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#### Abstract

The thesis deals with modeling and analysis of supply planning during or immediately after a natural disaster. In post emergency response planning, the supply of consumable and nonconsumable provisions for both civilians, who evacuate residential areas, and intervention groups at the corresponding shelters, is of immediate importance. In this thesis, provisions supply is modeled and analyzed by introducing the Emergency Supply using Heterogeneous Fleet Problem (ESHFP).

Initially, a Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) mathematical model is introduced for the ESHFP. In order to solve this problem, we have developed a novel heuristic algorithm, which aims in determining the set of routes and the vehicles that can be used to minimize the total supply time, respecting constraints concerning routing, timing, capacity and supply.

Since the corresponding MILP is difficult to be solved to optimality in reasonable time, we have introduced a novel heuristic approach for ESHFP which minimizes the total time needed to collect provisions from available pick up locations and (by using appropriate vehicles among those available) to deliver provisions to a) evacuees at shelters and b) intervention groups at their accommodation sites. The proposed heuristic approach takes into account all necessary constraints described in the MILP model.

To validate the effectiveness this approach, we have applied the proposed algorithm to a series of examples, generated randomly. Furthermore, we have used the proposed algorithm to deal with a real case study involving a significant forest fire in the Province of Teruel in Spain. The results of both the tests and the case study are very encouraging, attesting to the comprehensiveness of the proposed model and the efficiency of the new solution heuristic.
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## Chapter 1. Introduction

The number of both natural and man-made disasters striking all over the world has accelerated world-wide. Disasters affect human lives and have significantly adverse economic effects. The Federal Emergency Management Agency of the United States (FEMA) claims that the first 72 hours after a disaster are the most critical ones [1], [2], [3], since actions and responses during this period can determine whether lives are saved, as well as the effective and humane treatment of the survivors.

According to the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) [4], 3,784 natural disasters and 2,193 technological disasters were reported worldwide in the last decade (2007-2016). The number of human loses caused by natural disasters during the same period is 730,860 and the total people affected were more than 1.9 billion. As for the technological disasters, there were 68,844 deaths and more than 675 thousand people affected. The above data are presented extensively for each one of the years between 2007 and 2016 in Appendix I.

On the other hand, global support is also increasing over the last decades, using emergency logistics as a significant lever [5]. Emergency logistics may be defined as: "A process of planning, managing and controlling the efficient flows of relief, information, and services from the points of origin to the points of destination to meet the urgent needs of the affected people under emergency conditions', [5].

Based on the above, it is important to ensure efficiency of supplying necessary commodities in sufficient quantities to the victims of an emergency, who are evacuated at shelters, as well as to intervention groups. Speed of supply is critical in relief operations.

The scope of this thesis is to provide an integrated methodological framework for planning the supply of all required provisions throughout the theatre of the disaster in the minimum time, respecting several constraints.

The contribution of the thesis consists in introducing a novel approach for supplies distribution planning which addresses important characteristics of the problem beyond the existing literature. The main differences of the proposed approach include consideration of an heterogenous fleet of vehicles, of multiple commodities, of multiple supply origins and of multiple demand destinations. To address this problem, we developed a novel Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) model that maps accurately all problem characteristics. We have also proposed a new heuristic algorithm to solve this problem. After testing and validating the heuristic approach through several randomly generated problems, we applied it to a real case
study concerning supply of provisions to evacuees and intervention groups after a natural disaster occurrence at the Province of Teruel in Spain.

### 1.1. Problem Description

At the immediate aftermath of a natural disaster, and if necessary, local authorities implement appropriate evacuation plans. Evacuees are transported into shelters in safe areas, and simultaneously, intervention groups are dispatched to deal with the effects of the emergency and are based in strategic locations in the theatre of the emergency. Thereafter, it is important to develop a provisions supply plan in order to deliver the appropriate emergency supplies to evacuees at shelters and to intervention groups at the related accommodation sites. These supplies could include consumable goods such as food and water or non-consumable goods, such as mattresses and hygiene kits. The commodities can are supplied by warehouses or supermarkets based on a pre-specified arrangements. As for the vehicles which will transfer the commodities, they can start from different originating points, visit the appropriate supply locations, pick up the necessary commodities and transfer them to the corresponding sites. Vehicles can execute more than one route, and supply more than one sites. Under the aforementioned circumstances, the problem of collecting and delivering the necessary supplies after an emergency can be characterized as a special Pick-up and Delivery problem.

To deal with such a problem and in order to efficiently design a provisions supply plan, the decision maker must be aware of data concerning: (a) Commodities, (b) Supply Points (i.e. supermarkets), (c) Shelters, (d) Road Network and (e) Available vehicles. The problem dealt by this thesis is characterized by certain special assumptions: (a) more than one commodities are to be supplied; (b) the total supply offered at supply points is higher than the total demand, although each supply site may store a fraction of the demand; (c) there is at least one shelter for the evacuees and at least one accommodation site for the intervention groups; (d) the road network is known; (e) the vehicles used in the supply operation are heterogeneous. Given the aspects mentioned above, we can formulate the Emergency Supply using Heterogeneous Fleet Problem, hereafter referred ESHFP to deal with provisions supply after a disaster.

In order to model the above problem, we have developed a Mixed Integer Linear Program (MILP), the objective of which is to minimize the time needed to provide the required provisions to both evacuees and intervention groups at the corresponding shelters. Constraints model important aspects of the problem, such as routing, timing, capacity and availability of supply. Since usually such a problem is NP-hard, and in order to derive a solution of good quality in reasonable time, we propose a heuristic algorithm for the ESHFP, that aims to determine the set of routes and the vehicles that can be used to minimize the total time needed
to provide all required provisions to evacuees and to intervention groups, respecting all the corresponding constraints of the MILP.

### 1.2. Literature Review

As already mentioned, the problem at hand can be considered as a Pickup and Delivery Problem (PDP), a special category of the well-known Vehicle Routing Problem (VRP), in which commodities or people have to be transported between origins and destinations [6]. The VRP was introduced by Dantzig and Ramser in 1959 as the "Truck Dispatching Problem" and dealt with delivering gasoline between a terminal and stations [7]. The general notation used to describe the VRP is the following [8]:

Let

- $\quad V$ be a set of nodes
- $\quad K$ be the set of available vehicles
- $\quad V \backslash S$ be the set of all nodes apart from the nodes that are in $S$
- $\quad r(S)$ be the least number of vehicles that need to serve all nodes of $S$

The objective function of VRP is defined as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min \sum_{(i, j) \in V} d_{i j} x_{i j} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

s.t.

$$
\begin{gather*}
\sum_{i \in V} x_{i j}=1, \quad j \in V \backslash 0  \tag{1.2}\\
\sum_{j \in V} x_{i j}=1, \quad i \in V \backslash 0  \tag{1.3}\\
\sum_{j \in V} x_{0 j}=K  \tag{1.4}\\
\sum_{i \in V} x_{i 0}=K  \tag{1.5}\\
\sum_{i \in V \backslash S} \sum_{j \in V} x_{i j} \geq r(S), \quad \forall S \subseteq V \backslash 0, S \neq \emptyset  \tag{1.6}\\
x_{i j} \in\{0,1\}, \quad i \in V \backslash 0 \tag{1.7}
\end{gather*}
$$

Over the years, researchers have proposed numerous variants of the VRP. One of the most extensively studied problems is the Capacitated VRP (CVRP), in which every vehicle has
limited capacity [9]. In [10] the authors present a number of heuristics for the VRP with Pickups and Deliveries (VRPPD) in which customers may both receive and send goods. Pickups and deliveries can be either simultaneous, i.e. a node can receive and send goods simultaneously or mixed. A similar problem is the 1-VRPPD in which many vehicles are routed for carrying a single type of commodity [11]. There also exist problems where pickups come only after deliveries are finished. In case that the available fleet for pick up and deliveries consists of just one vehicle, the problem is converted into Capacitated Traveling Salesman Problem with Pickups and Deliveries problem (CTSPPD) [12]. In [12] also, the authors present two polynomial-time approximation algorithms for the latter problem.

In [13] the authors propose a mixed integer linear programming model for the Single VRP with Pickups and Deliveries (SVRPPD) which consists of designing a route in terms of cost for a vehicle of capacity $Q$. Each customer can be visited once or twice, and the route starts and ends at the depot. In [14], the authors propose a Tabu algorithm for the Split Delivery VRP (SDVRP), in which a fleet of homogeneous vehicles has to serve a set of customers by minimizing the total distance. There is also a capacity constraint which does not let the sum of the quantities delivered in each tour to exceed the capacity of the vehicles. No constraint on the number of the available vehicles is considered, but there is only one depot, and each vehicle has to start and end its tour at that depot. Another assumption is that each customer can be visited more than once and the demand of each customer can be greater than the capacity of the vehicles.

In [15] and [16], the authors address the Multi Depot VRP (MDVRP) and Multi Depot VRP with Time Windows (MDVRPTW) where several depots are taken into consideration. The latter also considers the constraints imposed by Time Windows. VRPTW has also been studied extensively, and it is an extension of the Capacitated VRP where the service at each customer must start within an associated time window [17]. In $\llbracket 18]$ and $\llbracket 19]$ the authors illustrate the VRP with backhauls, and [20] deals with the Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) with delivery and backhauls.

An interesting approach on pick-up and delivery problem is the One-Commodity Pickup and Delivery TSP (1-PDTSP) which is a generalization of the well-known TSP. In 1-PDTSP cities correspond to customers providing or requiring known amounts of a product, and the only vehicle that is routed, has a known capacity. Each customer must be visited only once by the vehicle serving the demands on the aim of the problem is to minimize the total travel distance. It is also assumed that any unit of product collected from a pickup customer can be delivered to any delivery customer [21].

Another problem studied in literature is the Heterogeneous Fleet VRP (HFVRP) in which the customers are served by a heterogeneous fleet of vehicles with various capacities. HFVRP consists of designing a set of vehicle routes, each starting and ending at the depot and such that each customer is visited exactly once [22]. There are also a few papers which present and address classical as well as modern Heuristics for the VRP such as the Clark and Wright Savings algorithm, and the Fisher and Jaikumar algorithm which is well-known as cluster-first, route second algorithm [23], [24] and [25]. In [26] the authors consider route first-cluster second methods for the vehicle routing problem.

As for Pickup and Delivery Problems (PDPs), there exists an extensive literature. In [27], the authors suggest that in the PDP each transportation request specifies a single origin and a single destination and all vehicles depart from and return to a central depot. They also focus in the General Pickup and Delivery Problem (GPDP).

In addition to the general PDP, a usual classification of the PDPs concerns the number of origins and destinations of the commodities to be transported. In many-to-many problems, any node can either serve as a supply point or a demand point for any commodity. In [28], a single vehicle of unit capacity is used for transporting objects from many origins to many destinations. Additionally in this category, there can be found problems where the pick-up and delivery locations sets can have common elements [29].

Another issue that affects the classification of PDPs is the information on how pickup and delivery is performed at demand nodes. Finally, PDPs can be classified according to the number of vehicles used, or according to other factors, such as the number of commodities to be transported.

In one-to-many-to-one problems, commodities that are initially available at a depot have to be transported to customers and commodities that are available at customer locations have to be transported to the depot. On the other hand, in one-to-one problems, each commodity has a certain origin and a certain destination. Such problems can arise in courier operations or in door-to-door transportation for elderly or disabled people [30].

From the above review, we have concluded that the problems which are closer to ESHFP are those discussed in [11], [13], [14], [17] and [31]. However, we have distinguished certain differences between the ESHFP and literature approaches. These differences highlight the necessity of developing a new mathematical model such as ESHFP. The most important differences are the following:

- In ESHFP, there are more than one vehicles, which are heterogeneous, and are selected among an available vehicle fleet, for the supply operation as opposed to [13] and [14] which address cases with only one available vehicle.
- In [11] and [31], the authors examine their case with a single commodity; in ESHFP multiple types of commodities must be delivered.
- In ESHFP, pick-up nodes and shelters can be visited more than once contrary to [31] in which both the customers and the depot must be visited exactly once. The same goes for [17] in which each customer is assigned to exactly one vehicle route.

Consequently, in this thesis, we propose a new model that takes into account these differences as well as all other features of ESHFP. The mathematical model introduced as well as the proposed heuristic approach are designed in order determine the set of routes and vehicles to operate for providing commodities to both evacuees and intervention groups.

### 1.3. Thesis Structure

The remainder of the thesis is organized as follows: In Chapter 2 the mathematical formulation for the ESHFP is proposed. In Chapter 3 we propose the solution approach and the corresponding heuristic algorithm for ESHFP. Chapter 4 presents the computational results for the validation of the proposed heuristic. A case study concerning provisions supply to evacuees and intervention groups in case of a natural disaster at the Province of Teruel is presented in Chapter 5. Finally, Chapter 6 includes the conclusions and suggestions for future work.

## Chapter 2. Mathematical model for the ESHFP

The objective of ESHFP is to minimize the time span needed to provide the required provisions in case of a disaster to both evacuees and intervention groups at the corresponding shelters and crew accommodation sites. More specifically, ESHFP aims in determining the set of routes and the corresponding vehicles for providing consumable and non-consumable commodities to shelters and intervention groups' accommodation sites. The abovementioned time span consists of traveling time of vehicles, loading time of commodities at supply points and unloading time at delivery points. Among the possibly multiple solutions with the minimum supply time, the one with the minimum operational cost (time) is selected. To deal with ESHFP, a Mixed Integer Linear Programming Problem is formulated.

### 2.1. Notation

## Let

- $\quad P=\left\{p_{1}, \ldots, p_{r}\right\}$ be the set of shelters (including accommodation sites), hereafter called demand points, in which the provisions for the evacuees and the intervention groups will be transported to
- $\quad K=\{1, \ldots, u\}$ be the set of available vehicles, assuming that $u$ is the total number of available vehicles both public and private, each of capacity $Q_{k}, k \in K$. Note that all vehicles start and finish their routes from/to different locations (depots),
- $\quad O=\left\{o^{k} \mid k \in K\right\}$ be the set of originating locations of the vehicles
- $E=\left\{e^{k} \mid k \in K\right\}$ be the set of the ending locations. Each of these locations may be considered as a single parking space. The locations are used in order to address the requirement to separate the total vehicle operation time (or operational cost) from the supply time; note that the supply time is defined by the time the last required unit of commodity arrives to a shelter, and the total operation time is the sum of the operation times of all vehicles (till they return to the ending depots).
- $\quad S$ be the set of all supermarkets, hereafter called pick-up nodes.
- $\quad C=\{1, \ldots, m\}$ be the different types of commodities to be supplied to the evacuees and to the intervention groups
- $\quad U^{c}, c \in C$ be the volume per unit of commodity type $c$.
- $\quad M_{i}^{c}$ denote the availability of commodity $c \in C$ at supermarket $\in S$,
- $\quad h_{j}^{c}$ be the demand for commodity $c \in C$ at demand point $j \in P$.
- $\quad V^{k}=\left\{v_{1}^{k}, v_{2}^{k}, \ldots, v_{\left|V^{k}\right|}^{k}\right\}, k \in K$ be an ordered set containing the possible trips of each vehicle $k$, assuming that $\left|V^{k}\right|=\left\lceil\frac{\sum_{j \in P} \sum_{c \in C} h_{j}^{c} U^{c}}{Q_{k}}\right\rceil, k \in K$, i.e. the maximum number of trips required to deliver all the supplies by (utilizing the full capacity of) vehicle $k$. Note that a vehicle trip is the route of the vehicle between two consecutive visits to shelters.
- $\bar{V}=\bigcup_{k \in K} V^{k}$, be the set of all possible trips.
- $Q^{v}=Q_{k}, v \in V^{k}, k \in K$ denote that the capacity of the trips is equal to the capacity of the corresponding vehicle making the trip.

We formalize now the definition of directed graph $G(N, A)$, in which $N=P \cup S \cup O \cup E$ is the set of nodes, A is the arc set connecting the nodes of $N$ and $\bar{A}=A_{O} \cup A_{S} \cup A_{P} \cup A_{E}$ is a set of triplets, with each triplet comprising an arc and a trip. Thus

- $A_{O}=\left\{\left(o^{k}, j, v_{1}^{k}\right) \mid j \in S \cup\left\{e^{k}\right\}, k \in K\right\}$ contains the triplets that include a) the arcs starting from the originating location of each vehicle $k$ and $b$ ) the corresponding first trip. The first trip may be directed to a pick-up node, or to the ending location. The latter is used to model the idle vehicles (if any).
- $A_{S}=\left\{(i, j, v) \mid i \in S, j \in(S \backslash\{i\}) \cup P, v \in V^{k} \backslash\left\{v_{\left|V^{k}\right|}^{k}\right\}, k \in K\right\}$ be triplets containing arcs connecting each pick-up node $i \in S$ to all other pick-up nodes and to the demand points by all trips, excluding the last trip. The latter is dedicated to the return of the vehicle to its ending location
- $A_{P}=\left\{(i, j, v) \mid i \in P, j \in S \cup\{P \backslash\{i\}\}, v \in V^{k} \backslash\left\{v_{1}^{k}, v_{\left|V^{k}\right|}^{k}\right\}, k \in K\right\} \quad$ be triplets containing arcs between the demand points to all pick-up nodes (supermarkets) and to all other demand points by all trips besides the first and the last ones
- $A_{E}=\left\{\left(i, e^{k}, v_{\left|V^{k}\right|}^{k}\right) \mid i \in P, k \in K\right\}$ be triplets comprising of arcs connecting the demand points with the ending location of each vehicle by its last trip

Additionally, we define a set of pairs comprising trips related to certain nodes of the directed graph. Thus, we define set $\bar{N}=N_{O} \cup N_{S} \cup N_{E}$, where:

- $\quad N_{O}=\left\{\left(o^{k}, v_{1}^{k}\right) \mid k \in K\right\}$ includes pairs that contain the first trip of each vehicle and the corresponding originating location. Note that this set is used for formulation purposes only to indicate that only the first trip of each vehicle starts from the vehicle's associated location
- $\quad N_{S}=\left\{(j, v) \mid j \in S \cup P, v \in V^{k} \backslash\left\{v_{\left|v^{k}\right|}^{k}\right\}, k \in K\right\}$ includes pairs that contain all trips except the last trip of each vehicle. These trips may arrive at a pick-up location and a demand point.
- $N_{E}=\left\{\left(e^{k}, v\right) \mid v \in\left\{v_{1}^{k}, v_{\left|v^{k}\right|}^{k}\right\}, k \in K\right\}$ indicates that the first and/or the last trip of each vehicle may arrive at the corresponding ending location; an idle vehicle will be directed from the originating location to its ending location at its first trip, though a non-idle vehicle will make its last trip to its ending location.

Let $t_{i j}^{v},(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}$ be the minimum travel time between nodes i and j by trip v . Let also:

- $\quad w_{i}^{v},(i, v) \in \bar{N}$ be the time that trip $v$ arrives to node $i$
- $q_{i v}^{c},(i, v) \in \bar{N} \backslash N_{O}, c \in C$ be the quantity of commodity $c \in C$ on board a vehicle just before its arrival to node $i$ during trip $v$
- $\quad d_{i v}^{c},(i, v) \in\{\bar{N} \mid i \in S\}, c \in C$ be the quantity of commodity $c$ picked up from pick up node $i$ during trip $v$
- $\quad \hat{d}_{i v}^{c},(i, v) \in\{\bar{N} \mid i \in P\}, c \in C$ be the quantity of commodity $c$ delivered to delivery node (point) $i$ during trip $v$
- $\quad x_{i j}^{v},(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}$ be assigned the value 1 if $\operatorname{arc}(i, j) \in A$ is traversed by trip $v$, and 0 otherwise
- $\quad T_{\text {sup }}$ be the duration of the supply process, i.e. the time span defined by the start of the supply procedure until the time the last item of the demand at the shelters is delivered.


### 2.2. Model Formulation

The objective function of ESHFP is defined as follows:

$$
\begin{equation*}
T C=\min \left\{T_{\text {sup }}+\frac{1}{L} \sum_{(i, j, v) \in A} t_{i j}^{v} x_{i j}^{v}\right\} \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first term refers to the supply time of operation while the second term is the total vehicle operation time (cost) and $L$ ensures that the first term of objective function (2.1) dominates lexicographically the second term, the total supply time that is the objective time. Setting $L>$ $\sum_{(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}} t_{i j}^{v}$ ensures that in case of multiple solutions with the same supply time the one with the lowest total travel time among all, will be preferred [31], [32].

Optimization of (2.1) is subject to:

## Routing constraints

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{j \in N \mid\left(o^{k}, j, v_{1}^{k}\right) \in \bar{A}} x_{o^{k} j}^{v_{1}^{k}}=1, \quad k \in K  \tag{2.2}\\
& \sum_{v \in \bar{V}, j \in(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}} x_{i j}^{v} \geq 1, \quad i \in P \tag{2.3}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& x_{o^{k} e^{k}}^{v_{1}^{k}}+\sum_{i \in P} x_{i e^{k}}^{v_{\left|V^{k}\right|}^{k}}=1, \quad k \in K  \tag{2.5}\\
& x_{o^{k} e^{k}}^{v_{1}^{k}}+\sum_{i \in N \mid(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}} x_{i j}^{v}=1, \quad v \in V^{k} \backslash\left\{v_{\left|V^{k}\right|}^{k}\right\}, k \in K, j \in P  \tag{2.6}\\
& \sum_{i \in N \mid(i, l, v) \in \bar{A}} x_{i l}^{v}=\sum_{j \in N \mid(l, j, v) \in \bar{A}} x_{l j}^{v}, \quad l \in S, v \in V^{k} \backslash\left\{v_{\left|V^{k}\right|}^{k}\right\}, k \in K \tag{2.7}
\end{align*}
$$

## Timing constraints

$$
\begin{align*}
& T_{\text {sup }} \geq w_{j}^{v}, \quad v \in\left\{v_{\left|V^{k}\right|-1}^{k} \mid k \in K\right\}, j \in P  \tag{2.8}\\
& w_{i}^{v}+t_{i j}^{v}-B\left(1-x_{i j}^{v}\right) \leq w_{j}^{v}, \quad(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}, i \in O \cup S  \tag{2.9}\\
& w_{l}^{v_{n}^{k}}+t_{l j}^{v_{n+1}^{k}}-B\left(1-x_{l j}^{v_{n+1}^{k}}\right) \leq w_{j}^{v_{n+1}^{k}}, \quad \begin{array}{l}
\left(l, j, v_{n+1}^{k}\right) \in \bar{A}, \\
n=1, \ldots,\left|V^{k}\right|-1,
\end{array}  \tag{2.10}\\
& k \in K, j \in S \cup P \cup\left\{e^{k}\right\}, l \in P \\
& 0 \leq w_{j}^{v} \leq B \sum_{(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}} x_{i j}^{v}, \quad(j, v) \in \bar{N} \tag{2.11}
\end{align*}
$$

## Capacity constraints

$$
\begin{align*}
& q_{i v}^{c}+d_{i v}^{c}-B\left(1-x_{i j}^{v}\right) \leq q_{j v}^{c}, \quad(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}, i \in S \cup, c \in C  \tag{2.12}\\
& \sum_{c \in C} q_{i v}^{c} U^{c}+\sum_{c \in C} d_{i v}^{c} U^{c} \leq Q^{v}, \quad(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}, i \in S \tag{2.13}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll} 
& \left(i, j, v_{n+1}^{k}\right) \in \bar{A}, \\
q_{i v_{n}^{k}}^{c}-\hat{d}_{i v_{n}^{k}}^{c}-B\left(1-x_{i j}^{v_{n+1}^{k}}\right) \leq q_{j v_{n+1}^{c}}^{c}, & n=1, \ldots,\left|V^{k}\right|-1,  \tag{2.14}\\
& k \in K, j \in S \cup P \cup\left\{e^{k}\right\}, i \in P
\end{array}
$$

## Supply constraints

$$
\begin{array}{rl}
\sum_{v \in \bar{V} \mid(i, v) \in \bar{N}} d_{i v}^{c} \leq M_{i}^{c}, & c \in C, i \in S \\
\sum_{v \in \bar{V} \mid(j, v) \in \bar{N}} \hat{d}_{j v}^{c} \geq h_{j}^{c}, & c \in C, j \in P \\
d_{i v}^{c} \in \mathbb{N}_{0} & c \in C, i \in S \cup O,(i, v) \in \bar{N} \\
\hat{d}_{j v}^{c} \in \mathbb{N}_{0} & c \in C, j \in P,(i, v) \in \bar{N} \tag{2.18}
\end{array}
$$

## Other constraints

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{c \in C} \sum_{k \in K} q_{e^{k} v_{\left|v^{k}\right|}^{c}}^{c}+\sum_{c \in C} \sum_{k \in K} w_{s^{k}}^{v_{1}^{k}}=0,  \tag{2.19}\\
& \sum_{c \in C} q_{j v_{1}^{k}}^{c} \leq B\left(1-x_{i j}^{v_{1}^{k}}\right), \quad(i, j, v) \in \bar{A}, i \in O, j \in S  \tag{2.20}\\
& x_{i j}^{v} \in\{0,1\}, \quad(i, j, v) \in \bar{A} \tag{2.21}
\end{align*}
$$

Regarding the routing constraints: Constraint (2.2) ensures that the first vehicle trips should depart from the originating depot. Constraint (2.3) denotes that the demand points should be visited at least once. Constraint (2.4) indicates that when a vehicle trip arrives at a demand point the next vehicle trip should depart from it. Constraint (2.5) ensures that the first or the last trip should arrive at the ending depot. Constraint (2.6) ensures that the trips of non-idle vehicles should arrive at the demand points, or idle vehicles should be headed directly to the ending location. Constraint (2.7) indicates that if a vehicle arrives at a pick-up location (supermarket) it should also depart from this node within the same trip.

Regarding the timing constraints: Inequality (2.8) ensures that the supply time is greater than the last visit to any demand point. Constraint (2.9) defines the change of the arriving time at any node other than the ending locations for each trip (demand points), where $B \gg 1$. Correspondingly, constraint (2.10) defines the change of the arriving time for each next trip that departs from a demand point. Constraint (2.11) ensures that the time of arrival to any node will be greater or equal to zero, with $B \gg 1$, and, specifically, it will be equal to zero if the location is not visited.

Regarding the capacity constraints: Inequality (2.12) defines the change of the load after an originating or a pick-up location for each trip, where $B \gg 1$. Additionally, inequality (2.13) ensures that the capacity of a vehicle is not violated, while inequality (2.14) defines the change of the load for each trip after a visit to a demand point, where $B \gg 1$.

Regarding the supply constraints: Inequalities (2.15) and (2.16) refer to the total supplies to be picked up and delivered; no more than the available commodities may be picked-up from any pick-up location during all vehicle trips; the demand of supplies should be satisfied for all demand points correspondingly. Constraint (2.17) defines the nature of the pick-up quantity variable and constraint (2.18) defines the nature of the delivery quantity variable.

Regarding the rest of the constraints: Inequality (2.19) ensures that each vehicle trip starts at time equal to zero, and ends empty at the ending location. Constraint (2.20) ensures that a vehicle starts empty from its originating location. Finally, constraint (2.21) defines the binary nature of the arc variables at each trip $v$.

### 2.3. Required inputs for ESHFP

In order to apply the model presented in Section 2.2, the following 5 categories of data need to be provided: (a) Commodities, (b) Pickup locations (supermarkets), (c) Demand points (shelters), (d) Road Network, (e) Available vehicles.

More specifically, regarding the commodities to be picked up and delivered to the evacuees and the intervention groups, the Stock Keeping Unit (SKU or part number, i.e. mineral water) and the volume (or weight) of the storage unit (i.e. each, carton, pallet) per commodity should be provided in order to optimally plan the loading of the vehicles.

Regarding the nodes of the network, the pick-up locations (supermarkets), and their exact location should be provided. The same holds for the starting and ending locations of each vehicle, as well as of the shelters. For the network arcs, input data required include the distances a) between the originating points of available vehicles and the pick-up locations, b) between each pick-up location and the other pick up locations, as well as all shelters, c) between each shelter and the other shelters, as well as the ending locations of each vehicle. Note that when possible, any alternative arcs should be also being provided.

Regarding the available vehicles either public or private, input information should include for each vehicle, the capacity (in volume or weight) and their originating and ending locations.

## Chapter 3. Solution Framework for ESHFP

Due to its complexity, ESHFP is very difficult to be solved to optimality in a reasonable time. In order to efficiently solve the aforementioned problem in reasonable time, we have developed a heuristic algorithm. This algorithm aims in determining the set of routes and the vehicles to operate them that minimize the total time to supply all required provisions to evacuees and intervention groups at the corresponding shelters with respect to constraints concerning routing, timing, capacity, demand and supply.

The important data for ESHFP include the following categories:

- Commodities
- Supply Points
- Shelters
- Road Network
- Available vehicles


## Heuristic Approach for the ESHFP

In the proposed algorithm, firstly we create a list of all available vehicles, thereinafter called $A V L$, which is sorted in descending order with respect to their capacity. It is necessary to note that during the creation of $A V L$, the public vehicles have priority in $A V L$ against private vehicles. This is because there is uncertainty about immediate availability of private vehicles after an emergency. When AVL is created, the abovementioned priority ceases to apply, and all vehicles are utilized with the same way. Following that, all shelters that will be served are grouped into clusters according to their geographic location. Each cluster will be served by one (or more if necessary) vehicles. The well-known $K-$ means algorithm is used for clustering. The cluster with the highest total demand is selected to be served first. Then, we select the vehicle from $A V L$ with the smallest capacity among the vehicles that are concluded in AVL that can cover the total demand of the selected cluster. If there is no such vehicle in the $A V L$, the vehicle with the highest capacity among all vehicles (both public and private) in $A V L$ is selected instead. Subsequently

- We create a route for the nodes (shelters) in the selected cluster using the Clark \& Wright Savings algorithm and we select the nodes of the given route that the vehicle may serve by using the parameters X \& Y that are used to decide on whether a vehicle should continue its supply trip to a subsequent shelter after it has delivered to the current shelter. Threshold X is the remaining capacity which a vehicle can have in order for the algorithm to continue planning its loading. Threshold Y is the maximum
allowable time distance needed for traveling from a shelter to another, so as for the algorithm to continue planning vehicle's loading. The decision of continuing planning examines both these thresholds. If the remaining capacity of a vehicle is lower than X and the triangular time distance between two shelters and the temporary point is lower than Y , then the algorithm plans vehicle's loading for both shelters.
- We create a route for the supply points that can provide the higher amount of commodities for serving the current cluster using the Clark \& Wright Savings and 2opt algorithms. The selected vehicle is then routed to the selected supply points and collects the inventory. Next, the vehicle is routed to the first node of the route set for the selected cluster, and the needed commodities are unloaded. When the vehicle finishes its route, it becomes available again.

After routing the first vehicle, the entire process is repeated until the total demand of all shelters is met.

Since the objective of the algorithm is to minimize the time span of the entire operation, all selected vehicles start their first routes at time zero.

The proposed algorithm works as follows:
Step 0. (Preparatory Step) Compute the center of gravity of supply points, identify the supply point that is closest to it and set that supply point as Temporary Point (TP). This will be the reference point for vehicles to return when they complete a route. Select also the appropriate vehicles among all available, to create AVL. More specifically, if the Total Demand is higher than Total Capacity of all vehicles (both public and private), then insert all into AVL, else include vehicles in AVL, until their Total Capacity exceeds the Total Demand by picking first the public and then the private vehicles (see above).
Step 1. (Clustering) Create a matrix named Clusters by grouping the shelters into clusters; two options are provided: a) the user creates the clusters manually, b) using the $K$ means algorithm

Step 2. (Initialization) Convert all the amounts of commodities into cubic meters and create $A V L$ which includes all vehicle information (such as capacity, traveled time and vehicle ID)
Step 3. (Assignment) Set the cluster with the highest demand as Current Cluster and set as Current Vehicle the vehicle with the lowest capacity that can cover the total demand of the selected cluster. In case there is no such vehicle, select the vehicle with the highest capacity among all. Note that the Current Vehicle, will be routed only to Current Cluster, even though its capacity far exceeds the total demand of that cluster.

Step 4. (Delivery route) Create a route for all shelters of the Current Cluster, using the Clark \& Wright Savings algorithm. The Temporary Point (TP), will be used as the starting and the ending point of that route simultaneously. The entire route or part of it will be served by Current Vehicle. Compute the necessary inventory to be collected from supply points
Step 5. (Commodities picking) Select the supply points that can supply the necessary inventory so as to be visited by Current Vehicle. Then, set a route for visiting supply points by using Clark \& Wright Savings algorithm and use 2-opt algorithm to improve it. Execute the route and load the vehicle with appropriate commodities from each supply point

Step 6. (Commodities delivering) Execute the shelter route and deliver the planned amount of commodities at each shelter

Step 7. (Termination) Update Clusters by removing the shelters that are fully served.
If Total Demand is still higher than zero
Go to Step 3.

## Else

Compute Total Supply Time as the maximum service time among all shelters End

The pseudo code of the algorithm as well as the necessary notation, is given in the following:

## Notation

- Let $F$ be the number of clusters to create for grouping shelters
- Let Clusters be a matrix containing $F$ clusters (rows). The non-zero elements of row $i=1, \ldots, F$ are the shelters grouped into cluster $i$
- Let $h$ be the demand matrix for shelters (elements in units)
- Let $s$ be the supply matrix for supply points (elements in units)
- Let $v o l \_h$ be the demand in volume $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$
- Let $C P$ be a matrix with the IDs and current point of each vehicle
- Let $C V$ be the current vehicle
- Let $A V L$ be a list including all available vehicles along with their ID, their total traveling time and their capacity $\left(m^{3}\right)$
- Let loading_time $\equiv$ uloading_time be 9 min for loading $3 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ (assumption)
- Let Var_Map be a matrix including the following [\# of public vehicles, \# of private vehicles, \# of shelters, \# of supply points, \# of Reference Points]
- Let $V L$ be the on board inventory per commodity for a vehicle
- Let $S M_{-}$route be the initial sequence of visits to supply points
- Let SM_Final_Route be an improved version of SM_route
- Let nearestSM be a matrix with the distances of each supply point from the reference point
- Let $T$ be a matrix with the total service time for each shelter
- Let Total_Demand be the total demand of all shelters $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$
- Let Final Routes be the routes of supply plan
- Let Travel_Times be the traveling times between all nodes
- Let Total_Supply_Time be the time that is needed for covering the total demand
- 


## Pseudocode

- Compute the coordinates of reference point
- Initialize nearest SM

For $i=1$ : number of supply points
nearestSM $(i, 1)=$ the ID of supply point $i$ nearestSM $(i, 2)=$ the Euclidean distance from supply point $i$ to reference point
End

- Set as ID of the reference point the ID of its nearest supply point
- Initialize Var_Map, Travel_Times, $C P, T, h$, s, Final_Routes
- Call subroutine Clustering to group the shelters into clusters
- Call subroutine Commodities_Conversion_into_Volume in order to convert all the amounts of commodities into volume
- Compute Total_Demand using vol_h
- Call subroutine AVL_Creation in order to select the appropriate vehicles to operate the supply process

While Total_Demand $>0$

- Call subroutine Cluster_Selection to select the cluster to be served
- Call subroutine Vehicle_Selection to select the vehicle to serve the selected cluster
- Set the selected vehicle as $C V$
- Call subroutine Shelters_CWS to create an optimal route for all shelters inside the selected cluster
- Call subroutine Shelters_Selection_For_Route in order to select which nodes of the selected cluster will be served during each route
- Initialize the load of $C V$ per commodity (matrix $V L$ )
- Call subroutine Supermarket_Selection_For_Route to select which supply points will be visited by $C V$
- Call subroutine Supermarkets_CWS in order to create a route for the selected supply points (SM_route)
- Call subroutine 2-opt_for_sm in order to optimize the resulted route of subroutine Supermarkets_CWS (SM_Final_Route)
- Initialize loading_time
- Call subroutine SM_Route_Execution_and_Vehicle_Loading to execute the routes for the selected supply points and load $C V$ with the appropriate amounts per commodity
- Initialize unloading_time
- Call subroutine Shelters_Route_Execution to execute the routes for shelters of the selected cluster and unload the appropriate amounts of commodities at each shelter
- Call subroutine Clusters_Update in order to update Clusters matrix by deleting shelters that have been already served
- Update Total_Demand

End

- Total_Supply_Time $=$ maxelement(T)

A detailed description of the algorithm and the pseudocode of each subroutine as well as the flowchart of the proposed algorithm are presented in Appendix II.

## Chapter 4. Computational Results

In order to validate the proposed algorithm, various problem instances have been solved both manually and using the algorithm coded in MATLAB. More specifically we solved five problems. In Section 4.1. we present one of these examples. In addition to validating the algorithm, the purpose of these tests is also to examine whether the provisions supply plan provided by the proposed algorithm is efficient or any improvements should be introduced. The experiments indicate that the proposed heuristic (both routing and loading $\backslash$ unloading subroutines) performs well and the derived supply plans are in fact efficient.

### 4.1. Validation of Proposed Heuristic

To validate the proposed algorithm, consider an instance of the ESHFP problem with three shelters grouped into two clusters. Let's also assume that two vehicles (one public and one private) with the same starting point are available for collecting and delivering supplies. The supplies consist of two different commodities, collected from five supply points. Table 4.1 presents in detail the supply-related input for the algorithm, Table 4.2 presents the shelterrelated input for the algorithm, and Table 4.3 provides input concerning the pick-up locations. Vehicle-related information and the road network are presented in Tables 4.4 and 4.5 respectively.

Table 4.1. Commodities-related input for the for the validation example

| Table 4.1. Commodities-retated input for the for the validation example |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | ID | Dimensions (m) per item (commodity) |  |  |  |
|  |  | Length | Width | Height |  |
| Agua mineral (1,5lt) | 887 | 0.0650 | 0.0700 | 0.3400 |  |
| Sandwiches | 884 | 0.3000 | 0.0700 | 0.0600 |  |

Table 4.2. Shelter-related input for the validation example

| Shelters | ID | Cluster | Coordinates |  | Demand (units) Per Commodity ID |  | Demand ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) Per Commodity ID |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Latitude | Longitude | 887 | 884 | 887 | 884 |
| 1 | 9928 | 1 | 38.86297 | 22.43984 | 6300 | 3000 | 9.7461 | 3.78 |
| 2 | 9984 | 2 | 38.83657 | 22.44121 | 3000 | 1000 | 4.641 | 1.26 |
| 3 | 9957 | 2 | 38.86297 | 22.43984 | 1000 | 1000 | 1.547 | 1.26 |

Table 4.3. Supply point-related input for the validation example

| Supply points | ID | Coordinates |  | Supplies (Stock in Units) Per Commodity ID |  | Supplies (Stock in $\mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{3}}$ ) <br> Per Commodity ID |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Latitude | Longitude | 887 | 884 | 887 | 884 |
| 1 | 3352 | 45,3112 | 1,513769 | 2100 | 1000 | 3.2487 | 1.26 |
| 2 | 3361 | 45,3055 | 1,517245 | 2100 | 0 | 3.2487 | 0 |
| 3 | 3341 | 45,3082 | 1,530034 | 2100 | 2000 | 3.2487 | 2.52 |
| 4 | 3389 | 45,3088 | 1,562497 | 1900 | 1000 | 2.9393 | 1.26 |
| 5 | 3374 | 45,3143 | 1,560761 | 2100 | 1000 | 3.2487 | 1.26 |

Table 4.4. Vehicle-related input for the validation example

| Vehicle | ID | Starting Point 's Coordinates |  |  | Starting Point ID |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | C | Latitude | Longitude |  |
| Public Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 4452 | 15 | 40,33302 | -1,08217 | 7784 |
| Private Vehicles |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 5568 | 7 | 40,33302 | -1,08217 | 7712 |

Table 4.5. Network (distances in min) input for the validation example

| From | Network (min) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ToIDs | Public Vehicles' Starting Points 7784 | Private <br> Vehicles' Starting Points 7712 | Shelters |  |  | Supply points |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 9928 | 9984 | 9957 | 3352 | 3361 | 3341 | 3389 | 3374 |
| Public Vehicles' | 7784 | 0 | - | - | - | - | 3 | 7 | 2 | 16 | 18 |
| Starting Points Private |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Vehicles' | 7712 | - | 0 | - | - | - | 19 | 21 | 16 | 2 | 1 |
| Starting Points |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 9928 | - | - | 0 | 30 | 29 | 6 | 10 | 1 | 30 | 30 |
| Shelters | 9984 | - | - | 30 | 0 | 2 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 3 | 2 |
|  | 9957 | - | - | 29 | 2 | 0 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 3352 | - | - | 6 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 30 | 30 |
|  | 3361 | - | - | 10 | 30 | 30 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 30 | 30 |
| Supply points | 3341 | - | - | 1 | 30 | 30 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 30 | 30 |
|  | 3389 | - | - | 30 | 3 | 4 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 0 | 2 |
|  | 3374 | - | - | 30 | 2 | 4 | 30 | 30 | 30 | 2 | 0 |

Based on the heuristic algorithm (see also Table 4.6) the public vehicle, which has the highest capacity, should be routed to cluster 1 which requires the highest demand, and the private vehicle should be routed to cluster 2 . However, according to its capacity, the private vehicle cannot pick up the total demand needed at cluster 2 . Thus, cluster 2 should be visited again by one of the vehicles. Due to the travel times of the abovementioned routes, the private vehicle is the first that becomes available again and thus this is the vehicle to revisit cluster 2.

The public vehicle visits three supply points to collect the required demand of cluster 1 , and the private vehicle visits two supply points until its capacity is met. The demand of cluster 2 is not satisfied by the first trip of the private vehicle, since the demand is higher than the vehicle's capacity, and a second trip for cluster 2 is performed by the private vehicle (which is the first of the two vehicles that becomes available). The private vehicle, on its second trip, visits one supply point that can provide the rest of the supplies for cluster 2 and thereafter it delivers its load to terminate the entire supply process. The total supply time is determined by the time that the public vehicle needs to pick up and deliver the required supplies in cluster 1. In Table 4.6, the output of the proposed algorithm is provided.

Note that the results provided by the algorithm are the expected ones, since firstly the routes are indeed constructed according to the algorithm's concept (vehicle with the highest capacity
routed to the cluster with the highest demand). Beyond this, according to capacities and demand, cluster 2 , which is assigned to the private vehicle, needs indeed two routes to be served. Finally, the algorithm manages to satisfy the entire demand of each shelter.

| Number of Route | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  | 3 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle ID | 4452 |  |  | 5568 |  |  | 5568 |  |  |
| Route Starting Time | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  | 66 |  |  |
| Ending Time | 116 |  |  | 62 |  |  | 88 |  |  |
|  | ID of Supply point/ Shelter | Commodity ID | Quantity $\left(\mathbf{m}^{3}\right)$ | ID of Supply point / Shelter | Commodity ID | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Quantity } \\ & \left(\mathbf{m}^{3}\right) \end{aligned}$ | ID of Supply point / Shelter | Commodity ID | Quantity $\left(\mathbf{m}^{3}\right)$ |
| Supply points | 3361 | 887 | 3.249 | 3389 | 887 | 2.491 | 3389 | 887 | 0.448 |
|  |  | 884 | 0 |  | 884 | 0 |  | 884 | 1.26 |
|  | 3352 | 887 | 3.249 | 3374 | 887 | 3.249 | 3374 | 887 | - |
|  |  | 884 | 1.26 |  | 884 | 1.26 |  | 884 | - |
|  | 3341 | 887 | 3.249 | - | 887 | - | - | 887 | - |
|  |  | 884 | 2.52 |  | 884 | - |  | 884 | - |
| Shelters | 9928 | 887 | 9.747 | 9984 | 887 | 4.641 | 9984 | 887 | 0.448 |
|  |  | 884 | 3.78 |  | 884 | 1.26 |  | 884 | 1.26 |
|  | - | 887 | - | 9957 | 887 | 1.099 | 9957 | $887$ <br> 884 | - |
|  |  | 884 | - |  | 884 | 0 |  |  | - |
| Cluster | Shelter ID |  | Shelter Service Time (in min) |  | Total Supply Time |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 9928 | - | 116 | - | 116 |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 9984 | 9957 | 51 | 88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 4.2. Problem Generator

In order to test the performance of the proposed algorithm in different ESHFP configurations, a problem generator was developed to generate multiple problem instances.in order to study the effects of critical problem parameters on the value of the problem's objective function.

### 4.2.1. Problem Generator Description

To generate the test problems we generated needed data (inputs) for the following 5 categories: (a) Commodities, (b) Supply points, (c) Shelters, (d) Available vehicles, (e) Road network.

Furthermore, to examine the behavior of the solution with respect to significant problem characteristics, we defined suitable normalized parameters based on the above input data.

### 4.2.2. Definition of Normalized Parameters

We have defined the following normalized parameters based on the inputs used to generate the problems. These parameters characterize the significant features of each problem, and are used to study the behavior of the solution (in terms of the value of the objective function) based on the problem features/characteristics.

1) Parameter " $S$ " is the ratio of the number of shelters over the number of supply points (e.g. supply points):

$$
\begin{equation*}
S=\frac{\# \text { of shelters }}{\# \text { of supermarkets }}, \quad S=1,2 \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

2) Parameter " $P$ " is the ratio of total demand over total supply:

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=\frac{\text { Total Demand }}{\text { Total Supply }}, \quad P=0.05,0.1, \ldots, 0.9,0.95 \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

3) Parameter " $D$ " is the ratio of total demand over the total capacity of vehicles that will be used in the algorithm:

$$
\begin{equation*}
D=\frac{\text { Total Demand }}{\text { Total Capacity }}, \quad D=0.1,0.2,0.3,0.4,0.5,1,2 \tag{4.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

4) Parameter " $\sigma$ " quantifies the distribution of commodities at supply points. More specifically it quantifies whether:
4.a. commodities are distributed (almost) uniformly among supply points
4.b. commodities are distributed non-uniformly among supply points

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma^{2}=\sum_{c \in C} s_{c}^{2} \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C=\{1, \ldots, m\}$ is the set of types of commodities to be supplied to the evacuees and to the intervention groups.

For example, for the commodity water, the deviation is given as follows):

$$
s_{\text {water }}=\sqrt{\frac{\left(s_{1}^{\text {water }}-\frac{d_{\text {water }}}{n}\right)^{2}+\left(s_{2}^{\text {water }}-\frac{d_{\text {water }}}{n}\right)^{2}+\cdots+\left(s_{n}^{\text {water }}-\frac{d_{\text {water }}}{n}\right)^{2}}{(n-1)}}
$$

where

- $s_{i}^{\text {water }}$ is the units of mineral water provided by supply point $i$,
- $\quad d_{\text {water }}$ is the he total demand for mineral water (in units)
$n$ is the number of supply points

If the commodities are distributed (almost) uniformly among supply points, $\sigma^{2}$ is low and if the commodities are distributed non-uniformly among supply points, $\sigma^{2}$ is high. For every single problem and for each commodity, we generate the inventory of the supply points randomly 100 times and we compute $\sigma^{2}$. The cases with supply point's inventory resulting to the highest and lowest values of $\sigma^{2}$ are chosen.

Considering all the above, and combining the values of the mentioned parameters, we address the following cases (Table 4.7.):

Table 4.7. The four main groups of problem categories that are generated.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
S=\frac{\# \text { of shelters }}{\# \text { of supermarkets }}=1 & \sigma^{2}=\text { high } \\
S=\frac{\# \text { of shelters }}{\# \text { of supermarkets }}=1 & \sigma^{2}=\text { low } \\
S=\frac{\# \text { of shelters }}{\# \text { of supermarkets }}=2 & \sigma^{2}=\text { high } \\
S=\frac{\text { Total Demand }}{\# \text { of shelters }}=2 & \sigma^{2}=\text { low }
\end{array} \quad D=\frac{\text { Total Demand }}{\text { Total Capacity }}
$$

The combination of the above creates 532 different cases.

Note that 100 problems are solved for each different case and the analysis considers the mean Total Supply Time, and the mean km travelled by vehicles.

The sample problems are generated based on the following:

## Step 1. Generator 's constants

- Parameters $X$ are $Y$ are 0 and 10 , respectively.
- The commodities and their characteristics are provided in Table 4.8:

Table 4.8. Commodities-related input for the generator

| Table 4.8. Commodities-related input for the generator |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Type | ID | Dimensions (m) per item (commodity) |  |  |
|  |  | Length | Width | Height |
| Agua mineral (1,5lt) | 334 | 0.0650 | 0.0700 | 0.3400 |
| Dairy products, juices | 339 | 0.0900 | 0.0600 | 0.2100 |
| Fruits (oranges, apples...) | 336 | 0.1000 | 0.1000 | 0.1000 |
| Sandwiches | 338 | 0.3000 | 0.0700 | 0.0600 |
| Hygiene kits | 335 | 0.2000 | 0.1800 | 0.0500 |
| Mattrers or landing mat | 331 | 1.8000 | 0.6000 | 0.0500 |

- Personal Demand (items per person) as in Table 4.9:

Table 4.9. Daily demand per commodity per person

| Type | Mineral <br> Water <br> $(\mathbf{1 , 5 l t})$ | Dairy <br> products, <br> juices | Fruits <br> (oranges, <br> apples,...) | Sandwiches | Hygiene | Mattrers or <br> kits <br> landing mat |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Personal Demand <br> (Items per Person) | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 |

- Assumptions:

Pallet Volume $=0.96 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$.
Pallet Dimensions: $1.2 \mathrm{~m} \times 0, .8 \mathrm{~m} \times 1 \mathrm{~m}$.

- We compute the volume of demand per person
- The Total Demand is generated initially into pallets. The number of pallets is generated, and follows Normal Distribution with $\mu=30$ pallets and $\sigma=2$. We also accept number of pallets higher or equal to 25 . This step is done for generator's implementation. More specifically, by forcing each problem to have similar Total Demand with the other problems, we have objectivity between all the problems. Thus, the Total Supply Time of a problem will not be differentiated from the other 99 problems of the same case.
- We generate the Total Demand into pallets using normal distribution with $\mu=30$ and $\sigma=2$.
- We compute the volume of Total Demand (into $m^{3}$ )
- We compute the total number of people that will be served my dividing the total volume of demand with the volume of demand per person.


## Step 2. Number of Supply points

- It is generated from the Uniform Distribution, $\mathrm{U}(2,5)$.


## Step 3. Shelters

- We compute the number of Shelters according to Parameter " $S$ "
- The shelter coordinates follow a Uniform Distribution and their Euclidian distance from $(0,0)$ is between 30 and 50 . (Figure 4.1 indicates the area that shelters are placed)
- The number of people in each shelter is created randomly maintaining the total number of people in all centers constant as discussed above
- The number of clusters follows the Uniform Distribution, U (1,3, and is smaller or equal to the number of shelters


## Step 4. Supply points (Other Information)

- Supply points' coordinates follow a Uniform Distribution and their Euclidian distance from $(0,0)$ is between 0 and 20. (Figure 4.1 indicates also the area of the supply points)
- As for the inventory, it is generated in accordance with the current case and / or sub case.


Figure 4.1. Geographical Representation of the space that the nodes are located

## Step 5. Vehicles

- Number of Vehicles (Total number of vehicles) is generated from the Uniform Distribution, $\mathrm{U}(2,5)$.
- The coordinates of the origins of the public and private vehicles follow a uniform distribution and their Euclidian distance from $(0,0)$ is between 0 and 20.
- The vehicle capacities are generated in accordance with parameter $D$ which refers to the total capacity of the case
- The mean speed of both Public and Private vehicles is generated form the Uniform Distribution, U $(45,55)$.


## Step 6. Network

- We calculate the Euclidian distance from each node to all others
- We compute the time distance using the Euclidian distance from each node to all others, and the mean speed of vehicles that is generated in the previous step


### 4.2.3. Test Results

In the first set of experiments, the commodities are distributed non-uniformly ( $\sigma^{2}=$ high ) among supply points and there is an equal number of shelters and supply points ( $S=$ $\frac{\text { \# of shelters }}{\# \text { of supermarkets }}=1$ ). The results are shown in Table 4.10, and in Figure 4.2. Lower Total Supply Time $(T)$ is achieved for $D=1$ where Total Demand is equal to Total Capacity of all
vehicles, independently of $P$. On the other hand, Total Supply Times reveals a peak for $D=$ 2.

In the second set of experiments, the commodities are distributed (almost) uniformly ( $\sigma^{2}=$ low) among supply points and there is an equal number of shelters and supply points ( $S=$ $\frac{\# \text { of shelters }}{\# \text { of supply points }}=1$ ). The results are shown in Table 4.11 and in Figure 4.3. The lowest time in this case is 197.4 minutes and is achieved for $D=1$ and $P=0.2$. Under these parameter values all vehicles will be used approximately once, and the vehicles will visit a low number of supply points. On the other hand, the highest time is 337.63 minutes and comes when $D=2$ and $P=$ 0.9 . This is because the vehicles are forced to execute multiple routes to satisfy the demand, and simultaneously, they will visit multiple supply points per route (in this case total demand is $90 \%$ of total supply).

In the third set of experiments, the commodities are distributed non-uniformly ( $\sigma^{2}=h i g h$ ) among supply points and the number of shelters is twice the number of supply points ( $S=$ $\frac{\# \text { of shelters }}{\# \text { of supply points }}=2$ ). The results are shown in Table 4.12 and in Figure 4.4. Lower Total Supply Time ( $T$ ) is achieved for $D=1$, independently of the value of P . On the other hand, Total Supply Times reveals a peak when $D=2$, because here also, the vehicles are forced to execute multiple routes to cover the demand.

In the last set of experiments, the commodities are distributed (almost) uniformly ( $\sigma^{2}=$ low) among supply points and the number of shelters is twice the number of supply points $\left(S=\frac{\# \text { of shelters }}{\# \text { of supply points }}=2\right)$. The results are shown in Table 4.13 and in Figure 4.5. The lowest time is 231.57 minutes and is achieved for $D=1$ and $P=0.2$. On the other hand, the highest time is 375.32 minutes for $D=2$ and $P=0.9$. In this case the vehicles not only are forced to execute multiple routes, but they have to visit a larger number of supply points.

Overall it can be observed that the value of Total Supply Time is varying in almost the same manner for all groups of problems. For instance, for $D=0.1$ to $D=0.5$ there is a slight fluctuation of Total Supply Time ( $T$ ). On the other hand, $T$ achieves its lowest values for $D=$ 1 , while $T$ increases for $D=2$. The most favorable case relates to $D=1$ since:

- The vehicles can collect all the needed demand by executing about one trip
- All vehicles operate in parallel

As for parameters $S, P, D$ and $\sigma$, we can conclude the following:

- The increase of the number of shelters causes an expected increase of Total Supply Time as we can see in Figure 4.6 and 4.7.
- The increase of Total Demand in terms of Total Supply, as we can see in Figures 4.24.5 , is responsible for a slight increase of Total Supply Time because more commodities have to be collected and subsequently more time for loading and unloading is needed.
- The capacity of vehicles has the most critical effect on Total Supply Time. If it is lower than Total demand, some vehicles are forced to execute more than one routes. If Total capacity of all vehicles is lower than Total Demand, the algorithm will not use all of them, which means that the vehicles that will be used, are forced to visit multiple supply points to collect the necessary commodities while others will not be used at all.
- The cases where commodities are distributed (almost) uniformly among supply points results in lower Total Supply Time versus the cases where the commodities are distributed non-uniformly (see Figures: 4.8 and 4.9). This is because vehicles may have to visit more supply points in the former case, to collect the proper commodities then route to shelters.
- Uneven distribution of commodities across supply points increases Total Supply Time.

Concerning the above, it can be claimed that the proposed Heuristic Algorithm is somehow greedy as far vehicle loading concerns. A smarter loading approach may improve its performance.

Table 4.10. Generator Results for the first group of problems ( $S=1, \sigma^{2}=$ high $)$
D = Total Demand / Total Capacity

|  |  | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 1 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0,05 | 243,29 | 251,44 | 254,73 | 246,8 | 238,58 | 221,34 | 312,87 |
|  | 0,1 | 254 | 243,56 | 255,64 | 258,69 | 245,29 | 234,01 | 323,99 |
|  | 0,15 | 259,42 | 258,55 | 256,65 | 242,79 | 250,28 | 224,59 | 323,42 |
|  | 0,2 | 256,41 | 261,91 | 267,19 | 249,32 | 252,39 | 223,85 | 330,98 |
|  | 0,25 | 269,23 | 266,12 | 258,37 | 259,42 | 259,6 | 227,09 | 340,51 |
|  | 0,3 | 260,03 | 252,61 | 264,81 | 262,49 | 247,47 | 241,4 | 331,3 |
|  | 0,35 | 271,06 | 267,17 | 266,49 | 253,19 | 253,34 | 231,99 | 333,9 |
|  | 0,4 | 260,38 | 259,92 | 261,71 | 261,53 | 251,21 | 227,84 | 339,63 |
|  | 0,45 | 270,57 | 254,71 | 263,11 | 263,93 | 255,88 | 218,52 | 343,41 |
|  | 0,5 | 254,48 | 260,38 | 259,31 | 261,42 | 253,6 | 240,53 | 335,16 |
|  | 0,55 | 256,85 | 268,31 | 257,22 | 265,77 | 259,97 | 232,67 | 347,6 |
|  | 0,6 | 255,71 | 261,6 | 263,55 | 248,06 | 269,92 | 231,51 | 345,79 |
|  | 0,65 | 247,63 | 257,72 | 264,83 | 267,08 | 251,47 | 226,07 | 343,82 |
|  | 0,7 | 258,31 | 262,27 | 260,43 | 269,4 | 247,55 | 233,08 | 339,62 |
|  | 0,75 | 249,7 | 261,98 | 241,52 | 265,9 | 251,82 | 230,98 | 340,05 |
|  | 0,8 | 259,83 | 261,92 | 262,25 | 253,58 | 265,18 | 235,5 | 337,83 |
|  | 0,85 | 262,23 | 262,13 | 258,14 | 253,47 | 254,93 | 234,09 | 337,45 |
|  | 0,9 | 261,49 | 268,02 | 254,76 | 250,63 | 251,17 | 228,71 | 341,26 |
|  | 0,95 | 261,08 | 258,7 | 252,3 | 265,55 | 267,19 | 240,7 | 346,93 |



Figure 4.2. Generator Results for the first group of problems $\left(S=1, \sigma^{2}=\right.$ high $)$

Table 4.11. Generator Results for the second group of problems $\left(S=1, \sigma^{2}=\right.$ low $)$
D = Total Demand / Total Capacity

|  |  | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 1 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0,05 | 220,06 | 228,58 | 237,9 | 229,24 | 221,7 | 208,54 | 307,53 |
|  | 0,1 | 234,85 | 232,86 | 219,42 | 218,25 | 227,6 | 207,19 | 303,93 |
|  | 0,15 | 221,91 | 231,4 | 227,07 | 226,4 | 221,6 | 201,16 | 300,28 |
|  | 0,2 | 233,63 | 230,8 | 235,7 | 221,21 | 233,94 | 197,4 | 291,44 |
|  | 0,25 | 244,24 | 237,21 | 241,69 | 231,5 | 220,57 | 216,91 | 307,52 |
|  | 0,3 | 233,98 | 232,18 | 232,58 | 242,24 | 227,38 | 201,95 | 293,74 |
|  | 0,35 | 230,36 | 252,77 | 231,65 | 243,67 | 225,02 | 203,79 | 293,27 |
|  | 0,4 | 232,57 | 234,01 | 240,51 | 233,55 | 238,08 | 209,1 | 313,88 |
|  | 0,45 | 237,96 | 235,65 | 244,9 | 233,63 | 235,54 | 212,49 | 314,84 |
|  | 0,5 | 238,28 | 246 | 245,19 | 241,1 | 243,42 | 209,89 | 313,98 |
|  | 0,55 | 254,29 | 234,37 | 243,1 | 241,67 | 250,3 | 204,09 | 306,14 |
|  | 0,6 | 245,22 | 244,84 | 242,88 | 245,53 | 246,53 | 217,35 | 329,15 |
|  | 0,65 | 254,19 | 252,79 | 244,88 | 238,59 | 240,33 | 208,16 | 328,49 |
|  | 0,7 | 258,15 | 249,38 | 256,94 | 248,52 | 253,81 | 217,4 | 325,42 |
|  | 0,75 | 261,91 | 268,75 | 242,85 | 251,67 | 254,79 | 220,07 | 326,06 |
|  | 0,8 | 247,09 | 247,29 | 257,17 | 251,83 | 243,4 | 216,69 | 322,09 |
|  | 0,85 | 256,37 | 257,45 | 261,04 | 243,7 | 257,12 | 226,56 | 322,34 |
|  | 0,9 | 271,62 | 260,39 | 262,07 | 253,89 | 249,12 | 233,58 | 337,63 |
|  | 0,95 | 245,72 | 263,01 | 266,55 | 260,2 | 264,37 | 220,57 | 323,18 |



Figure 4.3. Generator Results for the second group of problems $\left(S=1, \sigma^{2}=\right.$ low $)$

Table 4.12. Generator Results for the third group of problems ( $S=2, \sigma^{2}=$ high $)$
D = Total Demand / Total Capacity

|  |  | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 1 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0,05 | 284,25 | 282,9 | 284,1 | 287,55 | 280,4 | 238,89 | 355,54 |
|  | 0,1 | 292,07 | 296,44 | 288,29 | 291,16 | 292,33 | 255,28 | 375,21 |
|  | 0,15 | 300,68 | 280,43 | 286,78 | 292,45 | 304,28 | 260,98 | 367,32 |
|  | 0,2 | 292,45 | 288,39 | 307,51 | 291,15 | 293,5 | 251,16 | 362,09 |
|  | 0,25 | 303,96 | 306,94 | 281,62 | 297,12 | 304,81 | 256,47 | 373,8 |
|  | 0,3 | 289,88 | 297,23 | 296,5 | 304,18 | 298,29 | 270,24 | 379,41 |
|  | 0,35 | 285,86 | 285,35 | 283,24 | 287,34 | 285,4 | 250,15 | 381,9 |
|  | 0,4 | 290,74 | 287,96 | 301,79 | 288,93 | 290,32 | 254,95 | 396 |
|  | 0,45 | 293,51 | 306,25 | 291,35 | 311,69 | 280,72 | 289,76 | 382,78 |
|  | 0,5 | 310,87 | 294,6 | 288,37 | 317,61 | 302,53 | 267,21 | 376,59 |
|  | 0,55 | 303,27 | 298,01 | 313,66 | 298,08 | 290,92 | 265,88 | 391,99 |
|  | 0,6 | 300,03 | 303,33 | 308,4 | 287,72 | 290,99 | 273,31 | 386,49 |
|  | 0,65 | 296,6 | 295,09 | 302,69 | 290,2 | 284,85 | 268,75 | 402,23 |
|  | 0,7 | 303,91 | 318,05 | 292,08 | 294,75 | 292,61 | 267,42 | 396,37 |
|  | 0,75 | 304,72 | 298,32 | 309,67 | 314,07 | 298,16 | 267,13 | 381,67 |
|  | 0,8 | 299,98 | 301,99 | 300,12 | 300,31 | 294,43 | 266,17 | 369,79 |
|  | 0,85 | 284,64 | 302,16 | 297,8 | 294,04 | 294,83 | 266,32 | 367,62 |
|  | 0,9 | 299,44 | 305,57 | 288,65 | 304,98 | 307,82 | 263,01 | 373,8 |
|  | 0,95 | 290,56 | 301,05 | 311,74 | 296,72 | 291,79 | 279,82 | 359,01 |



Figure 4.4. Generator Results for the third group of problems $\left(S=2, \sigma^{2}=\right.$ high $)$

Table 4.13. Generator Results for the last group of problems ( $S=2, \sigma^{2}=$ low $)$
D = Total Demand / Total Capacity

|  |  | 0,1 | 0,2 | 0,3 | 0,4 | 0,5 | 1 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0,05 | 273,73 | 268,29 | 267,22 | 258,13 | 271,61 | 237 | 326,61 |
|  | 0,1 | 262,13 | 272,43 | 276,22 | 258,81 | 275,79 | 239,12 | 334,55 |
|  | 0,15 | 270 | 258,05 | 263,26 | 261,02 | 261,67 | 236,3 | 341,7 |
|  | 0,2 | 281,38 | 284,41 | 277,76 | 272,57 | 275,72 | 231,57 | 334,95 |
|  | 0,25 | 273,71 | 256,01 | 259,78 | 271,7 | 262,06 | 237 | 345,82 |
|  | 0,3 | 279,52 | 269,79 | 275,91 | 294,73 | 278,98 | 235,61 | 341,73 |
|  | 0,35 | 269,48 | 267,1 | 280,46 | 268,76 | 266,08 | 237,6 | 338,4 |
|  | 0,4 | 276,42 | 282,5 | 277,58 | 281,71 | 266,91 | 233,54 | 338,37 |
|  | 0,45 | 281,49 | 292,79 | 299,54 | 275 | 266,14 | 239,58 | 327,21 |
|  | 0,5 | 275,29 | 276,27 | 283,84 | 282,32 | 289,04 | 238,57 | 336,68 |
|  | 0,55 | 279,4 | 289,13 | 294,65 | 284,2 | 273,07 | 237,74 | 332,11 |
|  | 0,6 | 277,9 | 282,51 | 307,44 | 288,29 | 284,43 | 245,34 | 342,88 |
|  | 0,65 | 293,8 | 280,59 | 285,16 | 275,06 | 288,42 | 240,63 | 360,06 |
|  | 0,7 | 280,25 | 279,8 | 290,31 | 304,08 | 288,48 | 245,02 | 342,73 |
|  | 0,75 | 305,26 | 290,13 | 290,1 | 288,41 | 277,64 | 241,08 | 347,85 |
|  | 0,8 | 293,57 | 283,5 | 282,05 | 288,68 | 274,97 | 236,97 | 353,34 |
|  | 0,85 | 289,95 | 293,47 | 301,88 | 287,59 | 297,99 | 248,42 | 352,21 |
|  | 0,9 | 290,09 | 299,35 | 281,06 | 304,66 | 297,05 | 263 | 375,32 |
|  | 0,95 | 287,89 | 292,77 | 306,48 | 292,36 | 299,44 | 253,86 | 356,01 |



Figure 4.5. Generator Results for the fourth group of problems $\left(S=2, \sigma^{2}=\right.$ low $)$

—工 $\mathrm{S}=1, \sigma^{\wedge} 2=$ high, $\mathrm{P}=0,05-0,2-0,5-0,95$
Figure 4.6. Generator Results for the first and the third group of problems $\left(S=1, S=2, \sigma^{2}=\right.$ high $)$


Figure 4.8. Generator Results for the first and the second group of problems $\left(S=1, \sigma^{2}=\right.$ high, $\sigma^{2}=$ low $)$

— $\mathrm{S}=1, \sigma^{\wedge} 2=1 \mathrm{low}, \mathrm{P}=0,05-0,2-0,5-0,95$ $S=2, \sigma^{\wedge} 2=10 w, P=0,05-0,2-0,5-0,95$
Figure 4.7. Generator Results for the second and the fourth group of problems $\left(S=1, S=2, \sigma^{2}=\right.$ low $)$

$\longrightarrow S=2, \sigma^{\wedge} 2=$ high, $P=0,05-0,2-0,5-0,95$
$\longrightarrow S=2, \sigma^{\wedge} 2=$ low, $P=0,05-0,2-0,5-0,95$
Figure 4.9. Generator Results for the third and fourth group of problems $\left(S=2, \sigma^{2}=\right.$ high, $\sigma^{2}=$ low $)$

## Chapter 5. Case Study

The case study considered in this thesis focuses on an emergency situation at the Province of Teruel. The emergency is caused by a forest fire which evolves dynamically. Under these circumstances, and due to the fact that some villages need to be evacuated to a shelter while intervention groups take action, a plan for providing the aforementioned population categories with the necessary supplies needs to be developed.

Two different scenarios are presented for the case study. The first one deals with solving ESHFP only for the first day of the forest fire. Note that this scenario was examined in the Pilot Test Event which was held in Teruel in September 2016. In the second scenario, the solution of ESHFP is presented for day-to-day supply, taking into account that the forest fire lasts for seven days. In this case evacuees, but also intervention groups, have to be supplied with provisions during the entire seven-day period.

### 5.1. Scenario A: Solving ESHFP for the first day of the forest fire

Under this scenario, there are only two nodes that need to be served: the evacuees' shelter in Teruel and the accommodation site of the intervention groups during Day 1 in Villel. All vehicles will be available during the event. Note, that the abovementioned scenario was executed during a Pilot Test Event organized in September 2016, at Teruel, in order to test the results provided by the proposed algorithm for the ESHFP in real world circumstances.

The input data needed for this problem are shown in Appendix III. The solution, including the resulted provisions supply schedule for these two shelters, is shown in Table 5.1. Even though the single public vehicle can supply both sites, the algorithm uses two vehicles for the supply process. These vehicles operate simultaneously in order to reduce the total supply time. The routes to be operated for accomplishing the supply process are shown in Figure 5.1. A detailed map with the supermarkets and the shelters is also presented in Figure 5.2. Note that the map shows not only the supermarkets and the shelters that are included in supply routes for the Pilot Test Event Scenario, but all supermarkets and shelters included in Input Data for the Case Study.

In the first route, the vehicle with ID 9930 (public vehicle) is visiting supermarkets 77875, 77496 and 77857 . Following that, it serves shelter 66546 which is in Teruel. The starting and ending time of the route, are 0 and 88 minutes respectively. As for the second route, it is executed by the vehicle with ID 8875 (private vehicle) which visits supermarkets 77875 and
77496. The route serves shelter 66789 in Villel and the total time needed for that route is 68 minutes. The total time needed for accomplishing the entire supply process is 88 minutes.


Figure 5.1. Supply routes for the Pilot Test Event Scenario (Scenario A)

Table 5.1. Provisions supply plan (Scenario A)

| Number of Route | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle ID | 9930 (PB) |  |  | 8875 (PR) |  |  |
| Route Starting Time | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Ending Time | 88 |  |  | 68 |  |  |
|  | ID of Supermarket / Shelter | $\begin{gathered} \text { Commodity } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Quantity (into cubic meters) | ID of <br> Supermarket / <br> Shelter | Commodity ID | Quantity (into cubic meters) |
| $\underset{\mathrm{s}}{\text { Supermarket }}$ | 77875 | 334 | 0 | 77875 | 334 | 0 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0 |  | 336 | 0 |
|  |  | 338 | 0,363 |  | 338 | 0,345 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |  | 331 | 0 |
|  | 77496 | 334 | 0,743 | $77496$ | 334 | 2,119 |
|  |  | 339 | 0,218 |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0,288 |  | 336 | 0,548 |
|  |  | 338 | 0 |  | 338 | 0 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |  | 331 | 0 |
|  | 77857 | 334 | 0 | - | - | - |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |  | - | - |
|  |  | 336 | 0 |  | - | - |
|  |  | 338 | 0 |  | - | - |
|  |  | 335 | 0,173 |  | - | - |
|  |  | 331 | 5,184 |  | - | - |
| Shelters | 66546 Teruel | 334 | 0,743 | 66789 <br> Villel | 334 | 2,119 |
|  |  | 339 | 0,218 |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0,288 |  | 336 | 0,548 |
|  |  | 338 | 0,363 |  | 338 | 0,345 |
|  |  | 335 | 0,173 |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 5,184 |  | 331 | 0 |
| Cluster | Shelter ID |  | Shelter Service Time (in min) |  | Total Supply Time |  |
| 1 | $66546$ |  | 88 |  | 88 |  |
| 2 | 66789 |  | 68 |  |  |  |

[^0]*PR = Private Vehicle


Figure 5.2. Detailed map with the supermarkets and the shelters that participate in the Case Study

### 5.2. Scenario B: Solving ESHFP solution for day-to-day supply

In this scenario, it is assumed that the fire evolves for seven days. During this period, firstly the population of all affected villages around the area of the fire needs to be evacuated. The evacuees are transported to a safe shelter at Teruel, where they need to be supplied with consumable and non-consumable provisions. Simultaneously, intervention groups, responsible for fire extinguishing, will also use shelters for their accommodation. These shelters need to be supplied with the appropriate provisions as well.

Therefore, ESHFP addresses the case of supplying consumable and non-consumable provisions to evacuees as well as to intervention groups during their stay to an accommodation site.

Table 5.2. Shelters to be supplied during 7-day period

\left.| Shelter | Duration of supply for shelter |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |$\right]$| Hours | 36 | $1 \& 2$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Teruel (Shelter for evacuees) | 12 | 1 |
| Mas de la Cabrera (Intervention group accommodation site) | 30 | $1 \& 2$ |
| Villel (Intervention group accommodation site) | 120 | $3,4,5,6 \& 7$ |
| San Blas (Intervention groups' accommodation site) |  |  |

Provisions for the intervention groups need to be supplied for the entire simulated period of seven days. As a consequence, a daily supply plan needs to be determined. Table 5.2 includes the shelters involved into the provisions supply problem per day. According to this, we have derived the daily demand per commodity for each shelter (in $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ), in order to identify the provisions to be supplied on a daily basis to evacuees and intervention groups. The corresponding daily demand is shown in Appendix IV, along with the rest of the required input data.

The solution including the provisions supply schedule for ESHFP for the first day is shown in Table 5.3, and contains two routes. In the first route, vehicle with ID: 9930 (public vehicle) visits supermarkets 77875,77496 and 77857 . Following that, it serves shelter 66546 which is in Teruel. The starting and ending time of the route, are 0 and 88 minutes respectively. As for the second route, it is executed by vehicle with ID 8875 (private vehicle) which visits supermarkets 77984 and 77893. In the same route, shelters 66782 and 66789 in Mas de la Cabrera and in Villel respectively, are served, and the total time needed for the route is 95 minutes. The total time needed for accomplishing the entire supply process is 95 minutes.

The solution for the rest of the days is shown in Appendix V. Note that based on the information included in Appendix IV, the demand at the accommodation sites of the intervention groups for Days 3 and 4 is exactly the same, and, thus, the same supply plan will be adopted for these two days. This also the case for Days 5, 6 and 7. Based on inputs and outputs of the algorithm, it is worth mentioning that the sole public vehicle which is available is capable of delivering the
supply needs for each of days $3,4,5,6,7$. Nevertheless, the algorithm uses two vehicles for the supply process, which operate simultaneously, for Day 1 and Day 2 (multiple shelters), resulting in reduction of the total supply time, which is the objective of the proposed algorithm. Consequently, using the proposed algorithm, we provide a daily plan for provisions supply for evacuees and intervention groups for both scenarios. Note that the algorithm may respond to any changes regarding vehicles' availability or the road network by appropriately re-defining the input data.

Table 5.3. Provisions supply plan for Day 1(Scenario B)

*PB = Public Vehicle
${ }^{*}$ PR $=$ Private Vehicle

## Chapter 6. Conclusions

Due to the increasing number of both natural and man-made disasters, the development of efficient and effective disaster relief networks is a critical issue. At the post-disaster phase, it is important to ensure efficiency at delivering highly needed commodities either in sufficient quantities to civilians who evacuate residential areas, or to intervention groups.

This thesis introduces and addresses ESHFP, which aims in planning the supply of consumable and non-consumable provisions to both evacuees and intervention groups at the corresponding shelters after a case of emergency, from multiple inventory holding locations. To deal with the abovementioned problem a MILP model has been developed. A heuristic algorithm is proposed to solve this problem. The algorithm aims to determine the set of routes and select the vehicles that can be used to minimize the total time needed to provide all required provisions to evacuees and intervention groups at the corresponding sites. Important constraints concerning vehicle capacities, road network and total demand are respected.

To examine how the problem parameters affect the solution of the proposed algorithm, we applied it to multiple randomly generated problems and we can claim that increase of Total Supply Time, when one or more of the following occurs:

- When the number of shelters is high
- When Total Demand is increased in terms of Total Supply
- When there is uneven distribution of commodities across supply points
- When the Total capacity of the vehicles that are used for distribution, is not the same as the Total Demand because the loading approach of the heuristic algorithm is not that smart

Finally, it is worth mentioned that future research may be focused on the following:

- Develop a metaheuristic algorithm, such as a Tabu-based one, in order to obtain more efficient solutions
- Dynamic changes of the network can be also taken into account. Due to the nature of a disaster, a road connecting two nodes may be closed, e.g. due to fire. In such case it is worth examining how provisions distribution needs to be re-planed.
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## Appendix I. Detailed Data for Natural and Technological Disasters (2007-2016)

Appendix I contains detailed data for Natural Disasters and Technological Disasters respectively, reported worldwide during the last decade

Table I.1. Natural Disasters that reported worldwide from 2007 to 2016. Source: CRED,2/2017

|  |  | Natural Disasters |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Occurrence | Total <br> deaths | Injured | Affected | Homeless | Total <br> Affected | Total damage <br> $(' 000 \$$ ) |
| 2007 | 450 | 22.422 | 73.127 | 211.621 .445 | 1.169 .731 | 212.864 .303 | 74.420 .257 |
| 2008 | 393 | 242.189 | 396.453 | 218.202 .922 | 3.242 .535 | 221.841 .910 | 190.849 .247 |
| 2009 | 388 | 16.021 | 47.978 | 201.230 .991 | 510.312 | 201.789 .281 | 46.776 .393 |
| 2010 | 435 | 329.900 | 740.761 | 256.795 .896 | 2.423 .997 | 259.960 .654 | 132.194 .096 |
| 2011 | 361 | 34.143 | 50.814 | 210.776 .553 | 1.964 .972 | 212.792 .339 | 364.093 .168 |
| 2012 | 369 | 11.619 | 63.919 | 110.411 .039 | 950.345 | 111.425 .303 | 156.692 .232 |
| 2013 | 355 | 22.225 | 124.421 | 96.450 .897 | 328.923 | 96.904 .241 | 119.484 .189 |
| 2014 | 342 | 20.882 | 107.296 | 139.497 .175 | 1.364 .787 | 140.969 .258 | 97.769 .314 |
| 2015 | 394 | 23.834 | 169.340 | 110.112 .431 | 619.992 | 110.901 .763 | 72.759 .136 |
| 2016 | 297 | 7.625 | 261.870 | 376.931 .699 | 236.562 | 377.430 .131 | 92.403 .670 |
| Total | 3.784 | 730.860 | 2.035 .979 | 1.932 .031 .048 | 12.812 .156 | 1.946 .879 .183 | 1.347 .441 .702 |

Table I.2. Technological Disasters that reported worldwide from 2007 to 2016. Source: CRED 2/2017

|  |  | Technological Disasters |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Occurrence | Total <br> deaths | Injured | Affected | Homeless | Total <br> Affected | Total damage <br> $(' 000 \$)$ |
| 2007 | 277 | 7.653 | 5.300 | 24.232 | 18.722 | 48.254 | 869.000 |
| 2008 | 260 | 6.946 | 4.503 | 24.773 | 9.496 | 38.772 | 0 |
| 2009 | 230 | 6.866 | 4.267 | 28.701 | 300 | 33.268 | 1.526 .400 |
| 2010 | 235 | 6.745 | 5.621 | 19.463 | 11.531 | 36.615 | 20.353 .000 |
| 2011 | 244 | 6.626 | 5.644 | 10.156 | 39.480 | 55.280 | 2.701 |
| 2012 | 188 | 6.052 | 10.090 | 13.504 | 800 | 24.394 | 31.000 |
| 2013 | 192 | 6.714 | 5.032 | 10.016 | 6.789 | 21.837 | 578.000 |
| 2014 | 205 | 6.389 | 4.233 | 284.893 | 7.200 | 296.326 | 0 |
| 2015 | 202 | 9.726 | 8.643 | 71.600 | 21.719 | 101.962 | 15.000 |
| 2016 | 160 | 5.127 | 3.809 | 14.828 | 242 | 18.879 | 0 |
| Total | 2.193 | 68.844 | 57.142 | 502.166 | 116.279 | 675.587 | 23.375 .101 |

## Appendix II. Heuristic Algorithm (Detailed Description - Flowchart and Pseudocode of Subroutines)

Appendix II contains the necessary notation, a detailed description of the heuristic algorithm and the corresponding flowchart (Figure II.1). The pseudocode of the heuristic algorithm subroutines is also provided here.

## Notation

$G(N, A)$ is a directed graph where $N$ is the set of all nodes related to the problem, and $A$ is the set of arcs that connects the nodes.

## Nodes and vehicles

- Let $R \subset N$ be the set of all supply points. In particular: $R=\{1,2, \ldots, S\}$.
- Let $T \subset N$ be the set of all shelters. In particular: $T=\{1,2, \ldots, P\}$.
- Let $K=\{1,2, \ldots, v\}$ be the set of available vehicles
- Let $S^{k} \subset N, k \in K$ be the originating location of vehicle $k$. In particular: $S^{k}=$ $\left\{\mathrm{s}^{1}, \mathrm{~s}^{2}, \ldots, \mathrm{~s}^{v}\right\}$
- Let $E^{k} \subset N, k \in K$ be the ending location of vehicle $k$. In particular: $E^{k}=$ $\left\{e^{1}, e^{2}, \ldots, e^{v}\right\}$


## Arcs (travel times)

- Travel_Times : Traveling times between all nodes. In particular, the non-zero sand non-empty entries of Travel_Times are entries
- $\quad\left[t_{i j}\right], i \in S^{k}, j \in R$
- $\quad\left[t_{i j}\right], i, j \in R, i \neq j$
- $\quad\left[t_{i j}\right], i \in R, j \in T$
- $\quad\left[t_{i j}\right], i, j \in T, i \neq j$


## Other

- Let Shelters' Matrix be a matrix with IDs, coordinates and demand (into units) per shelter and per commodity
- Let $F$ be the number of clusters to create for grouping shelters
- Let Clusters be a matrix containing $F$ clusters (rows). The non-zero elements of row $i=1, \ldots, F$ are the shelters grouped into cluster $i$
- Let Cluster_Length be the number of non-zero elements for each row of Clusters
- Let $C$ be the types of commodities
- Let dim be a matrix containing the dimensions of commodities (in meters: length, width, height)
- Let $h$ be the demand matrix for shelters (elements in units).
- Let $s$ be the supply matrix for supply points (elements in units)
- Let vol_h be the demand in volume ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ )
- Let vol_s be the supply in volume ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ )
- Let Shelters_Coordinates : Matrix with the coordinates of Shelters
- Let $C C$ denote the current cluster
- Let $C C_{-} D$ be the total demand of current cluster $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$
- Let $f$ be a matrix with the ID and the total demand per cluster
- Let Public_Vehicle be a matrix with the ID, the capacity $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and the coordinates of the starting points for all public vehicles
- Let Private_Vehicles be a matrix with the ID, the capacity $\left(\mathrm{m}^{3}\right)$ and the coordinates of the starting points for all private vehicles
- Let $C P$ be a matrix with the IDs and current point of each vehicle
- Let $C V$ be the current vehicle
- Let $Q_{k}$ be the capacity of vehicle $k \in K\left(\mathrm{~m}^{3}\right)$
- Let num_of_pub be the number of public vehicles
- Let num_of_priv be the number of private vehicles
- Let Total_capacity_of_public be the total capacity of all available public vehicles
- Let Total_capacity_of_private be the total capacity of all available private vehicles
- Let $T P$ be a matrix containing the ID and the coordinates of a reference point. Note the reference point is at the center of gravity of supply points
- Let $A V L$ be a list including all available vehicles along with their ID, their total traveling time and their capacity $\left(m^{3}\right)$
- Let loading_time $\equiv$ uloading_time be 9 min for loading $3 \mathrm{~m}^{3}$ (assumption).
- Let Var_Map be a matrix including the following [\# of public vehicles, \# of private vehicles, \# of shelters, \# of supply points, \# of Reference Points]
- Let $V L$ be the on board inventory per commodity for a vehicle
- Let $d$ be a matrix containing the volume per commodity to be collected by a vehicle for each supply point
- Let $\hat{d}$ be a matrix containing the volume per commodity to be delivered by a vehicle for each shelter
- Let Final Routes be the routes of supply plan
- Let load_t be the total loading time of a vehicle at a supply point
- Let unloading_time : It is the time it takes a vehicle to unload commodities to a Shelter. Like load_t, by default, it takes 9 minutes to unload 0-3 $m^{3}, 18$ minutes to unload 3-6 $m^{3}$, etc.
- Let $S M_{-}$route be the initial sequence of visits to supply points
- Let SM_Final_Route be an improved version of SM_route
- Let $N I$ be the useful inventory per supply point and per commodity
- necessary_inventory be the necessary at the current cluster amount of commodities which need to be collected by a vehicle
- Let $x$ be a threshold for vehicle's remaining capacity
- Let $y$ be a threshold for deciding on visiting a next note of a given route
- Let Dev be the total sum of commodities deviation (necessary_inventory -NI) for all supply points
- Let SM_Selection be a matrix containing the supply points' IDs, the corresponding element of matrix Dev for each supply point, and the time distance from $C V$ 's $C P$ to each supply point
- Let nearestSM be a matrix with the distances of each supply point from the reference point
- Let $T$ be a matrix with the total service time for each shelter
- Let Total_Demand be the total demand of all shelters ( $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ )

The heuristic algorithm is executed according to the following steps:

Step 1. Define and create vectors and matrices to be used by the algorithms
Step 1.1. Define a reference point (noted as Temporary Point) which will be located at the area of supply points

Step 1.2. Create a vector named: Var_Map. It includes the number of vehicles (public and private), shelters and supply points

Step 1.3. Create Travel Times' matrix. It contains the road network and the related distances in minutes between all nodes and the Temporary Point

Step 1.4. Initialize vector Current Point. It includes vehicle-related information: vehicle ID (e.g. plate number) and originating location ID

Step 1.5. Group the shelters into clusters, either according to users' preferences or by using $K$-means algorithm
Step 1.6. Convert all the amounts of commodities (demand and inventory) into $\mathrm{m}^{3}$

Step 1.7. Create $A V L$ which includes all information needed for public and private vehicles, from all the available vehicles to be used by the algorithm. During vehicle selection, priority is given to public vehicles

Step 2. While the total demand of Shelters (into volume) is higher than zero
Step 2.1. Set the cluster with the highest demand as Current Cluster
Step 2.2. Set as Current Vehicle the vehicle with the lowest capacity that can cover the total demand of the selected cluster. In case there is no such a vehicle, select the vehicle with the highest capacity among all

Step 2.3. Create a route for all nodes (shelters) of the Current Cluster, using the Clark \& Wright Savings algorithm

Step 2.4. Select the shelters (of the given route in Step 2.3) that Current Vehicle can serve based on the vehicle's capacity and the demand of the shelters, and compute the necessary inventory that it can collect from supply points

Step 2.5. Create a route for supply points to be visited: While the sum of necessary inventory to be loaded on Current Vehicle is higher than zero
i. Select the supply point that can provide the highest amount of commodities for serving the Current Cluster; in case there is more than one such supply points, select the nearest supply point to the Current Point of Current Vehicle
ii. Set a route for visiting supply points by using Clark \& Wright Savings algorithm
iii. Use 2-opt algorithm to improve the supply point route
iv. Execute supply points' route and load the vehicle with appropriate commodities from each one
v. Execute shelters' route and unload the appropriate amount of commodities needed at each shelter

Step 2.6. Update Clusters by removing the shelters that are fully served
Step 3. Compute Total Supply Time as the maximum service time among all shelters


Figure II.1. Flowchart for the heuristic algorithm for ESHFP

Below we present the corresponding pseudo codes for the subroutines used by the main algorithm for solving ESHFP, apart from the very well-known Clark and Wright Savingsrelated routines (Shelters_CWS, Supermarkets_CWS).

## Subroutines

## 1. Subroutine Clustering

If manual clustering is selected

- Matrix Clusters is defined by the user by entering the shelters into clusters as desired
- Initialize Cluster_length $=0$

For $i=1: F$
For $j=1$ : number of columns of Clusters
If $\operatorname{Clusters}(i, j)$ is not equal to zero
Cluster_length(i) $=$ Cluster_length $(i)+1$
End
End
End
Else if automatic clustering is selected

- Initialize Shelters_Coordinates
- Call kmeans function (matlab function) for grouping the shelters into clusters
- Initialize Clusters and Cluster_length
- Update Clusters and Cluster_lengt according to the output of kmeans

End
2. Subroutine Commodities_Conversion_into_Volume

- Initialize vol
- Initialize vol_s
- Initialize vol_h

For each type of commodity

- Calculate volume per item
- Convert the demand of all shelters for each commodity into $m^{3}$
- Convert the supply of all supply points for each commodity into $m^{3}$

End

## 3. Subroutine AVL Creation

- Read for input data num_of_pub
- Read for input data num_of_priv
- Compute the total demand per cluster
- Sort matrix f in descending with respect to clusters' demand
- Compute Total_capacity_of_public
- Compute Total_capacity_of_private
- $\quad$ Initialize AVL $=[]$

If Total_Demand > Total_capacity_of_public + Total_capacity_of_private

- Include all public and private vehicles in AVL

Else

- Sort the Public_Vehicles and Private_Vehicles in descending order, with respect to vehicles' capacity

For $i=1: F$
While total demand of cluster $i>0$
If public vehicles are available ( $n u m \_o f \_p u b>0$ )

- Include public vehicle in AVL
- Update the number of available public vehicles

Elseif private vehicles are available (num_of_priv >0)

- Include private vehicle in AVL
- Update the number of available private vehicles


## Else

Break
End End

End
End

- Update AVL


## 4. Subroutine Cluster_Selection

- Initialize f
- Compute the total demand per cluster
- Set as current cluster (CC) the cluster with the highest demand
- Set as current cluster's demand (CC_D) the demand of CC


## 5. Subroutine Vehicle_Selection

- Determine the number of vehicles in $A V L$ that have the same minimum traveling time and sort them in ascending order with respect to their capacity
- Set as CV the vehicle with the highest capacity among these vehicles

For $j=1$ : number of vehicle with the same minimum traveling time If the capacity of vehicle $j$ is higher than the demand of current cluster

- $\quad$ Set vehicle $j$ as CV
- Break the loop

End

## End

- $\quad$ Set the capacity of CV, $Q_{C V}$


## 6. Subroutine Shelters_Selection_For_Route

- Input: Route (CWS_Route) for shelters resulted by subroutine Shelters_CWS
- Set $r_{Q c v}$ as the remaining capacity of $C V$. Initially $r_{Q c v}=Q_{C V}$
- Initialize visited_nodes. (counter for nodes that will be visited by $C V$ )
- Initialize necessary_inventory

If total demand of first node in $C W S_{-}$Route $>r_{Q c v}$
For each commodity $c \in C$
If the demand of first node in $C W S_{-}$Route for commodity $c \geq r_{Q c v}$

- $\quad \mathrm{CV}$ loads $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{Qcv}} \mathrm{m}^{3}$ of commodity c


## Else

- $C V$ loads the entire demand of first node in $C W S \_$Route for commodity $c$


## End

- Update $r_{Q c v}$

End

- visited_nodes $=$ visited_nodes +1

Else

- Set necessary_inventory = the demand of first node of CWS_Route
- visited_nodes = visited_nodes + 1
- Update $r_{Q c v}$

For each one (node $i$ ) of the remaining nodes in $C W S_{-}$Route
If node's total demand $\leq r_{Q c v}$

- necessary_inventory = necessary_inventory + node's total demand
- visited_nodes = visited_nodes + 1
- Update $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{Qcv}}$


## Continue

## End

If $r_{Q c v}<x \% \cdot Q_{C V}$

- Set time $=$ the time distance needed from CWS_Route $(\mathrm{i}-1)$ to CWS_Route(i)+ the time distance needed from CWS_Route(i) to reference point - the time distance needed from CWS_Route $(i-1)$ to reference point

If time $>y$
Continue
Else
If total demand of node $i \geq r_{Q c v}$
For each commodity $c \in C$
If the demand of node $i$ for commodity $c \geq r_{Q c v}$

- Update necessary_inventory(c)


## Else

- CV loads the entire demand of node in CWS_Route for commodity c


## End

- Update $\mathrm{r}_{\text {Qcv }}$


## End

- visited_nodes = visited_nodes + 1

Else

- necessary_inventory $=$ necessary_inventory + node's total demand
- visited_nodes = visited_nodes + 1

End
End

## Else

For each commodity $c \in C$
If the volume of demand of node $i$ for commodity $c \geq r_{Q c v}$

- Update necessary_inventory(c)

Else

- CV loads the entire demand of i in CWS_Route for commodity c


## End

- Update $\mathrm{r}_{\mathrm{Qcv}}$

End

```
            - visited_nodes = visited_nodes + 1
        End
```

End
End

- Set Shelters_Route = the first "visited nodes" of vector CWS_Route


## 7. Subroutine Supermarket_Selection_For_Route

- Initialize $F P$ which is a copy of matrix $C P$
- Initialize SM_route
- Initialize matrix $d$
- Set a counter $z=0$

While sum of necessary_inventory >0

- $\mathrm{z}=\mathrm{z}+1$
- Initialize NI
- Initialize Dev
- Initialize SM_Selection.

For all supply points $i \in R$

## For all commodities $c \in C$

If necessary_inventory $(c)>$ vol_s $_{-}(i, c)$

- $N I(i, c)=v o l \_s(i, c)$

Else

- $\quad$ NI $(i, c)=$ necessary_inventory $(c)$

End

- $\quad \operatorname{Dev}(\mathrm{i})=\operatorname{Dev}(\mathrm{i})+\mathrm{NI}(\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{c})$


## End

End
If the vehicle is at a supply point and the sum of NI for all commodities for this supply point $>0$

- Set this supply point as CS

Else

- Sort matrix SM_Selection in ascending order with respect to the total deviation, and then sort it in ascending order with respect to the distance of each supply point from FP of CV
- $\quad$ CS $=$ SM_Selection $(1,1)$

End

- $\quad$ SM_route $(z)=C S$
- $\mathrm{d}($ of CS, for all commodities $)=\mathrm{NI}$ (of CS, for all commodities)
- $\quad \mathrm{FP}(\mathrm{CV})=\mathrm{CS}$
- Update vol_s
- Update necessary_inventory

End

- Update SM_route


## 8. Subroutine 2-opt_for_sm

- Initialize best ${ }_{\mathrm{TD}}=0$ (best total distance of a route)
- Initialize new_TD $=\infty$ (new total distance of a route).
- Initialize a vector named Existing_Route :
- [CP of CV,CWS_Route for supply points, the first shelter of CWS_Route for shelters]
- Determine the number of supply points in CWS_Route for supply points (number_of_SMs)

If ${ }^{n}$ umber_of_SMs $=1$

- SM_Final_Route = SM_CWS_Route


## Else

While best_TD $\neq$ new_TD

- best_TD $=0$
- Update best_TD = the total distance of a route in Existing_Route
- Set changes $=0$. Note that it will be raised to one if there are changes at the route with the best distance.
- $\quad$ Set New_Route $=0$

For $i=1:$ number_of_SMs
For $k=i+1: n u m b e r_{-} o f_{-} S M s+1$

- New_Route(1:i) = Existing_Route(1:i)

For $j=1: k-i+1$

- $\quad$ New_Route $(\mathrm{i}+\mathrm{j})=$ Existing_Route $(\mathrm{k}+1-\mathrm{j})$


## End

- New_Route(k+1: end) = Existing_Route(k+1: end)
- Update new_TD=0
- Update new_TD the total distance of a route in New_Route

If $n e w \_T D<b e s t \_T D$

- the New_Route = Existing_Route
- best_TD = new_TD
- $\quad$ changes $=1$


## Break

End

## End

If changes $=1$

- $\quad$ new_TD $=\operatorname{Inf}$

Break
End

## End

## End

- SM_Final_Route = Existing_Route (2 : end -1 )


## End

## 9. Subroutine SM_Route_Execution_and_Vehicle_Loading

For $i=1$ : number of supply points included in the SM_Final_Route

- Update $A V L$
- $\quad$ Update $V L$
- Compute load_t
- Update $A V L$ by adding the $l o a d_{-} t$, to the traveled time of $C V$
- Update $C P$ of $C V$
- Update $Q_{C V}$
- Include supply point $i$ in Final_Routes and keep a record of the commodities collected by $C V$ in supply point $i$

End

## 10.Subroutine Shelters_Route_Execution

For $j=1:$ length(CWS_Route for shelters)

- Update CV traveling time in $A V L$
- $\quad$ Set shelter $j$ as $C P$ of $C V$
- Initialize $\hat{d}$

For each commodity $c \in C$
If onboard amount of $\mathrm{c}>0 \mathbf{A N D}$ demand of shelter $j$ for $\mathrm{c}>0$
If (onboard amount of $\mathrm{c} \geq$ demand of shelter $j$ for c

- $\quad C V$ delivers the entire demand of shelter $j$ for commodity $c$

Else

- $C V$ delivers onboard amount of commodity c

End

- Update onboard amount of commodity $c$
- Update demand of shelter j for commodity c

Else

- Continue with the next commodity

End

## End

- Update AVL according to the time needed for serving shelter j
- Update total service time of shelter $j$
- Update Final_Routes

End
If Total_Demand > 0

- Update AVL
- CV returns to the reference point


## End

## 11.Subroutine Clusters_Update

- Initialize Matrix New_Clusters.
- Initialize Matrix New_Cluster_Length.
- $\mathrm{w}=0$

For all cluster $i$

- $\mathrm{w}=\mathrm{w}+1$

For $j=1$ : Clusters' $^{\prime}$ Length( $i$ )
If the total demand of all shelters in Clusters $(i, j)>0$

- New_Clusters_Length(w) = New_Clusters_Length(w) + 1
- $\quad$ Set New_Clusters(w,New_Clusters_Length(w)) $=$ Clusters(i, j$)$


## End

End
If the first column of New_Clusters $(w)=0$

- $\mathrm{w}=\mathrm{w}-1$

End
End

- $\quad$ Set Clusters $=$ New_Clusters (from the first to the $w^{\text {th }}$ row, and all the columns)
- Set Cluster Length $=$ New_Cluster_Length (from the first to the $w^{\text {th }}$ element)


## Appendix III: ESHFP: Input Data for the Pilot Test Event case

## Necessary data for ESHFP for the Pilot Test Event

The following tables present the necessary datain termsof a) typeof commodities that will be offered tothe evacuees and the intervention group for the 1 st

 transportation of goods, for the ES H FP. Futher details about the input data are given in the following sections.

## 1. Commodities

Table III. 1, presentsthe type of commodities, characterized by an ID number, that will be offeredtothe evacuees and the intervention groups. The table presents
also their characteristics (e.g. storage unit, number of items per storage unit, etc).

| Type |  | Dimensions (m) per item (commodity) |  |  | Storage unit (item, carton, pallet) | Number of items (commodity) per storage unit | Volume (in m ${ }^{3}$ andin $l t$ ) per storage unit | Number of storage <br> unitsper europallet |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Commodity ${ }^{\text {c i }}$ Id | Length | width | Height |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Agua mineral ( $1,51 \mathrm{t}$ ) | 334 | 0.065 | 0.070 | 0.340 | carton (plastic stretch film) | 6 | 0.009 (9) | 84 |
| 2. Dairy products.juices | 339 | 0.090 | 0.060 | 0.210 | carton (plastic stretch film) | 6 | 0.007 (7) | 125 |
| 3. Fruits (oranges, apples) | 336 | 0.100 | 0.100 | 0.100 | Wooden or cardboard Fruit Box | 6 | 0.006 (6) | 40 |
| 4. Sandwiches | 338 | 0.300 | 0.070 | 0.060 | cardboardbox | 15 | 0.019 (19) | 40 |
| 5. Hygiene kits | 335 | 0.200 | 0.180 | 0.050 | B ox | 18 | 0.032 (32) | 52 |
| 6. Mattress or landing mat | 331 | 1.800 | 0.600 | 0.050 | Warpplastic | 2 | 0.108 (108) | 48 |

## 2. Supermarkets


with their corresponding IDs. Furthermore, the daily stock percommodity in units is also presented.

|  | Detailed Address | Coordinates |  | Supplies (Stock in Units) Per Commodities' ID |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Latitude | Longitude | 334 | 339 | 336 | 338 | 335 | 331 |
| 77968 | Alvimar SCL. Don Jate SA. Polígono La Paz, Calle Berlín, 128. 44195 Teruel | 40.3617 | -1.1521 | 1260 | 1725 | 2400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77581 | Amela y Martín, SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Irún, Parcela 177 Izq. 44195 Teruel | 40.3634 | -1.15536 | 13306 | 1200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77152 | Bebinter SA. Polígono La Paz, Calle Estocolmo, 55. 44195 Teruel | 40.3589 | -1.14533 | 12096 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77496 | Coaliment Aragón SAU. Polígono La Paz, Calle BerlínDublín, 42. 44195 Teruel | 40.3578 | -1.14294 | 2318 | 375 | 2400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77814 | Conpol SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Berlín, 81. 44195 Teruel | 40.3609 | -1.14923 | 0 | 3075 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77896 | Frigoríficos Cervera SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Génova, Parcela 139. 44195 Teruel | 40.3628 | -1.15156 | 29736 | 7125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77638 | Frigoríficos La Perla, SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Colonia, Parcela 62. 44195 Teruel | 40.3588 | -1.14684 | 0 | 26925 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77574 | Horno Paco Sanz SL. Carretera de Cubla, 4. Puerta 5. 44001 Teruel | 40.3344 | -1.11112 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77856 | José Galo SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Génova, 142. 44195 Teruel | 40.3639 | -1.15116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77491 | Logística Terdibe SL. Polígono La Paz, Parcela 246. 44195 Teruel | 40.3679 | -1.15295 | 655 | 1725 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77821 | Distribuciones Manuel Borque SL. Parque Industrial Carretera de San Blas, 10. 44195 Teruel | 40.3545 | -1.13249 | 7812 | 1725 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77984 | Hipermercado Simply. Avenida de Sagunto, s/n. 44002 Teruel | 40.3338 | -1.08859 | 958 | 900 | 2400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77851 | Juancivi SL. Hotel Isabel de Segura. Ronda del Turia, 2. 44002 Teruel | 40.3339 | -1.10787 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 0 |
| 77893 | Taller Cocina de Teruel SL. Carretera de Cubla, 4. 44001 Teruel | 40.335 | -1.1108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 0 |
| 77875 | Asociados Hosteleros de Teruel SL. Carretera SaguntoBurgos, km 123. 44195 Teruel | 40.3591 | -1.13831 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 0 |
| 77857 | Cruz Roja Teruel. Polígono Industrial La Paz. 162A. 44195 Teruel | 40.3577 | -1.13463 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 100 |

## 3. Shelters

Table III. 3, presents the exact location of each shelter as well as the demand percommodity per personforthe first day and its id

| Location | ID | Coordinates |  | Total Demand (units) Per Commodities' ID |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Latitude | Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 334 | 339 | 336 | 338 | 335 | 331 |
| Teruel | 66546 | 40.33302 | -1.08217 | 480 | 192 | 288 | 288 | 96 | 96 |
| Villel | 66789 | 40.23628 | -1.19423 | 1370 | 0 | 548 | 274 | 0 | 0 |



## 4. Network

Table III. 4 , presents the transport network (arcs) that connect the shelters with the supermarkets and the supermarkets the melves.

| From | To | Network (min) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Public Vehicles | 66546 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Shelter |  | Supermarket |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | IDs | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66789 | 77968 | 77581 | 77152 | 77496 | 77814 | 77896 | 77638 | 77574 | 77856 | 77491 | 77821 | 77984 | 77851 | 77893 | 77875 | 77857 |
| Public Vehicles | 66546 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
| Private Vehicles' Starting Point | 66546 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
| Shelter | 66546 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 19 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66789 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 18 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 18 | 20 | 20 |
| Supermarket | 77968 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 22 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 77581 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 77152 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 21 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 77496 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | 20 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 3 |
|  | 77814 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 21 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 77896 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 21 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 77638 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 21 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 4 | 5 |
|  | 77574 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 7 |
|  | 77856 | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | 11 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 77491 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 20 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 4 |
|  | 77821 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | 10 | 17 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
|  | 77984 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 19 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 9 |
|  | 77851 | - | - | - | - | $-$ | - | - | - | 9 | 19 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 9 |
|  | 77893 | - | - | $-$ | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | 19 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
|  | 77875 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | $-$ | 10 | 19 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 77857 | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | 20 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 0 |

## 5. Public Vehicles

Table III. 5, presents the fleet of public vehicles that are available for the transportation of commodities frome the aforementioned
 about the starting point (depot) of the vehicle

| Type of Vehicle | ID | Number of Each Type of Vehicle | Capacity (in $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | Model | Technical Characteristics | Hydraulic Door | Starting Point |  |  |  |  | Coordinates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Company Name | Address | ID | Number | City | Latitude | Longitude |
| Truck | 9930 | 1 | 7.68 | - | - | Yes | Diputación de Teruel | Polígono La Paz, Calle Berlín | 66546 | N/A | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |

## 6. Private Vehicles

 shelters. As it can be seen, seven (7) trucks with hydraulic doors are available. The table providesthe capacity of the vehicles (in m ${ }^{3}$ ) as wellas information about the starting point (depot) of the vehicle.

| Type of Vehicle | ID | Number of Each Type of Vehicle | Capacity (in $\mathrm{m}^{3}$ ) | Model | Technical Characteristics | Hydrauli c Door | Starting Point |  |  |  |  | Coordinates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Company Name | Address | ID | Number | City | Latitude | Longitude |
| Truck | 8845 | 1 | 7.68 | Iveco Eurocargo | Refrigerator Reinforced Isothermal | Yes | Alvimar SCL. Don Jate S.A. | Polígono La Paz, Berlín | 66546 | 128 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8875 | 1 | 11.52 | Iveco Eurocargo |  | Yes | Alvimar SCL. Don Jate S.A. | Polígono La Paz, Berlín | 66546 | 128 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8861 | 1 | 5.76 | Ebro L80 | Refrigerator Isothermal | Yes | Frigorificos La Perla S.L. | Polígono La Paz, Colonia. Parcela 62 | 66546 | 16 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8891 | 1 | 5.76 | Nissan Cabstar | Isothermal | Yes | Frigorificos Cervera SL | Polígono La Paz, Génova. Parcela 139 | 66546 | - | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8837 | 1 | 5.76 | Mercedes Benz | Isothermal | Yes | Frigorificos Cervera SL | Polígono La Paz, Génova. Parcela 139 | 66546 | - | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8847 | 1 | 5.76 | - | - | Yes | Bebinter SA | Polígono La Paz, Estocolmo | 66546 | 55 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8829 | 1 | 5.76 | Nissan <br> Trade | - | Yes | Bebinter SA | Polígono La Paz, Estocolmo | 66546 | 55 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |

## Appendix IV: ESHFP: Input Data for the case study of daily supply (7-days)

## Necessary data for ESHFP for the scenario of daily supply

The following tables present the necessary data in terms of a) type of commodities that will be provided to the evacuees and the intervention groups, the available supermarkets that will supply the commodities (samefor all days), c) the sheltersthat will be used by the evacuees and the intervetion groupser day, d) the transportation net work that links the supermarkets with the shelters, e) the private and public fleet of vehicles available for the $\begin{gathered}\text { a }\end{gathered}$ goods, for the ESHFP (same for all days). Futher details about the input data are given in the following sections.

## 1. Commodities

 presents theircharacteristics (e.g. storage unit, number of items per storage unit, etc).

| Type |  | Dimensions (m) peritem (commodity) |  |  | Storage unit (item, carton, pallet) | Number of items (commodity) per storage unit | Volume (in m ${ }^{3}$ andin <br> $l t$ per storage unit | Number of storage units per europallet |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Commodity ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Id | Length | Width | Height |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Agua mineral (1,5it) | 334 | 0.0650 | 0.0700 | 0.3400 | carton (plastic stretch film) | 6 | 0.009 (9) | 84 |
| 2. Dairy products. juices | 339 | 0.0900 | 0.0600 | 0.2100 | carton (plastic stretch film) | 6 | 0.007 (7) | 125 |
| 3. Fruits (oranges, apples) | 336 | 0.1000 | 0.1000 | 0.1000 | Wooden or cardboard Fruit Box | 6 | 0.006 (6) | 40 |
| 4. Sandwiches | 338 | 0.3000 | 0.0700 | 0.0600 | cardboard box | 15 | 0.019 (19) | 40 |
| 5. Hygiene kits | 335 | 0.2000 | 0.1800 | 0.0500 | B o x | 18 | 0.032 (32) | 52 |
| 6. Mattress or landing mat | 331 | 1.8000 | 0.6000 | 0.0500 | Warp plastic | 2 | 0.108 (108) | 48 |

## 2. Supermarkets


with their corresponding IDs. Furthermore, the daily stock percommodity in units is also presented.

| Supermarket's ID | Detailed Address | Coordinates |  | Supplies (Stock in Units) Per Commodities' ID |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Latitude | Longitude | 334 | 339 | 336 | 338 | 335 | 331 |
| 77968 | Alvimar SCL. Don Jate SA. Polígono La Paz, Calle Berlín, 128.44195 Teruel | 40.3617 | -1.1521 | 1260 | 1725 | 2400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77581 | Amela y Martín, SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Irún, Parcela 177 Izq. 44195 Teruel | 40.3634 | -1.15536 | 13306 | 1200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77152 | Bebinter SA. Polígono La Paz, Calle Estocolmo, 55. 44195 Teruel | 40.3589 | -1.14533 | 12096 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77496 | Coaliment Aragón SAU. Polígono La Paz, Calle BerlínDublín, 42. 44195 Teruel | 40.3578 | -1.14294 | 2318 | 375 | 2400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77814 | Conpol SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Berlín, 81. 44195 Teruel | 40.3609 | -1.14923 | 0 | 3075 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77896 | Frigoríficos Cervera SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Génova, Parcela 139. 44195 Teruel | 40.3628 | -1.15156 | 29736 | 7125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77638 | Frigoríficos La Perla, SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Colonia, Parcela 62. 44195 Teruel | 40.3588 | -1.14684 | 0 | 26925 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77574 | Horno Paco Sanz SL. Carretera de Cubla, 4. Puerta 5. 44001 Teruel | 40.3344 | -1.11112 | 0 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77856 | José Galo SL. Polígono La Paz, Calle Génova, 142. 44195 Teruel | 40.3639 | -1.15116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77491 | Logística Terdibe SL. Polígono La Paz, Parcela 246. 44195 Teruel | 40.3679 | -1.15295 | 655 | 1725 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77821 | Distribuciones Manuel Borque SL. Parque Industrial Carretera de San Blas, 10. 44195 Teruel | 40.3545 | -1.13249 | 7812 | 1725 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77984 | Hipermercado Simply. Avenida de Sagunto, s/n. 44002 Teruel | 40.3338 | -1.08859 | 958 | 900 | 2400 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 77851 | Juancivi SL. Hotel Isabel de Segura. Ronda del Turia, 2. 44002 Teruel | 40.3339 | -1.10787 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 0 |
| 77893 | Taller Cocina de Teruel SL. Carretera de Cubla, 4. 44001 Teruel | 40.335 | -1.1108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 0 |
| 77875 | Asociados Hosteleros de Teruel SL. Carretera SaguntoBurgos, km 123. 44195 Teruel | 40.3591 | -1.13831 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 600 | 0 | 0 |
| 77857 | Cruz Roja Teruel. Polígono Industrial La Paz. 162A. 44195 Teruel | 40.3577 | -1.13463 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 | 100 |

## 3. Shelters

Table IV.3, presents the exact location of each shelter as well as the demand percommodity per personforthefirstay andits

| Location | ID | Coordinates |  | Total Demand (units) Per Commodities' ID |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Latitude | Longitude |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 334 | 339 | 336 | 338 | 335 | 331 |
| Day 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teruel | 66546 | 40.33302 | -1.08217 | 480 | 192 | 288 | 288 | 96 | 96 |
| Mas De la Cabrera | 66782 | 40.1553 | -1.2428 | 513 | 0 | 171 | 171 | 0 | 0 |
| Villel | 66789 | 40.23628 | -1.19423 | 1370 | 0 | 548 | 274 | 0 | 0 |
| Day 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teruel | 66546 | 40.33302 | -1.08217 | 288 | 96 | 192 | 192 | 0 | 0 |
| Villel | 66789 | 40.23628 | -1.19423 | 915 | 0 | 366 | 183 | 0 | 0 |
| Days 3 \& 4 (per day) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Blas | 66501 | 40.35815 | -1.17850 | 915 | 0 | 366 | 183 | 0 | 0 |
| Days 5, 6 \& 7 (per day) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| San Blas | 66501 | 40.35815 | -1.17850 | 705 | 0 | 282 | 141 | 0 | 0 |

Table IV. 4 , presents the daily number of the staff of the intervention groups (Shelters Mas de la Cabrera, Ville and, San Blass) that will be served.

| Day | People/Day | Mas de la Cabrera | Villel | San Blas | Total people/day |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1st | 139 | 341 | - | - | 432 |
| 1st | 202 | 341 | - | - |  |
| 1st | 91 | - | 274 | - |  |
| 2nd | 183 | - |  | - | 183 |
| 3rd | 183 | - | - | 789 | 183 |
| 4th | 183 | - | - |  | 183 |
| 5th | 141 | - | - |  | 141 |
| 6th | 141 | - | - |  | 141 |
| 7th | 141 | - | - |  | 141 |

## 4. Network

Table IV. 5 , presents the transport network (arcs) that conect the shelters with the supermarkets and

| From | To <br> IDs | Network (min) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Public } \\ & \text { Vehicles' } \\ & \text { Starting } \end{aligned}$ | Private Vehicles' Starting Point |  |  |  |  |  |  | Shelter |  |  |  | Supermarket |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66546 | 66782 | 66789 | 66501 | 77968 | 77581 | 77152 | 77496 | 77814 | 77896 | 77638 | 77574 | 77856 | 77491 | 77821 | 77984 | 77851 | 77893 | 77875 | 77857 |
| Public Vehicles, | 66546 | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Private } \\ & \text { Vehicles' } \\ & \text { Starting } \\ & \text { Point } \end{aligned}$ | 66546 | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66546 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | - | - |  | - | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
| Shelter | 66546 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 | 32 | 19 | 11 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 13 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 9 |
|  | 66782 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 33 | 0 | 19 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 34 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 35 | 31 | 35 | 35 | 33 | 32 | 33 | 31 | 33 | 33 |
|  | 66789 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 20 | 19 | 0 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 18 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 18 | 20 | 20 |
|  | 66501 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 34 | 20 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 6 |
| Supermarket | 77968 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 35 | 22 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 77581 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 35 | 22 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 77152 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 34 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 77496 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | 33 | 20 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 3 | 3 |
|  | 77814 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 34 | 21 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 77896 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 34 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 77638 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 12 | 34 | 21 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 4 | 5 |
|  | 77574 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 8 | 29 | 16 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 7 |
|  | 77856 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 34 | 21 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 4 |
|  | 77491 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 11 | 33 | 20 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 3 | 4 |
|  | 77821 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | 30 | 17 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 3 |
|  | 77984 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2 | 32 | 19 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 13 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 12 | 9 |
|  | 77851 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | 32 | 19 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 5 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 8 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 9 |
|  | 77893 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 9 | 30 | 19 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 8 |
|  | 77875 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | 32 | 19 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 3 |
|  | 77857 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 10 | 32 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 2 | 0 |

## 5. Public Vehicles



about the starting point (depot) of the vehicle.

| Type of Vehicle | ID | Number of Each Type of Vehicle | Capacity (in $\mathbf{m}^{3}$ ) | Model | Technical Characteristics | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Hydraulic } \\ & \text { Door } \end{aligned}$ | Starting Point |  |  |  |  | Coordinates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Company Name | Address | ID | Number | City | Latitude | Longitude |
| Truck | 9930 | 1 | 7.68 | - | - | Yes | Diputación de Teruel | Polígono La <br> Paz, Calle Berlín | 66546 | N/A | Teruel | 40,33302 | -1,08217 |

## 6. Private Vehicles

 shelters. As itcan be seen, seven (7) trucks with hydraulic doors are available. The table providesthe capacity of the vehicles (in m ${ }^{3}$ ) as well as the information about the starting point (depot) of the vehicle.

| Type of Vehicle | ID | Number of Each Type of Vehicle | Capacity (in $\mathbf{m}^{3}$ ) | Model | Technical Characteristics | Hydraulic <br> Door | Starting Point |  |  |  |  | Coordinates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Company Name | Address | ID | Number | City | Latitude | Longitude |
| Truck | 8845 | 1 | 7.68 | Iveco Eurocar go | Refrigerator Reinforced Isothermal | Yes | Alvimar SCL. Don Jate S.A. | Polígono La Paz, Berlín | 66546 | 128 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8875 | 1 | 11.52 | Iveco <br> Eurocar <br> go |  | Yes | Alvimar SCL. Don Jate S.A. | Polígono La Paz, Berlín | 66546 | 128 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8861 | 1 | 5.76 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ebro } \\ & \text { L80 } \end{aligned}$ | Refrigerator Isothermal | Yes | Frigorificos La Perla S.L. | Polígono La Paz, Colonia. Parcela 62 | 66546 | 16 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8891 | 1 | 5.76 | Nissan Cabstar | Isothermal | Yes | Frigorificos Cervera SL | Polígono La Paz, Génova. Parcela 139 | 66546 | - | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8837 | 1 | 5.76 | Merced es Benz | Isothermal | Yes | Frigorificos Cervera SL | Polígono La Paz, Génova. Parcela 139 | 66546 | - | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8847 | 1 | 5.76 | - | - | Yes | Bebinter SA | Polígono La Paz, Estocolmo | 66546 | 55 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |
| Truck | 8829 | 1 | 5.76 | Nissan Trade | - | Yes | Bebinter SA | Polígono La Paz, Estocolmo | 66546 | 55 | Teruel | 40.33302 | -1.08217 |

## Appendix V: Output Data for the case study of daily supply (7-days)

The following tables present the solution including the provisions supply schedule for ESHFP for Scenario B which was presented in Chapter 5.2. More specifically, the provisions supply plan for Day 2 is shown in Table V.1., the provisions supply plan for the day $3 \& 4$ is shown in Table V.2. Note that the demand at the accommodation sites of the intervention groups for Days 3 and 4 is exactly the same, and, thus, the same supply plan will be adopted for these two days. This is also the case for days 5,6 and 7 which provisions supply plan, is shown in Table V.3.

Table V.1. Provisions supply plan for Day 2

| Number of Route | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle ID | 9930 (PB) |  |  | 8875 (PR) |  |  |
| Route Starting Time | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| Ending Time | 56 |  |  | 49 |  |  |
|  | ID of Supermarket / Shelter | Commodity ID | Quantity (into cubic meters) | ID of <br> Supermarket <br> / Shelter | Commodity ID | Quantity (into cubic meters) |
| Supermarkets | 77984 | 334 | 1,416 | 77875 | 334 | 0 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0,366 |  | 336 | 0 |
|  |  | 338 | 0 |  | 338 | 0,242 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |  | 331 | 0 |
|  | 77893 | 334 | 0 | 77496 | 334 | 0,446 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |  | 339 | 0,109 |
|  |  | 336 | 0 |  | 336 | 0,192 |
|  |  | 338 | 0,231 |  | 338 | 0 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |  | 331 | 0 |
| Shelters | $\begin{gathered} 66789 \\ \text { Villel } \end{gathered}$ | 334 | 1,416 | 66546 <br> Teruel | 334 | 0,446 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |  | 339 | 0,109 |
|  |  | 336 | 0,366 |  | 336 | 0,192 |
|  |  | 338 | 0,231 |  | 338 | 0.242 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |  | 331 | 0 |
| Cluster | Shelter ID |  | Shelter Service Time (in min) |  | Total Supply Time |  |
| 1 | 66546 |  | 49 |  | 56 |  |
| 2 | 66789 |  | 56 |  |  |  |

${ }^{*}$ PB = Public Vehicle
PR = Private Vehicle

Table V.2. Provisions supply plan for Days 3 \& 4

| Number of Route | 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle ID | 9930 (PB) |  |  |
| Route Starting Time | 0 |  |  |
| Ending Time | 47 |  |  |
|  | ID of Supermarket / Shelter | Commodity ID | Quantity (into cubic meters) |
| Supermarkets | 77984 | 334 | 1,416 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0,366 |
|  |  | 338 | 0 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |
|  | 77893 | 334 | 0 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0 |
|  |  | 338 | 0,231 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |
| Shelters | $\begin{gathered} 66501 \\ \text { San Blas } \end{gathered}$ | 334 | 1,416 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0,366 |
|  |  | 338 | 0,231 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |
| Cluster | Shelter ID | Shelter Service Time (in min) | Total Supply Time |
| 1 | 66501 | 47 | 47 |

* $\mathbf{P B}$ = Public Vehicle
${ }^{*}$ PR $=$ Private Vehicle

Table V.3. Provisions supply plan for Days 5, 6 \& 7

| Number of Route | 1 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle ID | 9930 (PB) |  |  |
| Route Starting Time | 0 |  |  |
| Ending Time | 47 |  |  |
|  | ID of Supermarket / Shelter | $\begin{gathered} \text { Commodity } \\ \text { ID } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Quantity (into cubic meters) |
| Supermarkets | 77984 | 334 | 1,091 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0,282 |
|  |  | 338 | 0 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |
|  | 77893 | 334 | 0 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0 |
|  |  | 338 | 0,178 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |
| Shelters | $\begin{gathered} 66501 \\ \text { San Blas } \end{gathered}$ | 334 | 1,091 |
|  |  | 339 | 0 |
|  |  | 336 | 0,282 |
|  |  | 338 | 0,178 |
|  |  | 335 | 0 |
|  |  | 331 | 0 |
| Cluster | Shelter ID | Shelter Service Time (in min) | Total Supply Time |
| 1 | 66501 | 47 | 47 |

* $\mathbf{P B}$ = Public Vehicle
${ }^{*}$ PR $=$ Private Vehicle


[^0]:    PB = Public Vehicle

