

172 In this section, we explain the use of some nonparametric techniques to check whether the
173 standardized travel time is independent of the time of day. We also examine the goodness of fit of
174 the computed standardized travel time to the stable distributions. Express random travel time as
175 a function of the time of day by

$$T_t = \mu(t) + \sigma(t)X_t, \quad (5)$$

where $E(X_t) = 0$ and $\sigma(t)$ is the interquartile range of travel time at time t . This is always possible.
More precisely, the two functions are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(t) &= E[T|t] \quad \text{and} \\ \sigma(t) &= F_T^{-1}(0.75|t) - F_T^{-1}(0.25|t), \end{aligned}$$

176 where F_T^{-1} denotes the inverse of the distribution function of travel times conditional on the time
177 of day.

178 In the following subsections, we outline nonparametric techniques to estimate $\mu(t)$ and $\sigma(t)$,
179 which are associated with standardized travel time X_t . We estimate nonparametrically the loca-
180 tion function $\mu(t)$ using conditional mean regression, and the scale function $\sigma(t)$ using conditional
181 quantile regression. Nonparametric regression models, including mean, variance and quantile re-
182 gressions, employ minimal constraints on the functional form of the relationship between relevant
183 variables. Introductions to nonparametric econometrics and statistics are provided by, e.g., [Härdle](#)
184 [\(1990\)](#), [Pagan and Ullah \(1999\)](#) and [Li and Racine \(2007\)](#).

185 *3.1. Nonparametric conditional mean regression*

186 To compute the standardized travel time conditional on the time of day, we first have to estimate
 187 the conditional mean travel time as a measure of the location of the travel time distribution. Let
 188 (T_i, t_i) be a bivariate random sample of n observations ($i = 1, \dots, n$). Suppose that observations
 189 are distributed over time of day with density $p(t)$. Assume that the sample realizations are i.i.d.
 190 The i.i.d. assumption for the sample realizations means that we disregard serial dependence among
 191 travel times for consecutive times of day. This is justified by noting that travelers are assumed to
 192 consider the travel time distributions over all time periods. Our analysis aims not at travel time
 193 prediction, but at estimating the travel time distribution conditional on a given time of day.

We begin by considering the regression model:

$$T_i = \mu(t_i) + \epsilon_i \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

194 where $\mu(\cdot)$ is a smooth function of unknown form, and ϵ_i is an i.i.d. error term. We estimate
 195 $\mu(\cdot)$ nonparametrically using local constant kernel estimation. The function $\mu(t)$ is estimated by
 196 forming a weighted average of T_i around t as

$$\hat{\mu}(t) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n T_i K\left(\frac{t_i - t}{h_t}\right)}{\hat{p}(t)}, \quad (6)$$

where h_t is the bandwidth corresponding to the time of day, $K(\cdot)$ is a kernel, and $\hat{p}(t) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{t_i - t}{h_t}\right)$
 is the kernel density estimator of $p(t)$. The bandwidth h_t determines the size of the neighborhood
 over which an average is taken. The selection of h_t is explained later. We use a standard normal
 kernel throughout the paper.

$$K(u) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{u^2}{2}\right), \quad -\infty < u < +\infty.$$

The asymptotic normality of the estimated $\hat{\mu}(t)$ is generally guaranteed (Li and Racine 2007,
 p. 63) and we can compute the confidence intervals of the mean regression using the following
 relationship :

$$(nh_t)^{1/2} [\hat{\mu}(t) - \mu(t)] \sim \mathcal{N}\left(0, \sigma^2(t) \hat{p}^{-1}(t) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K^2(u) du\right),$$

197 where $\sigma^2(t)$ is the variance of travel times conditional on a given time of day t .³ This is estimated

³See Pagan and Ullah (1999) for the derivation. The empirical travel time distribution has variance since travel times are bounded. Later, we shall use approximate the travel time distribution by a stable distribution for which the variance does not exist.

198 by performing a nonparametric mean regression of squared residuals $(T_i - \hat{\mu}(t_i))^2$ against time of
 199 day using the bandwidth from the mean regression. Note that $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K^2(u)du = \frac{1}{2\pi^2}$ for the standard
 200 normal kernel.

201 3.2. Estimating the scale of the travel time distribution

202 It is common to use the standard deviation (the square root of the variance) as a measure of
 203 the scale when standardizing stochastic variables. However, stable distributions, which we will
 204 consider, do not have a second moment in general. Thus, the standard deviation (or variance) may
 205 not exist. Therefore we use the interquartile range (denoted as *IQR*) as measure of the scale. This
 206 leads us to compute quantiles of the travel time distribution conditional on the time of day.

207 We first present the estimation of a conditional cumulative distribution function (“conditional
 208 distribution” hereafter) because the quantile function is obtained by inverting the conditional
 209 distribution.⁴

210 3.2.1. Nonparametric conditional distribution

211 The nonparametric kernel estimator of a conditional distribution is analogous to the local con-
 212 stant estimator of the conditional mean regression outlined in Section 3.1. We denote a conditional
 213 distribution function of T given t as $F(T|t)$. It is estimated without imposing any restrictive
 214 functional forms. The estimated conditional distribution is given by

$$\hat{F}(T|t) = \frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n L\left(\frac{T-T_i}{h_T}\right) K\left(\frac{t_i-t}{h_t}\right)}{\hat{p}(t)}, \quad (7)$$

215 where $L(\cdot)$ is a kernel distribution function defined as $L(v) = \int_{-\infty}^v K(u)du$ and h_T denotes the
 216 smoothing bandwidth associated with travel times. The estimated conditional distribution is in-
 217 creasing by construction. We use the standard normal distribution for the kernel function $L(\cdot)$.

218 3.2.2. Nonparametric quantile regression

219 Once a conditional distribution function is estimated, it is straightforward to derive a condi-
 220 tional quantile function. The conditional ρ -quantile, $q_\rho(\cdot)$ with $\rho \in (0, 1)$ is defined using the inverse

⁴We estimate the conditional distribution of travel time against the time of day. Another use for the nonparametric conditional distribution is to check the independence of the standardized travel time over the time of day. This is described later.

221 of the conditional distribution

$$q_\rho(t) = \inf \{T : F(T|t) \geq \rho\} = F^{-1}(\rho|t). \quad (8)$$

The estimate $\hat{q}_\rho(t)$ of $q_\rho(t)$ is computed using

$$\hat{q}_\rho(t) = \arg \min_q |\rho - \hat{F}(q|t)|,$$

222 where $\hat{F}(q|t)$ is taken from (7).

223 Finally, the interquartile range of the travel time T conditional on the time of day t is estimated,
 224 using the estimated quantile functions, by $I\hat{Q}R(t) = \hat{q}_{0.75}(t) - \hat{q}_{0.25}(t)$. We use this expression to
 225 estimate the scale function $\sigma(t)$.

226 3.3. Conditional distribution of the standardized travel time

227 Once the location and the scale functions in (5) are estimated, standardized travel times are
 228 computed simply by $X_i = (T_i - \hat{\mu}(t_i))/\hat{\sigma}(t_i)$ for each observation. For the purpose of checking the
 229 independence of the standardized travel times over the time of day, we have to examine the overall
 230 shape of the standardized travel time distribution conditional on time of day. As in Section 3.2.1
 231 for the case of the conditional travel time distribution, the conditional standardized travel time
 232 distribution $G(x|t)$ is estimated by

$$\hat{G}(x|t) = \frac{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n L\left(\frac{x-x_i}{h_X}\right) K\left(\frac{t_i-t}{h_t}\right)}{\hat{p}(t)}, \quad (9)$$

233 where h_X is the bandwidth associated with standardized travel times.

234 Given values of h_X and h_t , it is easy to compute the conditional distribution with (9). Fur-
 235 thermore, it is possible to inspect the overall shape of the conditional probability density or the
 236 conditional distribution by drawing graphs such as contours or iso-quantiles of the probabilities.
 237 Recall that the FK model requires that the standardized travel time distribution is independent of
 238 the time of day. In this case, the contours of the distribution would be completely horizontal. We
 239 use this fact as an informal check of the independence. ⁵

⁵It is also possible to use cross-validation for the conditional distribution/density to detect whether the time of day is relevant to the standardized travel times, though the computation of cross-validation is generally very time consuming for large data sets. See Hall et al. (2004) and Li and Racine (2007) for details. Ichimura and Fukuda (2010) have developed a faster method for computing least-squares cross-validations for nonparametric conditional kernel density functions.

240 *3.4. Bandwidth selection*

241 While nonparametric kernel estimation is relatively insensitive to the choice of kernel, the
 242 choice of bandwidths does have significant effect on results. The time of day is binned by minute
 243 in our data, which means that observations do not become dense on the time axis as the number
 244 of observations increases. This violates the assumption of cross-validation methods. We therefore
 245 determine the bandwidths for the mean and interquartile range regressions using the plug-in method
 246 (Pagan and Ullah, 1999; Li and Racine, 2007). This method seeks relatively larger bandwidths
 247 than cross-validation methods for our large data set and this smoothes out some less credible
 248 fluctuations of the estimated travel time curves.⁶

249 The plug-in bandwidths with respect to the time of day in nonparametric mean regressions are
 250 given by

$$h_t^{plug,m} = 1.06\sigma_t n^{-1/5}, \quad (10)$$

251 where σ_t , the standard deviation of travel times in the population, is replaced by the sample
 252 standard deviation.

The plug-in bandwidths in the nonparametric conditional distribution, which are used for
 estimating the interquartile curves, are computed as

$$\begin{aligned} h_t^{plug,cd} &= 1.06\sigma_t n^{-1/6} \quad \text{and} \\ h_T^{plug,cd} &= 1.06\sigma_T n^{-1/6}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

253 where σ_T is the standard deviation of travel times, and also estimated by the sample standard
 254 deviation.

⁶We did attempt to use the bandwidths selected by cross-validation. (See Li and Racine (2007) for cross-validation of bandwidths: their chapter 2 for the mean regression and chapter 6 for the conditional distribution and quantile regression.) However, the bandwidths for the time of day (h_t) in the mean regressions from the least squares cross-validation turned out to be less than three minutes for our all data sets. Furthermore, we found that the bandwidths of travel times in the quantile regressions (h_T), which were computed using log-likelihood cross validation for the conditional distribution, were around 0.1 minutes, which is less than the bin-width of 1 minute. These very small bandwidths lead to unlikely patterns of the estimated mean and interquartile range of travel times. For example, we observed many large bumps in the mean or interquartile range of travel time, which might be caused by a small number of incidents that occurred during the observation period. Hence, we find that the cross-validation method tends to select unreasonably small bandwidths for our large data sets. For this reason we do not use cross-validation to compute an exact test of independence.

255 3.5. Fitting stable distributions to standardized travel times

256 Consider now the case where we accept the independence of the standardized travel times of the
257 time of day. We next investigate whether a stable distribution fits the data. This section presents
258 some basic properties of stable distributions.

259 Stable distributions allow asymmetry (skewness) of the probability density and heavy fat tails
260 that would be caused by rare events with extreme values. The class of stable distributions en-
261 compasses the Gaussian normal, Lévy and Cauchy distributions as special cases (Zolotarev, 1986;
262 Nolan, in press). A univariate random variable X with a stable distribution is described by four
263 parameters as $X \sim S(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$. The parameters are a stability parameter $\alpha \in (0, 2]$, a skewness
264 parameter $\beta \in [-1, 1]$, a scale parameter $\gamma > 0$ and a location parameter $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$. The stability
265 parameter α governs the tail behavior of the distribution; the tail becomes heavier as α decreases.
266 The parameter β describes the degree of skewness. In the case of $\beta = -1$, the distribution is
267 maximally skewed to the left and vice versa for the case of $\beta = 1$. The distribution is symmetric
268 when $\beta = 0$. The parameter γ determines the scale of the distribution, but it is not equivalent to
269 the standard deviation. The location parameter δ is not generally the mean.

270 *Stability property.* A favorable characteristic of stable distributions for our analysis is the stability
271 property. This property implies that the sum of independent stable random variables also follows
272 a stable distribution if (and only if) they share a common stability parameter α . The convo-
273 luted distribution shares the same stability parameter and expressions exist to compute the other
274 parameters.

Let $T^j \sim S(\alpha, \beta^j, \gamma^j, \delta^j)$, $j = 1, \dots, J$ be J mutually independent random variables that follow
stable distributions with common stability parameter α . In our analysis, these random variables
would correspond to the travel times for a set of consecutive road links. The average of the
independent stable random variables $\bar{T} = (1/J) \sum_{j=1}^J T^j$ also follows a stable distribution (Nolan,
in press). The distribution of the average of these random variables is

$$\bar{T} \sim S(\alpha, \bar{\beta}, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\delta}),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\beta} &= \frac{\sum_{j=1}^J \beta^j |\gamma^j/J|^\alpha}{\sum_{j=J}^m |\gamma^j/J|^\alpha}, \\
\bar{\gamma} &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^J |\gamma^j/J|^\alpha \right)^{1/\alpha}, \\
\bar{\delta} &= \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^J \delta^j/J + (\tan \frac{\pi\alpha}{2}) \left[\bar{\beta}\bar{\gamma} - \sum_{j=1}^J \beta^j \gamma^j/J \right] & (\alpha \neq 1) \\ \sum_{j=1}^J \delta^j/J + \frac{2}{\pi} \left[\bar{\beta}\bar{\gamma} \log \bar{\gamma} - \sum_{j=1}^J \beta^j \gamma^j/J \log |\gamma^j/J| \right] & (\alpha = 1) \end{cases}.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

275 It is useful for our purposes to note that linear combinations of stable random variables with
276 the same stability parameter α is also stable with the same α . In particular, if $\sigma \neq 0$ and
277 $X \sim S(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$, then $\sigma X \sim S(\alpha, \text{sign}(\sigma)\beta, |\sigma|\gamma, \sigma\delta)$. We check the equivalence of the stabil-
278 ity parameters among different road links in the empirical analysis. If their estimates are not
279 significantly different, we could convolute standardized travel time distributions for a set of road
280 links. For example, if two travel times are distributed as $\mu_1 + \sigma_1 X_1$ and $\mu_2 + \sigma_2 X_2$, where X_1 and
281 X_2 are stable with the same α , then the distribution of the sum is readily computed.

282 *Generalized central limit theorem.* Another important property of stable distributions is the role
283 they play in the generalized central limit theorem (GCLT). The classical central limit theorem states
284 that the normalized sum of independent random variables with finite variances weakly converges to
285 a standard normal distribution as the number of variables increases. [Gnedenko and Kolmogorov](#)
286 [\(1954\)](#) generalized this idea to the case where random variables have infinite variances. Roughly
287 speaking, the GCLT implies that the only possible limiting distribution of the normalized sum of
288 any independent random variables is stable ([Zolotarev, 1986](#); [Nolan, in press](#)).

289 Now, it is not difficult to imagine an urban road network with a large number of links where
290 the associated standardized travel times might have heavy right tails because of a very few, but
291 serious incidents. The distributions of standardized travel times might be obviously different from
292 normal because they seem to be skewed to the right and fat tailed. The GCLT assures that as the
293 sums of standardized travel times for these links accumulate over a long-range period, they might
294 converge to a stable distribution. This would enable estimation of the standardized travel time
295 distributions corresponding to some routes and further improve the measurement of the VTTV at
296 the route level.

297 There exist closed-form expressions of stable distributions only for some special cases with some
 298 specific parameterizations (e.g., Gaussian normal [$\alpha = 2$], Cauchy [$\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 0$] and Lévy
 299 [$\alpha = 0.5$ and $\beta = 1$]). In general, there are no explicit forms for stable densities or distributions. On
 300 the other hand, it is possible to express explicitly the characteristic function $\phi(\tau) = E(\exp(i\tau X))$
 301 for any stable distribution.

302 Zolotarev’s (M) parameterization (Zolotarev, 1986) is preferable for numerical purposes because
 303 the characteristic functions, densities and distribution function are jointly continuous in all four
 304 parameters (Nolan, in press). With this parameterization, the characteristic function is expressed
 305 as:

$$\phi(\tau) = \begin{cases} \exp \left\{ -\gamma^\alpha |\tau|^\alpha \left[1 + i\beta (\text{sign}\tau) \left(\tan \frac{\pi\alpha}{2} \right) \left((\gamma|\tau|)^{1-\alpha} - 1 \right) \right] + i\delta\tau \right\} & (\alpha \neq 1) \\ \exp \left\{ -\gamma |\tau| \left[1 + i\beta (\text{sign}\tau) \tan \frac{\pi}{2} (\ln |\tau| + \ln \gamma) \right] + i\delta\tau \right\} & (\alpha = 1) \end{cases}. \quad (13)$$

306 The function $\phi(\tau)$ characterizes the stable distribution of X . Based on (13), Nolan (1997) gave
 307 a computational formula for spline approximation to stable densities and also developed program
 308 code to compute numerically the density function of a general one-dimensional stable distribution.
 309 Nolan (2001) outlined a procedure of maximum likelihood for estimating stable parameters by
 310 approximation with a numerical quadrature. ⁷

311 4. Data

312 This section describes the traffic data used for the analysis. All data are provided by the
 313 TRIM system of the Danish Road Directorate. ⁸ They measure the speed and traffic flows on
 314 some consecutive congested links of the Danish road network using cameras and automatic vehicle
 315 identification (number plate matching).

316 The *Frederikssundsvej* data are recorded on four consecutive links with a total length of 11.263
 317 km. It is a main radial road in Greater Copenhagen connecting the city center and the north-west
 318 region. Figure 1 shows the location of the targeted road.

319 The data comprise minute-by-minute observations of average travel time on each link over
 320 about five months. We use data from weekdays between 6 a.m. and 10 p.m. during the period
 321 16th January to 8th May, 2007, in the direction toward Copenhagen.

⁷The program package has already been implemented as “STABLE” (Robust Analysis, Inc., 2006). We use this package for our empirical analysis.

⁸“TRIM” is the Danish acronym for “Traffic Management on the Motorways around Copenhagen”.

322 The road consists of four links: (1) Måløv Byvej; (2) Ballerup Byvej; (3) Herlev Hovedgade;
323 and (4) Frederikssundsvej. We also analyze data concerning traffic that passes through all four
324 consecutive links (5). Table 1 reports summary statistics of travel time data together with the com-
325 puted plug-in bandwidths that were explained in the previous section. We also present summary
326 statistics of travel time for each link in Table 2.

327 5. Empirical results and discussion

328 This section describes our empirical analysis for travel time distribution. All computations
329 are carried out using Ox (Doornik, 2001), R (R Development Core Team, 2007) and STABLE
330 (Robust Analysis, Inc., 2006).



Figure 1: Targeted link of the urban road in Copenhagen (Frederikssundsvej)

Table 1: Outline of the urban road, observations and the computed plug-in bandwidths

Link ID	Direction	Length (km)	Obs.	$h_T^{plug,m}$	$h_T^{plug,cd}$	$h_t^{plug,cd}$
1	A → B	2.725	60669	32.9	47.5	0.162
2	B → C	3.279	59950	32	46.1	0.406
3	C → D	2.508	57759	32.1	46.2	0.183
4	D → E	2.751	54462	32.6	46.9	0.339
5	A → E	11.263	24271	37.9	53.1	0.895


Note: The unit for plug-in bandwidths is minute.

Table 2: Summary statistics of travel times (in minutes)


Link ID	Mean	S.D.	Min.	L.Q.	Median	U.Q.	Max.
1	2.967	0.957	0.98	2.49	2.69	3.14	24.6
2	4.854	2.395	1.55	3.45	3.94	5.22	27.4
3	3.037	1.074	0.1	2.38	2.66	3.3	19.5
4	4.442	1.967	1.4	3.16	3.84	5.05	28.59
5	15.399	4.543	8.76	12.15	13.83	17.67	47.5

331 5.1. Mean and scale regressions


332 Figure 2 shows the nonparametric kernel regression of mean travel time together with 95%
333 confidence bands (upper panels) and the estimated interquartile range of travel times (lower panels)
334 over the time of day. Both curves are smoothed using the plug-in bandwidths defined by (10) for
335 mean and (11) for the interquartile range. In the two road links further from downtown (Figure 2
336 (a) and (b)), we see that there are distinct travel time peaks in the morning period. In contrast,
337 the remaining links closer to the city center (Figure 2 (c) and (d)) show a peak in the mean travel
338 time around 5 p.m. that would be caused by daily traffic congestion around the city center in
339 the evening hours. As for the traffic data that ran the whole links (Figure 2 (e)), we only see the
340 morning peak of the mean travel time. The narrow confidence bands for the mean travel time
341 curves indicate that μ is quite precisely estimated because of our large data set.




(a) Link 1




(b) Link 2



(c) Link 3




(d) Link 4




(e) Link 5

Figure 2: Mean regression (upper) and interquartile range regression (lower) of travel time over time of day




(a) Link 1

(b) Link 2



(c) Link 3

(d) Link 4



(e) Link 5

Figure 3: Scatter plot of mean and interquartile of travel times

342 In Figure 2, we see clear variation in $IQR(t)$ over the time of day. We also confirm the clear
343 correlation between μ and IQR as it is evident from the scatter plot of IQR against μ in Figure
344 3. There are significant positive correlations between μ and IQR meaning that the larger the
345 mean travel time, the larger the variation in travel time. In many cases, we also find that: (1) the
346 variation in travel time measured as the interquartile range increases more slowly than the mean
347 travel time; (2) they almost simultaneously reach their maximum in the peak period; and (3) the
348 mean travel time decreases faster than the scale of it after the peak period.⁹

349 5.2. Checking the standardized travel times conditional on time of day


350 Next, we standardize the travel times following the procedure described in Section 3.3. Figure 4
351 presents the contours of the conditional CDFs of standardized travel time over the time of day.
352 Each horizontal curve corresponds to a computed quantile (10% to 90%) of the standardized travel
353 time on a given time of day. If standardized travel time is strictly independent of the time of day,
354 all contour lines would be completely horizontal. We find that most of the estimated contour lines
355 in every road link seem to be roughly horizontal across the day. In some road links, there exist
356 infrequent but very big incidents such as serious traffic accidents, which result in extremely large
357 travel times. The corresponding standardized travel time is large and this creates bumps of the
358 contour lines of the larger quantiles in Figure 4, particularly during the morning or evening periods
359 of traffic congestion. Although we see some unevenness in the contour lines for the larger (e.g.,
360 90%) quantile, most of the contour lines seem to be about parallel. Hence, the essential assumption
361 in the FK model that the standardized travel time is independent of the time of day would not be
362 inappropriate to make as a rough approximation.

363 5.3. Density estimation of standardized travel times


364 Now we are able to estimate the unconditional standardized travel time distribution. We
365 estimate the four parameters characterizing stable distributions using the numerical maximum
366 likelihood estimation method (Nolan, 1997). The estimation procedure is carried out separately
367 for each road link.

368 Table 3 outlines the estimation results. We also show the maximum likelihood estimates of the
369 stable parameters for the data for the whole link (link 5) in the table. In every link, the estimates


⁹Fosgerau (2010) shows how this pattern arises due to the dynamics of congestion.




(a) Link 1




(b) Link 2



(c) Link 3



(d) Link 4



(e) Link 5

Figure 4: Conditional distribution of standardized travel times

Table 3: Estimated stable parameters


Link	α	β	γ	δ	LL_{\max}	LL_{\max}^{α}	$-2(LL_{\max}^{\alpha} - LL_{\max})$	p -value	Obs.
1	1.1585	0.8824	0.3265	-0.528	-67600.5	-67605.2	9.43	0.002	60669
2	1.113	0.9089	0.2825	-0.5181	-59883.1	-59890.2	14.2	0.0002	59950
3	1.1385	0.9172	0.3153	-0.484	-61490.8	-61491.2	0.823	0.360	57759
4	1.118	0.99	0.3043	-0.4762	-55424.1	-55428.3	8.4	0.004	54462
5	1.3	1	0.3049	-0.3785	-21940.4	–	–	–	24271

of the four stable parameters are statistically significant. All estimated stability parameters ($\hat{\alpha}$) are significantly less than two (normal distribution), showing leptokurtosis in standardized travel times. If $0 < \alpha < 1$, the first moment of the stable distribution diverges to infinity. On the contrary, all of our estimates of the α s are significantly greater than one.


All estimates of the skewness parameter (β) are close to one: the upper bounds of the skewness parameter in stable distributions. This means that the estimated stable distributions are very skewed to the right. The estimates of the location parameter (δ) take similar negative values and the estimated scale parameter (γ) are also close to each other. The fitted stable distributions for these four consecutive links are shown in Figure 5 together with the data histogram. The bin width of each histogram is given by $3.5\sigma_X/n^{1/3}$ which is known as “Scott’s choice rule” (Scott, 1979). The representation of data sets as histograms shows heavy tails on the right.

In Table 3, we observe that the estimated $\hat{\alpha}$ for the four consecutive links (1–4) take similar values with an average average of $\bar{\alpha} = 1/4 \sum_{j=1}^4 \hat{\alpha}_j = 1.1320$. We conduct a likelihood ratio test to check the equality of the stable parameter α across the four road links. To do this, we compute the maximal log likelihood of stable distributions (LL_{\max}^{α}) under the restriction that $\alpha = \bar{\alpha}$ and compute the test statistic $-2(LL_{\max}^{\alpha} - LL_{\max})$ as shown in Table 3. Because of the very large sample size, the statistical power in our empirical analysis is quite strong. Hence, the null hypothesis that the stable parameter is equal to $\bar{\alpha}$ is rejected even at the 0.1% significance level ($< \chi_{d.f.=1}^2 = 10.83$), except for link 2. We conclude that difference is statistically significant but not large.


We sketch the overall shapes of the estimated density curves in Figure 5. It seems that the estimated densities plots provide us with a stable distribution. Although the plotting results are likely to indicate the stability of the standardized travel time, it is less informative on the behavior




(a) Link 1



(b) Link 2



(c) Link 3



(d) Link 4

Figure 5: Fitting standardized travel times to stable distributions

392 of the tail probabilities. Figures 6 and 7 show variance stabilized P–P (probability–probability)
 393 plots (Michael, 1983) and Q–Q (quantile–quantile) plots of each data set respectively. Because too
 394 many data points add little to the plots, we show thinned P–P and Q–Q plots with 1,000 values.
 395 Nolan (2001) recommended using the variance stabilized P–P plots instead of standard P–P plots
 396 arguing that the use of the variance stabilized P–P plot is better than the standard P–P plot
 397 because it detects a poor fit near the extremes of the data.


398 The variance stabilized P–P plots show a reasonable fit around the modes for all data. However,
 399 we see in Figure 6 that there is a slight discrepancy between the data and the fitted distributions
 400 around the tail probabilities (i.e., 0 or 1) in all road links. This is more distinctive in the Q–Q
 401 plots in Figure 7. It can be seen that there is too much mass in the stable tails compared to the
 402 empirical distribution.

403 5.4. Computing H


404 We further compute the value of the functional H , defined by (3) for various values of η/λ under
 405 different distributional assumptions on standardized travel times. We consider three distributions:
 406 (1) normal; (2) empirical; and (3) stable. We compute H for the normal distributions using
 407 the sample mean and standard deviation for each road link. The H for stable distributions are
 408 computed on the basis of the maximum likelihood estimates of stable parameters shown in Figure
 409 3.¹⁰ The result of the computation is illustrated in Figure 8. Figure 8 also contains the results of
 410 some modified H s corresponding to truncations of the fitted stable distributions (see Section 6.2
 411 later).

412 Figure 8 summarizes the result of computing H . There are differences in H by distributional
 413 assumptions as well as across different road segments. The changes in H for different η/λ under
 414 normality are more distinctive than the other two distributional assumptions. For example, the
 415 normal H for $\eta/\lambda = 0.5$ in the road link 1 is 0.538. This is nearly 1.54 times larger than the
 416 empirical H for $\eta/\lambda = 0.5$. On the contrary, the normal H for $\eta/\lambda = 0.05$ in the road link 1 is
 417 0.140 and smaller than the empirical H for $\eta/\lambda = 0.05$. Similar tendencies can be seen in other
 418 road links. On the other hand, H for the empirical and the stable distribution do not change so
 419 much with η/λ .


¹⁰The numerical integral in (3) for normality and stability is computed using the trapezoidal rule.




(a) Link 1




(b) Link 2



(c) Link 3




(d) Link 4




(e) Link 5


Figure 6: Variance stabilized P-P plot of stable distributions




(a) Link 1




(b) Link 2



(c) Link 3



(d) Link 4



(e) Link 5

Figure 7: Q-Q plot of stable distributions

420 The computed H for the stable distributions in any road links are larger than for normal and
421 empirical. We find that the computed H are notably larger than that for the empirical. There exists
422 a significant difference in the right tail probabilities between the stable and empirical distributions
423 as shown in Figures 6 and 7. These difference in the tails between the empirical and stable would
424 be influential when H s are computed.

425 6. Discussion

426 The main purpose of the present paper is to investigate to which degree the empirical charac-
427 teristics of travel time distributions conform to the requirements of the FK model in applications
428 of valuing travel time variability.

429 6.1. Independence of standard travel time distributions and the time of day


430 The first fundamental hypothesis of the FK model is that the distribution of standardized
431 travel time, after removing changes in the mean and scale of travel time across the time of day, is
432 independent of the time of day. To investigate this hypothesis, we analyzed traffic data that were
433 collected on an urban road over a long period using nonparametric techniques.

434 The nonparametric regression results for the mean and the interquartile range of travel times
435 given a time of day (Figures 2 and 3) indicate that the mean and the scale of travel time are not
436 constant over the time of day in every road link. This is expected since traffic varies with the time
437 of day and such variation leads to variation in the mean and scale of travel times.


438 To check the independence assumption of standardized travel times against the time of day,
439 we studied the nonparametric distribution of standardized travel times conditional on the time of
440 day. Strict independence would require all contours of the probability distribution being completely
441 horizontal. Figure 4 shows that in every road link the contour lines for the probability distributions
442 of standardized travel times are not very different from horizontal. The fluctuations are largest at
443 the highest quantiles and may be due to a small number of incidents. So we would feel justified in
444 accepting that standardized travel time is roughly independent of the time of day.

445 6.2. Fitting standard travel times to stable distributions


446 The second hypothesis we investigate is that the standardized travel time follows a stable
447 distribution. If this hypothesis is supported, practical applications are facilitated by the favorable




(a) Link 1




(b) Link 2



(c) Link 3



(d) Link 4



(e) Link 5

Figure 8: Computed H at various values of η/λ

448 properties of stable distributions. To check stability, we estimate stable parameters for each road
449 link using maximum likelihood and evaluated some diagnostics.

450 The parameter estimates (Table 3) and the plotted stable densities (Figures 5) show that the
451 data sets of the standardized travel times for any road links are far from normal. All skewness
452 parameters are estimated to be close to the upper bounds ($\hat{\beta} = 0.8824 \sim 1.0000$) indicating that
453 the distributions are very skewed to the right. With this skewness, the estimated stable densities fit
454 the data around the modes of the distributions as shown in Figure 5. Furthermore, the estimated
455 stability parameters are scattered around 1.1320 as explained in Section 5.3. The estimates are
456 closer to the stability parameter of a Cauchy distribution ($\alpha = 1$) than to a normal distribution
457 ($\alpha = 2$).

458 These results might be caused by the typical characteristics of travel times on urban roads: (1)
459 there would exist a lower bound of travel time because of physical and environmental constraints;
460 and (2) the maximal standardized travel times, on the other hand, would be very large because
461 there would be a small but significant possibility that severe incidents might occur.

462 As for the behavior of the tails on the other hand, there seem to be significant differences
463 between the data and the estimated stable distributions. The Q–Q plots in Figure 7 show that the
464 extreme tails of the standardized travel time data are thinner than the stable densities. Thus the
465 fitted stable distributions tend to overestimate the tail probabilities. This fact significantly affects
466 the computational results of the functional H . As shown in Figure 8, the value of H obtained for
467 the stable distributions is larger than for the empirical distribution on each road link.

468 This difference is related to the fact that stable but non-normal distributions have infinite
469 variances. In our empirical results, the estimated stability parameters are all near 1.1320, and
470 hence the distributions are far from normal. In contrast, empirical travel times are bounded and so
471 have finite variance. This would provide much larger tail probabilities in the fitted stable densities
472 than in the empirical distributions. In other words, the fitted stable distribution will predict too
473 high probability of outrageously high travel times.

474 6.3. Assumption of the maximum travel time in the distributions

475 A possibility for circumventing the above-mentioned problem in the use of stable distributions
476 is to reconsider the scheduling model by imposing a “maximum” travel time when the traveler
477 evaluates the expected cost. We assume that the traveler only considers travel times below this

478 maximum. This assumption corresponds to replacing the upper integral limit in (1) by a finite
 479 positive number.

Denote the maximum of standardized travel times as X_{\max} . Furthermore, denote the probability that a standardized travel time is equal to or less than X_{\max} as $p_{X_{\max}} = \text{Prob}(x \leq X_{\max}) = \Phi(X_{\max})$. The scheduling model (1) is rewritten as:

$$EC^* = \min_D EC(D, T) = \min_D \left[\eta D + \lambda \int_{\frac{D-\mu}{\sigma}}^{X_{\max}} (\mu + \sigma x - D) \phi(x) dx + \omega \mu \right].$$

The first order condition of the scheduling model (2) is replaced by the following similar formula:

$$D' = \mu + \sigma \Phi^{-1} \left(p_{X_{\max}} - \frac{\eta}{\lambda} \right).$$

480 Furthermore, the new functional H' becomes:

$$H' \left(\Phi, \frac{\eta}{\lambda}, p_{X_{\max}} \right) = \int_{p_{X_{\max}} - \frac{\eta}{\lambda}}^{p_{X_{\max}}} \Phi^{-1}(\nu) d\nu. \quad (14)$$

481 Notice that $H' \left(\Phi, \frac{\eta}{\lambda}, 1 \right)$ tends to $H \left(\Phi, \frac{\eta}{\lambda} \right)$ as $\lim_{X_{\max} \rightarrow \infty} p_{X_{\max}} = 1$.

482 The choice of $p_{X_{\max}}$ is somewhat arbitrary. We can however check the resulting H' for stable
 483 distributions to empirical ones. We can also find appropriate values of $p_{X_{\max}}$ by checking the
 484 goodness-of-fit of stable H' s with respect to the empirical H s.

485 Figure 8 presents the computed H' s with three different values of $p_{X_{\max}}$ for the fitted stable
 486 distributions. If $p_{X_{\max}} = 99.99\%$, for example, the probability that the standardized travel time
 487 becomes greater than X_{\max} is 0.01% and travelers are assumed to disregard such a large travel
 488 time in their scheduling choice. This result shows that the restriction on the upper limit integral
 489 in (14) would significantly reduce the deviations from the empirical H s. In our applications, we
 490 expect that the appropriate $p_{X_{\max}}$ would be between 99.0% and 99.9%.

491 6.4. Equality of stability parameters

492 As shown in Table 3, the estimated $\hat{\alpha}$ s do not differ much from each other. Thus, it may
 493 not be inappropriate to assume that the standardized travel time distributions share a common
 494 stability parameter across the different road links. From the comparison of the stable parameters
 495 for the links 1–4 and the one for the link 5, we see that these difference are not so large but
 496 significant because of large samples. For this result, we speculate that some correlation might
 497 exist among standardized travel times across different road links. Because the traffic congestion

498 upstream propagates to downstream, it is likely that the travel times for the consecutive roads are
499 positively correlated.

500 Recall that the standardized travel times should be independent in the convolutions of stable
501 distributions. To check this informally, we have plotted the pair of standardized travel times for
502 the consecutive two links and have drawn a bivariate joint density in Figure 9. The pairs are
503 identified based on the date and the time of day for each link. We find that there does not seem
504 to be significant conditional dependence between the two standardized travel times and so the
505 independence assumption of standardized travel times could be reasonable.¹¹

506 7. Concluding remarks


507 This paper has analyzed some empirical characteristics of the travel time distribution on an
508 urban road with the purpose of checking the degree to which the travel time distribution conforms
509 to the assumption in the Fosgerau and Karlström (2010) model. A number of nonparametric
510 techniques were employed to estimate the distribution of standardized travel time conditional on
511 the time of day.

512 First, we found that the FK assumption that the standardized travel time is independent of
513 the time of day seems reasonable as an approximation. This is crucial for the application of the
514 FK model.


515 Second, the standardized travel time distribution is far from normal but close to a stable
516 distribution. Like the normal distribution, the stable distribution arises in a central limit theorem,
517 but requires weaker assumptions on the variances of the random variables of which it is a limit.
518 The stable distribution is able to reproduce the high skewness and fat tails of empirical travel time
519 distributions.

520 Third, the extreme right tails of the stable distribution are fatter than in the empirical distri-
521 butions. This suggests that the stable distribution is not appropriate as a description of extreme
522 delays. In reality, these are bounded from above; this is not true of the stable distribution. This
523 suggests using some truncation of the stable distribution. Truncating the stable distribution yields
524 values of the standardized mean lateness factor H that are close to the empirical values.


¹¹Some statistical tests (e.g. Su and White (2007)) would be applicable to check this formally.



(a) Links 1 and 2 (54,310 points)



(b) Links 2 and 3 (50,499 points)



(c) Links 3 and 4 (52,649 points)

Figure 9: Scatter plot and joint density of two standardized travel times

525 Fourth, the stability parameter α seems to be roughly constant across road links. Furthermore,
526 standardized travel times seem to be about independent across links. Therefore, computing the
527 travel time distribution for a route as the convolution of travel times on individual links may be
528 considered reasonable for practical purposes.

529 **Acknowledgements**

530 The authors are thankful for comments from Ken Small and Anders Karlström. Mogens Fos-
531 gerau has received support from the Danish Social Science Research Council. Part of the work
532 was carried out during a research stay of Daisuke Fukuda at the Technical University of Denmark,
533 funded by the Kajima Foundation. We also thank the Tokyo Institute of Technology for use of the
534 “TSUBAME” grid supercomputer for numerical computations.

535 **References**

- 536 Bates, J., Polak, J., Jones, P., Cook, A., 2001. The valuation of reliability for personal travel. *Transportation Research*
537 *Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* 37 (2–3), 191–229.
- 538 Brownstone, D., Small, K., 2005. Valuing time and reliability: assessing the evidence from road pricing demonstra-
539 tions. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 39 (4), 279–293.
- 540 Doornik, J. A., 2001. *Ox: An Object-Oriented Matrix Language*. London.
- 541 Fosgerau, M., 2010. On the relation between the mean and variance of delay in dynamic queues with random capacity
542 and demand. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 34 (4), 598–603.
- 543 Fosgerau, M., Engelson, L., forthcoming. The value of travel time variance. *Transportation Research Part B: Method-*
544 *ological*.
- 545 Fosgerau, M., Karlström, A., 2010. The value of reliability. *Transportation Research Part B: Methodological* 43 (8–9),
546 813–820.
- 547 Gnedenko, B. V., Kolmogorov, A. N., 1954. *Limit Distributions for Sums of Independent Random Variables*. Addison-
548 *Wesley*.
- 549 Hall, P., Racine, J., Li, Q., 2004. Cross-validation and the estimation of conditional probability densities. *Journal of*
550 *the American Statistical Association* 99 (468), 1015–1027.
- 551 Härdle, W., 1990. *Applied Nonparametric Regression*. *Econometric Society Monograph Series*. Cambridge University
552 *Press*.
- 553 Ichimura, T., Fukuda, D., 2010. A fast algorithm for computing least-squares cross-validations for nonparametric
554 conditional kernel density functions. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 54 (12), 3404–3410.
- 555 Lam, T. C., Small, K., 2001. The value of time and reliability: measurement from a value pricing experiment.
556 *Transportation Research Part E: Logistics and Transportation Review* 37 (2-3), 231–251.

557 Li, Q., Racine, J., 2007. *Nonparametric Econometrics: Theory and Practice*. Princeton University Press.

558 Michael, J. R., 1983. The stabilized probability plot. *Biometrika* 70 (1), 11–17.

559 Nolan, J. P., 1997. Numerical calculation of stable densities and distribution functions. *Stochastic Models* 13 (4),
560 759–774.

561 Nolan, J. P., 2001. Maximum likelihood estimation of stable parameters. In: Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Mikosch, T.,
562 Resnick, S. I. (Eds.), *Lévy Process: Theory and Applications*. Birkhäuser, Boston, pp. 379–400.

563 Nolan, J. P., in press. *Stable Distributions – Models for Heavy Tailed Data*. Birkhäuser, Boston.

564 Noland, R. B., 1997. Commuter responses to travel time uncertainty under congested conditions: expected costs and
565 the provision of information. *Journal of Urban Economics* 41 (3), 377–406.

566 Noland, R. B., Polak, J. W., 2002. Travel time variability: a review of theoretical and empirical issues. *Transport*
567 *Reviews* 22 (1), 39–54.

568 Noland, R. B., Small, K. A., 1995. Travel-time uncertainty, departure time choice, and the cost of morning commutes.
569 *Transportation Research Record* 1493, 150–158.

570 Noland, R. B., Small, K. A., Koskenoja, P. M., Chu, X., 1998. Simulating travel reliability. *Regional Science and*
571 *Urban Economics* 28 (5), 535–564.

572 Pagan, A., Ullah, A., 1999. *Nonparametric Econometrics*. Cambridge University Press.

573 R Development Core Team, 2007. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for
574 *Statistical Computing*, Vienna, Austria.

575 Robust Analysis, Inc., 2006. *User Manual for STABLE 4.0 S-Plus/R Version*.

576 Scott, D. W., 1979. On optimal and data-based histograms. *Biometrika* 66 (3), 605–610.

577 Small, K. A., 1982. The scheduling of consumer activities: work trips. *American Economic Review* 72 (3), 467–479.

578 Small, K. A., Winston, C., Yan, J., 2005. Uncovering the distribution of motorists’ preferences for travel time and
579 reliability. *Econometrica* 73 (4), 1367–1382.

580 Su, L., White, H., 2007. A consistent characteristic function-based test for conditional independence. *Journal of*
581 *Econometrics* 141 (1), 807–834.

582 Vickrey, W. S., 1973. Pricing, metering, and efficiency using urban transportation facilities. *Highway Research Record*
583 476, 36–48.

584 Zolotarev, V., 1986. *One-Dimensional Stable Distributions*. American Mathematical Society.