



Pedestrian fundamental diagrams: Comparative analysis of experiments in different geometries

Jun Zhang

Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH
Institute for Advanced Simulation (IAS)
Jülich Supercomputing Centre (JSC)

Pedestrian fundamental diagrams: Comparative analysis of experiments in different geometries

Jun Zhang

Schriften des Forschungszentrums Jülich

IAS Series

Volume 14

ISSN 1868-8489

ISBN 978-3-89336-825-9

Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| Declaration | i |
| Abstract | ii |
| Zusammenfassung | iii |
| Acknowledgements | v |
| List of tables | x |
| List of figures | xi |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Background | 1 |
| 1.2 Aim and objective | 4 |
| 1.3 Methodology | 5 |
| 1.4 Thesis outline | 6 |
| 2 Literature review on the fundamental diagram | 7 |
| 2.1 Design of escape routes | 7 |
| 2.1.1 Prescriptive method | 8 |
| 2.1.2 Performance-based method | 9 |
| 2.1.2.1 Handbooks | 10 |
| 2.1.2.2 Simulations | 22 |

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 2.2 Empirical studies | 25 |
| 3 Experiments and methodology | 32 |
| 3.1 Experiment setup | 33 |
| 3.1.1 Unidirectional flow in corridor | 34 |
| 3.1.2 Bidirectional flow in corridor | 36 |
| 3.1.3 Merging flows in T-junction | 40 |
| 3.2 Extraction of pedestrian trajectories | 41 |
| 3.2.1 Extraction method | 41 |
| 3.2.2 Trajectories | 43 |
| 3.3 Measurement methodology | 47 |
| 3.3.1 Method A | 48 |
| 3.3.2 Method B | 49 |
| 3.3.3 Method C | 49 |
| 3.3.4 Method D | 51 |
| 3.3.5 Effect of measurement methods | 51 |
| 4 Fundamental diagram analysis | 57 |
| 4.1 Unidirectional flow | 57 |
| 4.1.1 Spatiotemporal profile | 57 |
| 4.1.2 Size and position of the measurement area | 62 |
| 4.1.3 Specific flow concept | 65 |
| 4.1.4 Interpretation in terms of boundary-induced phase transitions | 69 |
| 4.2 Bidirectional flow | 72 |
| 4.2.1 Spatiotemporal profile | 73 |
| 4.2.2 Lane formation | 73 |
| 4.2.3 Specific flow concept | 75 |
| 4.2.4 Comparison of SSL and DML flow | 76 |
| 4.2.5 Comparison of BFR and UFR flow | 76 |

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------------|
| 4.3 Merging flow | 77 |
| 4.3.1 Spatiotemporal profile | 78 |
| 4.3.2 Branch and main stream | 80 |
| 4.3.3 Specific flow concept | 82 |
| 4.4 Comparison of different types of flows | 84 |
| 4.4.1 Uni- and bidirectional flows | 84 |
| 4.4.2 Unidirectional and merging flows | 86 |
| 5 Conclusion and outlook | 88 |
| 5.1 Conclusion | 88 |
| 5.2 Outlook | 90 |
| Bibliography | 93 |
| Publications | 102 |
| Curriculum Vitae | 103 |

This dissertation mainly analyzes the fundamental diagram describing the relation between crowd density, velocity and flow based on series of well-controlled laboratory experiments. The commonly used fundamental diagrams in handbooks are reviewed especially for uni- and bidirectional pedestrian streams. The differences and influence of them on facility designs are compared.

Four different measurement methods are taken to calculate the crowd density, velocity and specific flow. Their influences on the fundamental diagram are tested with the data obtained from the experiment of unidirectional flow.

Pedestrian experiments of uni-, bidirectional and merging flow are analyzed based on the Voronoi method for its high precision. The topographical information for density, velocity and specific flow, from which the boundary effect are observed, are extracted. The specific flow concept is applicable to all types of flows in the density ranges observed in the experiments. Surprisingly, no difference is found for the fundamental diagrams of bidirectional flow with different modes of ordering.

A sharp distinction is observed between the fundamental diagrams of uni- and bidirectional flow. For the merging flow in T-junction, the fundamental diagrams measured in front of and behind the merging show also significant differences.