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Inefficiencies in current operations:

- Aircraft are delayed in departure queues
- Excess taxi-out times, fuel consumption and emissions
Surface Optimization at NASA

- Spot and Runway Departure Advisor (SARDA) provides a departure metering capability by efficiently scheduling aircraft on airport surface

- Human-in-the-loop simulations (2010, 2012)
  - Dallas/Fort Worth Airport (DFW), East Tower
  - Advisories provided to tower controllers

- Human-in-the-loop simulations (2014)
  - Charlotte Douglas International Airport (CLT)
  - Advisories provided to ramp controllers
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Efficient Runway Scheduler that incorporates aircraft specific constraints, as well as arrivals

Both computation time and solution quality are critical factors in deciding a solution technique for Runway Scheduler
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Single Runway Scheduling

- Departures on taxiway form 3 queues
- Arrivals can be merged into a single queue
- Spots needs to be considered as forming their own queue
Single Runway Scheduling

- Exact Dynamic Program (EDP)
- Restricted Dynamic Program (RDP)
- Insertion and Local Search (ILS)
Runway Scheduler: Inputs

- For each aircraft:
  - Earliest available time
  - Spot, surface route, position, and fix/exit
  - Weight class and operation type
- Wake-vortex separation criteria and RNAV separation
- Separation between arrivals and departures for mixed use runway
- Separation between arrivals and departures for runway crossings
- Individual time-windows of intended take-off times for departing aircraft — Expect Departure Clearance Time (EDCT) and Call For Release (CFR)
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Partial solution: \{b_1, b_2\}
Exact Dynamic Program
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- Definition of state may not be rich enough
- It does not carry enough process history to determine optimality of remaining decisions
- Enhance state definition or consider multiple objectives
Exact Dynamic Program

State Definition:

- heading of last departure
- weight-class of last departure
- last operation type
- \#aircraft in queue 1
- \#aircraft in queue 2
- .
- .
- .
- \#aircraft in queue Q
Exact Dynamic Program

- **State Definition:**
  - heading of last departure
  - weight-class of last departure
  - last operation type
  - #aircraft in queue 1
  - #aircraft in queue 2
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - 
  - #aircraft in queue Q

- **Value Function:**
  - Last time a departure took off
  - Makespan
  - Cumulative delay
Exact Dynamic Program

State Definition:
- heading of last departure
- weight-class of last departure
- last operation type
- #aircraft in queue 1
- #aircraft in queue 2
- ...
- #aircraft in queue Q

Value Function:
- Last time a departure took off
- Makespan
- Cumulative delay

Pareto dominance can be applied
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- Number of nodes in DP is proportional to product of number of aircraft in each queue

- Some stages of the EDP formulation of the SRS could have a large number of states
Restricted Dynamic Program

- In each stage, only a restricted subset of $H$ states with the smallest delay is kept.

- Increasing the value of $H$ should yield better solutions, but will also result in higher computation times.
Insertion and Local Search

- Start with a First-Come-First-Served (FCFS) initial solution

\[ a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3 \ a_4 \ a_5 \ a_6 \ a_7 \ a_8 \ a_9 \ a_{10} \ a_{11} \ a_{12} \ a_{13} \]
Insertion and Local Search

- Find all permutations of ‘k’ free aircraft
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- Find all permutations of ‘k’ free aircraft
- Select sequence which gives best objective value
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- Fix first free aircraft
- Find all permutations of next ‘k’ free aircraft
Insertion and Local Search

- Fix first free aircraft
- Find all permutations of next ‘k’ free aircraft
Insertion and Local Search

- If final sequence is different from starting sequence, repeat whole procedure (descent search)
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Simulation Setup

- DFW East-side in South-flow configuration
- 20 Departures and 15 runway crossings considered.
- Planning window of 15 minutes
- Earliest available times were uniformly distributed within 0-900 seconds
- 80% of type Large, 10% of type Heavy, 10% B75x
- Heading were randomly assigned to 0 or 1
Simulation Setup

- Scenarios were generated with varying numbers of queues (from 3 to 10)
- Hundred different scenarios generated for each queue number
- Three variants of RDP algorithm: RDP10K (H=10,000), RDP20K (H=20,000), RDP30K (H=30,000)
- ILS algorithm used a value of 7 for the neighborhood parameter k
Computation times
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Summary: Single Runway Scheduling

- Comparative study of three algorithms:
  - Exact Dynamic Programming (EDP)
  - Restricted Dynamic Programming (RDP)
  - Insertion and Local Search (ILS)

- Simulations conducted for the east side of the Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport (DFW)

- ILS heuristics is the most suitable candidate for application in tactical surface decision support tools
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The list of Future Improvements and their expected effects on capacity does not imply FAA commitment to, or approval of, any item on the list.
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In order to obtain an optimal solution for the airport runway operations it is necessary to formulate an algorithm that includes operations at all the runways.
Runway Scheduler: Inputs

- Estimated runway queue entry times (for departures)
- Estimated runway time (for arrivals)
- Spot, runway, position and fix/exit for each aircraft
- Type (weight class) of each aircraft
- Separation requirements between pair of aircraft
- Individual time-windows of intended take-off times for departing aircraft (EDCT, CFR)
Separation Requirements

- Between departures on same runway (wake vortex and RNAV separation)
- Between arrivals and departures for mixed use runway, runway crossings and converging runway operations
- Separation between departure from parallel runways going to same fix
- Separation between departures going to same constraint fix (MIT)
Separation Requirements

- Between departures on same runway (wake vortex and RNAV separation)
- Between arrivals and departures for mixed use runway, runway crossings and converging runway operations
- Separation between departure from parallel runways going to same fix
- Separation between departures going to same constraint fix (MIT)

These separations are converted to time-based separations for use in the MILP
MILP Runway Scheduler

Decision Variables

- Let $t_i$ denote the calculated time at which the aircraft uses the runway (take-off, land or cross).

- Let $Z_{i,j}$ be a binary sequencing variable:
  $$Z_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 
  1 & \text{if aircraft } i \text{ uses runway before } j \\
  0 & \text{otherwise} 
  \end{cases}$$
MILP Runway Scheduler

Objective Function

- System Delay - cumulative waiting time of all aircraft
- Let $\alpha_i$ be an earliest available time

System Delay:

$$\min \sum_{i \in F} (t_i - \alpha_i)$$
MILP Formulation
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- Linear ordering constraints:  \( Z_{i,j} + Z_{j,i} = 1 \)
- Runway use after earliest time:  \( t_i \geq \alpha_i \)
- Arrival landing time cannot be changed:  \( t_i \leq \alpha_i + \delta \)
- Time-Window constraints:  \( TMI_L \leq t_i \leq TMI_H \)
- Separation requirements:  \( Z_{i,j}(t_j - t_i - \Delta_{i,j}) \geq 0 \)
- FCFS constraints on crossing aircraft:  \( Z_{i,j} = 1, \text{ if } \alpha_i < \alpha_j \)
- FCFS constraints on MIT aircraft:  \( Z_{i,j} = 1, \text{ if } \alpha_i < \alpha_j \)
- Constrained Position Shift (CPS) constraint on sequence of departures only
Simulation Setup

- Mixed operation runway with arrivals, departures and crossing traffic
- Another stream of arrivals was modeled to simulate converging runway operations
- Planning window of 15 minutes
- Number of aircraft in the scenarios was varied from 10 to 35 in increments of 5
- Hundred different scenarios generated for each aircraft count
Simulation Setup

- Earliest available times were uniformly distributed within 0-900 seconds
- Sixty percent of the traffic was chosen to be departures, 20% arrivals and 20% crossing aircraft
- 80% of type Large, 10% of type Heavy, 10% B75x
- Departure fix assigned randomly from 6 discrete choices
Simulation Setup

- Earliest available times were uniformly distributed within 0-900 seconds
- Sixty percent of the traffic was chosen to be departures, 20% arrivals and 20% crossing aircraft
- 80% of type Large, 10% of type Heavy, 10% B75x
- Departure fix assigned randomly from 6 discrete choices
- MILP formulation is compared with a FCFS to examine the benefits of the proposed algorithm
- The MILP is solved using Gurobi
Computation times
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Summary: Multiple Runway Scheduling

- A MILP formulation for multiple runway scheduling
- 30% average improvement in total delay over FCFS
- Maximum position shift (MPS) parameter value of 2 is a good trade-off between solution quality and computation times
- MPS value of 0 and 1 are also good for cases with limited computational resources