



An Integer Programming-Based Heuristic for the Period Vehicle Routing Problem

Damon Gulczynski
Mathematics Department
University of Maryland

Bruce Golden
Robert H. Smith School of Business
University of Maryland

Edward Wasil
Kogod School of Business
American University

INFORMS Annual Meeting
San Diego, CA
October 2009



VRP and PVRP

- In contrast to the classical VRP, the PVRP is a multi-period, multi-level vehicle routing problem
- In the period vehicle routing problem (PVRP), customers might require service several times during a time period




PVRP Description

- We must first assign customers to patterns (certain days of the time period) and then find routes on each day servicing the customers scheduled on that day
- We seek to minimize total distance traveled throughout the time period
- For example, a waste management company has to assign customers to certain days of the week and then create daily routes
- Some customers might only need service once a week, some might need service multiple times


PVRP Example

- The time period is two days, $T = \{1, 2\}$
- Customer 1 must be serviced twice
- Customers 2 and 3 must be serviced once
- Node labels in parentheses are demands per delivery
- Edge labels are distances
- Vehicle capacity is 30



PVRP Example

- Customer 1 is assigned to day 1 and day 2
- Customer 2 is assigned to day 1
- Customer 3 is assigned to day 2



Total distance traveled is 34 units



PVRP Applications

- Commercial sanitation
- Grocery and soft drink distribution
- Fuel oil and industrial gas delivery
- Internal transport installation and maintenance
- Utility services
- Automobile parts distribution
- Oil collection from onshore wells



PVRP Literature

- PVRP literature dates back to the 1970s
- Recent papers on solving the PVRP
 - Cordeau, Gendreau, and Laporte (1997)
 - Alegre, Laguna, and Pacheco (2007)
 - Hemmelmayr, Doerner, and Hartl (2009)



IP Based PVRP Heuristic

- We develop an IP-based Heuristic algorithm for solving the PVRP, denoted IPH
- We easily adapt IPH to solve two variants later on
- We present computational results which demonstrate the effectiveness of our algorithm



IPH: Overview

1. Generate an initial PVRP solution S
2. Improve S by solving an IP that reassigns and reroutes customers in a way that maximizes total savings (main step)
3. Improve daily routes using a VRP heuristic
4. Remove and reinsert customers using an IP
5. Repeat steps 2-4 until a stopping condition is reached



IPH: Initial Solution

- We first assign customers to patterns in a way that balances the amount of demand serviced on each day (standard assignment IP)
- Next we find a VRP solution on each day using a quick heuristic (e.g., CW savings)
- The result is an initial PVRP solution



IPH: Improvement IP

- Given a solution S , we formulate an improvement IP (IMP) that maximizes the savings from reassigning customers to new service patterns, removing customers from their current routes, and inserting them into new routes
- We solve IMP repeatedly until no more improvement is achieved



IPH: IMP Formulation

Objective Function

- Maximize savings from reassignments and rerouting

Constraints

- We remove a customer from its current route if and only if we reinsert it elsewhere
- We move a customer to a new day if and only if we assign it to a pattern containing that day



IPH: IMP Formulation

- The total demand of the customers we move to a route minus the total demand of the customers we move from the route cannot exceed the residual capacity of the route
- If a customer i or its predecessor is removed from a route, we do not move any other customers immediately prior to i and we remove at most one of i and its predecessor (this ensures the objective function gives the savings accurately)
- We assign a customer to at most one feasible pattern

IPH: IMP Example


■ Initial Solution

Customer 1 is assigned to day 1 and day 2

Customer 2 is assigned to day 1

Customer 3 is assigned to day 2

Vehicle Capacity is 30 units




Total distance traveled is 34 units

IPH: IMP Example

- Improved Solution

Customer 2 is removed from its route on day 1, reassigned to day 2 and inserted immediately prior to customer 3, for a savings of 4 units





IPH: ERTR

- We improve daily routes by solving VRPs using the enhanced record-to-record travel algorithm (ERTR)
- ERTR was developed by Groer, Golden, and Wasil (2008)
- One-point move, two-point exchange, two-opt move
- Three-point move, OR-opt move



IPH: Re-initialization

- We remove some customers randomly from their routes
- We create a fictitious day F and assign all removed customers to routes on day F
- We solve IMP adding a constraint forcing all customers visited on F to be reassigned to a feasible pattern
- Re-initialization allows us to further explore the solution space from a new starting solution



IPH: Best Solution

- We iterate IMP, ERTR, and the re-initialization procedure until a stopping condition is reached
- The best solution found throughout this process is returned at the end



IPH Results

- On 32 problems from the PVRP literature, IPH had an average deviation from the best-known solution of 1.14%
- For Cordeau, Gendreau, and Laporte (1997) it was 1.58%
- For Alegre, Laguna, and Pacheco (2007) it was 1.36%
- For Hemmelmayr, Doerner, and Hartl (2009) it was 1.39%



IPH Run-times

- On the 32 problems IPH had an average run-time of 686 seconds
- For Cordeau, Gendreau, and Laporte it was 139 (comparable machine)
- For Alegre, Laguna, and Pacheco it was 1449 (slower machine)
- For Hemmelmayr, Doerner, and Hartl it was 149 (comparable machine)
- Problem size ranges from 50 to 417 customers



IPH Virtues

- Comparable performance to the best algorithms on PVRPs
- Easily modified to handle real-world variants
- In the real world, we rarely start from scratch



PVRP Variants

- In practice, companies have pre-existing solutions that over time, due to the addition and deletion of customers and other small modifications, become inefficient
- Some companies have fleets of thousands of vehicles that service millions of customers annually
- Not practical economically, logistically, or perhaps contractually to reroute from scratch
- Instead, the major inefficiencies in the pre-existing routes should be eliminated in a way that does not cause widespread disruption



PVRP Variants

- From a pre-existing solution S' we find an improved solution S^* while constraining the total amount of disruption
- We consider three types of constraints
 1. Hard constraint: we set a limit W and only accept solutions S^* such that the number of customers assigned to different patterns from S' to S^* is at most W
 2. Soft constraint: in the objective function we penalize S^* for each customer assigned to a different pattern than the one in S'
 3. Restricted reassignment constraints: we fix all multi-day customers to their patterns in S' but allow one-day customers to be freely reassigned in S^*
- Collectively, we call these variants the PVRP with reassignment constraints (PVRP-RC)



PVRP-BC

- Because route balance is important in industry we also consider the period vehicle routing problem with balance constraints (PVRP-BC)
- In the PVRP-BC we start with a pre-existing solution S' that is well-balanced or has low cost routes (but not both)
- In the objective function, we penalize a solution for having imbalanced routes
- Starting from S' , we wish to find a solution S^* that minimizes routing distance plus an imbalance penalty



PVRP-RCH and IPH-RCH

- We modify IPH to solve the PVRP-RC with a hard constraint (PVRP-RCH)
- In the PVRP-RCH, we allow no more than W customer reassignments from the pre-existing initial solution S'
- In practice, it helps to do this in stages
- We denote the modified IPH algorithm by IPH-RCH



IPH-RCH Results


- For comparison, we implement a greedy algorithm that randomly selects a reassignment from the current three best-savings reassignments and repeats until W reassignments are made or there is no improvement
- On 26 problems, with $W = 10\%$ of the number of customers, we run IPH-RCH once and the greedy algorithm 151 times, recording the best solution and the median solution, respectively
- We started with an initial solution S' that was on average 16.64% above the baseline (solution in which no restriction was put on the number of reassignments)
- For IPH-RCH the solution was 9.91% above, for Greedy Best it was 11.51% above, and for Greedy Median it was 12.62% above



Tradeoff Between Distance and Disruption

- We modify IPH for the PVRP with soft reassignment constraints (IPH-RCS)
- For an example problem, we run IPH-RCS for different reassignment penalties and see how the solution is impacted

IPH-RCS Results





Reassigning one-day customers


- One-day customers are the easiest and most convenient to reassign
- We consider the PVRP in which we fix all multi-day customers to their initial patterns, but allow one-day customers to be reassigned freely
- In our computational experiments, the initial solution can be substantially improved using this practical compromise



PVRP-BC

- Route balance is of key importance in industry
- We consider the problem of improving a maximally balanced initial solution or a low cost initial solution without inducing too much imbalance
- Minimize: routing distance + $\rho C(U - L)$
 - ρ = imbalance penalty fraction
 - C = distance of the initial solution
 - U = the most customers on a route in a solution
 - L = the fewest customers on a route in a solution
- We denote this problem PVRP-BC
- We modify IPH for the PVRP-BC (IPH-BC)

IPH-BC Results





Conclusion

- We develop a new IP-based algorithm for solving the PVRP
- We adapt our algorithm to solve several variants – the PVRP-RC, the PVRP-BC, and both
- These PVRP variants are important in modeling real-world problems