

A Scalable Approach to Equitable Facility Location

Drew Horton¹, Tom Logan², Joshua Murrell³, Daphne Skipper³, and Emily Speakman¹

¹University of Colorado Denver, Denver, CO, USA

²University of Canterbury, Canterbury, New Zealand

³United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD, USA

Abstract

In a recent advance in the environmental justice literature, the Kolm-Pollak Equally Distributed Equivalent (EDE) was introduced as the most principled metric for ranking distributions of disamenities, such as air pollution, radiation levels, or, in our case, distance from an essential service, when equity is a concern. The Kolm-Pollak EDE incorporates both the center and the spread of a distribution by penalizing inequality at a level prescribed by the decision-maker via an aversion to inequality parameter, thereby capturing the experience of an individual more accurately than the population mean. We present, analyze, and computationally test a model for optimizing the Kolm-Pollak EDE in the context of facility location, both with and without a penalty term applied for the selection of less-suitable potential locations. Extensive computational experiments demonstrate that, unlike other facility location models that incorporate measures of equity, this model scales to extremely large practical problem instances. Optimal solutions represent significant improvements for the worst-off residents with respect to distance from an open amenity, while also attaining a near-optimal “average” experience.

1 Introduction

Traditional facility location models were designed to address operational problems and, as a consequence, typically provide solutions that are not concerned with the equity of the optimal distribution of distances. Thus, if we apply these models to improve residential access to neighborhood amenities, there may be unintended consequences. In particular, placing amenities in order to minimize the mean distance from an individual to their closest service tends to leave some community members many miles from a facility. Likewise, directly minimizing the maximum distance that a resident must travel ignores the average experience of the community. Despite the challenges, incorporating equity into facility location models is vital because it can help ensure that resources and services are distributed fairly across a population, reducing disparities and promoting social justice. This importance has led to a wealth of literature on the subject; see [Mandell \(1991\)](#), [Marsh and Schilling \(1994\)](#), [Eiselt and Laporte \(1995\)](#), [Drezner et al. \(2009\)](#), [Ogryczak \(2009\)](#), [Lejeune and Prasad \(2013\)](#), [Karsu and Morton \(2015a\)](#), and [Barbati and Piccolo \(2016\)](#), to name a few. However, even with continued interest in incorporating equity into facility location, there has been little consensus on how equity should be measured in these models. Typically, equity-aware metrics that have been proposed for ranking distributions with respect to amenities (e.g., income) or disamenities (e.g., air pollution) are computationally expensive to optimize due to their algebraic complexities. As a result, the authors have not found any equitable facility location optimization models in the literature that scale well enough to apply to very large, city-sized instances.

In this work, we introduce a computationally-light equitable facility location model using a function from the environmental justice literature known as the Kolm-Pollak Equally Distributed Equivalent (EDE). Computational experiments on data from the largest cities in the United States, including New York City which leads to an instance with more than 200 million binary variables, verify that our model is practical for very large real-world applications *and* produces solutions that provide near-optimal mean distances while still protecting those that are farthest away.

We begin by motivating our work and providing the necessary background in Section 2. In particular, we introduce the Kolm-Pollak EDE and explain why it is the most principled metric for comparing distributions of travel distances when equity is a concern. We also provide background on the well-known facility location problem and summarize the current state of the literature on incorporating equity into facility location optimization models. In Section 3, we present our integer linear equitable facility location model, and in Section 3.1, discuss extensions to some common modeling scenarios, including capacitated facilities and split demands. In Section 4, we provide guidance on how to effectively scale the aversion to inequality parameter so that the desired level of inequality aversion is obtained. We also present computational experiments testing the sensitivity of the model to this scaling. In Section 5, we adapt the standard facility fixed-charge model for use in our setting, allowing a modeler to incorporate facility preferences by introducing distance penalties. The penalty term requires both parameter approximation and linearization, which we analyze in order to derive error bounds and provide modeling guidelines. In Section 6, we conduct extensive computational experiments using a real-world equitable facility location application: optimizing equitable access to supermarkets in the 500 largest cities in the United States. Our experiments verify the scalability of our model to very large practical instances. Moreover, the desirable properties of optimal solutions obtained by the model validate the use of the Kolm-Pollak EDE in this context. We end with concluding remarks in Section 7.

2 Background

2.1 Facility location optimization models

Given a set of potential locations and their distances (which could be substituted by, for example, travel time or travel cost) to the population served, the facility location problem asks where to best locate new facilities according to some metric. In addition to a vast collection of application areas (see [Current et al. \(2002\)](#) for numerous examples), there are many different classes of facility location models. Examples include set covering, maximal covering, p -center, and p -median. Set covering models aim to minimize the number of facilities required to cover all demand points within a specified distance threshold ([Chvatal 1979](#)). Maximal covering models seek to maximize the number of demand points that are within a given distance of one of a fixed number of selected facilities ([Church and ReVelle 1974](#)). The p -center model minimizes the maximum distance between a demand point and its nearest facility, optimizing the worst-case scenario ([Hakimi 1964](#)). The p -median model, minimizes the mean (or equivalently, the total) distance between facilities and demand points ([Hakimi 1964, 1965](#)). The p -median model is attractive for minimizing the total travel cost. For an extensive history of the facility location problem and descriptions of the many diverse models that fall into this category, see [Hale and Moberg \(2003\)](#), [Drezner and Hamacher \(2004\)](#), or [Farahani and Hekmatfar \(2009\)](#).

The model we will present is an adaptation of the p -median model. Let R be a set of origins. We can think of these as the locations of “customers” served by the facilities we seek to place. Let S be the set of “potential locations” where a service facility may be opened, and let k represent the desired number of open facilities. Let p_r be the population of origin $r \in R$, and let $T := \sum_{r \in R} p_r$ represent the total population across all origins. The parameter $d_{r,s}$ represents

the distance (or travel time or cost) between origin $r \in R$ and potential facility $s \in S$. We define two sets of binary indicator variables:

$$x_s := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if a service is opened at location } s; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \forall s \in S;$$

$$y_{r,s} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if origin } r \text{ is assigned to location } s; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \forall s \in S, r \in R.$$

A standard p -median facility location optimization model (with no fixed facility costs nor facility capacities) can be formulated as follows:

(p-Med)

$$\text{minimize } f(\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{s \in S} p_r d_{r,s} y_{r,s}, \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_{s \in S} x_s = k; \quad (1b)$$

$$y_{r,s} \leq x_s, \quad \forall r \in R, s \in S; \quad (1c)$$

$$\sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} = 1, \quad \forall r \in R; \quad (1d)$$

$$x_s \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall s \in S; \quad (1e)$$

$$y_{r,s} \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall r \in R, s \in S. \quad (1f)$$

The objective function, (1a), minimizes the mean distance traveled by each member of the population to reach their assigned facility. Constraint (1b) ensures k facilities are opened, (1c) ensures that origins are not assigned to closed facilities, and (1d) ensures that each origin is assigned to a single facility.

The p -median model is not appropriate for situations in which equity is a concern because it does not take into account the spread of the distances traveled, and therefore, cannot produce solutions that protect those in the community who are worst off. An approach that seeks to protect the worst-off is the p -center model, introduced by [Hakimi \(1965\)](#). In a p -center model, the objective is to minimize the maximum distance separating any demand node from its assigned facility i.e., minimize $\max_{r \in R, s \in S} d_{r,s} y_{r,s}$. This can be achieved in a linear model by introducing a single new variable, z , and a set of constraints as follows, so that z captures the maximum distance from any demand node to its closest facility:

(p-Ctr)

$$\text{minimize } z,$$

$$\text{subject to } z \geq d_{r,s} y_{r,s}, \quad \forall r \in R, s \in S;$$

$$(1b) - (1f).$$

By minimizing the maximum distance, (p-Ctr) ensures that no individual is excessively far from a facility. However, while (p-Ctr) addresses the worst-case scenario, it does not address the experience of the whole community. That is, it does not consider the average distance traveled. This limitation results in solutions that appear equitable on the surface, but fail to consider the experience of the majority of residents. We require a method that balances the needs of the worst-off residents with the needs of the population as a whole.

An additional issue with the (p-Ctr) model is that it does not scale to large problems as well as (p-Med). Thus, a multi-objective model that includes minimizing the maximum distance, for example, minimizing a weighted average of the mean distance and maximum distance (Halpern 1976), would encounter problems with computational tractability for large instances. Moreover, the weighted average of the mean and maximum does not have all of the properties that have been identified as important for disamenity-ranking metrics – for example, it is easy to see that this metric does not satisfy the *principle of transfers* (described in Section 2.2).

Both the p -center model and the p -median models can be viewed from the more general framework of Minkowski p -norm minimization. There is a well-established literature considering p -norm objectives within combinatorial optimization models. Such models have been studied with equity as the goal, as well as in many other contexts. This approach has been used in the setting of facility location, in addition to other optimization models; for examples see Karsu and Morton (2015a) Olivier et al. (2022), Gupta et al. (2023), and Xinying Chen and Hooker (2023). Unfortunately, general p -norm optimization does not scale to large problems even as well as the p -center model, becoming intractable for even relatively small instances.

2.2 Quantifying inequality

2.2.1 Environmental justice applications.

Facility location was one of the earliest optimization applications in which equity issues were considered, with some of the first contributions to the discussion of equity in the mathematical programming literature (O’Brien 1969, McAllister 1976, Savas 1978). Since these earliest examples, many measures of equity have been proposed, both within the optimization literature and elsewhere.

Before we discuss specific equity measures, we turn to a related question. What *properties* are necessary in a metric that quantifies the level and inequality of the distribution of an amenity or disamenity (i.e., burden) across an urban system? In particular, the metric should enable principled comparisons of distributions of the amenity or burden.

This question has been addressed thoroughly in the environmental justice literature, and recent results establish a consensus on the required characteristics of such a metric. This discussion originated in the economics community in the context of income inequality (Fields and Fei 1978, Blackwood and Lynch 1994, Adger 1997), and with careful study has evolved into the properties presented in Logan et al. (2021), the current standard (see also Marsh and Schilling (1994), Levy et al. (2006), Cox Jr. (2012), Maguire and Sheriff (2020)). There are six key properties that an inequality measure should possess if it is used to evaluate the distribution of a singular amenity or burden. For completeness, we note that a seventh and final property is included in Logan et al. (2021), however, this “multivariate” property is not relevant in our context and is omitted from the discussion below.

The first property that characterizes an ideal metric is *symmetry* (or impartiality). The intuitive definition easily translates to a mathematical one; a function is symmetric if its value remains unchanged under any permutation of its arguments. For example, if person A has an income of \$1 and person B has an income of \$5, an inequality measure should take on the same value as it would if person A had an income of \$5 and person B had an income of \$1.

The second property is *population independence*. This states that the inequality measure is not influenced by the number of individuals in the community and is therefore appropriate for the comparison of different populations.

The third property is known as *scale dependence* and ensures that the level of the amenity or burden is taken into account as well as its spread across the community. An example quickly demonstrates why this property is key. Without it, an inequality metric for income could declare that distribution I, corresponding to everyone in our population earning \$1, is preferable to distribution II, corresponding to half our population earning \$5 and the other half earning

\$10. However, in environmental justice applications, where lack of an amenity or excess of a burden has a direct impact on well-being, logic dictates we prefer distribution II, where every community member is comparatively better off.

The fourth property is called *the principle of transfers* and guarantees that if we redistribute some fixed quantity from a relatively advantaged member of our community to a disadvantaged member, then our measure should improve (assuming no other changes occurred).

The fifth condition states that the inequality measure should satisfy the *mirror property* which ensures the measure can appropriately deal with amenities *and* burdens. Failure to meet this property can lead to unexpected consequences. We would like our ordering of distributions by preference to remain the same irrespective of whether we consider an amenity directly or its complementary burden. For example, the same distribution should be preferred regardless of whether we consider the ‘burden’ of carbon dioxide in the air or the ‘amenity’ of clear air measured by a lack of carbon dioxide. It is the mirror property that ensures this consistency.

Finally, the sixth property is *separability* and enables meaningful comparison between sub-groups of our population. Importantly, it allows us to assess disparities between demographic groups.

The Kolm-Pollak Equally Distributed Equivalent (EDE), which we present in detail in Section 2.3, was introduced by Maguire and Sheriff (2020). By construction, this recently defined metric satisfies all six properties and is therefore the preferred inequality metric for environmental justice applications.

2.2.2 Equitable facility location.

The equitable location of services and amenities within a community is an environmental justice application. For example, the travel distance from an individual to their closest grocery store is classified as a disamenity or burden that can significantly impact an individual’s well-being, with marginalized communities being most at risk (Neff et al. 2009). Therefore, the six properties identified in the previous section apply in this context.

Researchers in facility location have also considered what constitutes the necessary properties for a function to measure inequality. While there is no consensus on which metric should be used, many of the agreed-upon properties align with those we have discussed (Erkut 1993, Marsh and Schilling 1994, Eiselt and Laporte 1995, Barbati and Piccolo 2016). However, there are additional characteristics to consider in facility location optimization. Perhaps the most important such property is *analytic tractability*; ideally, models could be applied to real-world instances to locate services in our largest cities. A second key property is *appropriateness* (or interpretability) because it is crucial that we can explain the measure to a decision maker. Finally, the metric must be adaptable to an appropriate level of *sensitivity* to inequality for a given application. We also note that some equitable facility location applications in the literature require scale invariance. However, in this application, we have seen *scale dependence* is necessary because the level of the distribution (i.e., average distance) is a critical consideration (Maguire and Sheriff 2020, Logan et al. 2021).

Through the remainder of this article, we will see that the Kolm-Pollak EDE satisfies the three additional properties, as well as the original six.

2.2.3 Literature.

Before presenting the Kolm-Pollak EDE, we conclude this section by briefly discussing equity measures that have appeared frequently in the facility location literature thus far. We review the benefits and drawbacks of these metrics to illustrate the necessity of exploring alternative options. For a more complete treatment of this topic, see survey papers such as Mulligan (1991), Mandell (1991), Erkut (1993), Marsh and Schilling (1994), Eiselt and Laporte (1995), Ogryczak (2009), Karsu and Morton (2015b), and Barbati and Bruno (2017).

As noted in Section 2.1, the maximum value is a commonly-used metric in facility location because it optimizes the experience of the “worst off” member of the population. However, both the maximum value and the range only consider the extreme values in the distribution and neither metric satisfies the principle of transfers. Metrics such as the mean absolute deviation, variance, maximum deviation, and variance of logarithms involve expressions that represent the deviation from the mean distance; these metrics also do not satisfy the principle of transfers (Allison 1978, Erkut 1993). Other measures of inequality that frequently appear throughout the literature are Schutz’s Index, coefficient of variation, the Gini coefficient, Theil’s entropy coefficient, and Atkinson’s coefficient. Similar to the previously mentioned measures, Schutz’s index does not satisfy the principle of transfers (Allison 1978). The remaining measures satisfy the principle of transfers but have other drawbacks, as discussed below.

Originally designed to quantify income inequality, the Gini coefficient (Gini 1921) has appeared in the facility location literature many times (Mandell 1991, Mulligan 1991, Drezner et al. 2009, Lejeune and Prasad 2013, Alem et al. 2022). Gini measures the dispersion, but not the level, or center, of a distribution. As such, it will prefer a distribution where everyone is equidistant but far from an amenity to one where each individual is closer but there is variation in the distances. That is, it does not satisfy scale dependence. Similarly, the coefficient of variation and Theil’s entropy coefficient do not satisfy scale dependence.

Equally distributed equivalents take the center *and* the spread of the distribution into account and thus are scale dependent. The Atkinson EDE (Atkinson 1970) is one such measure; however, like other EDEs from economics, it assumes higher values represent better welfare. This means it is not appropriate for ranking distributions of disamenities, or burdens, such as distance to a service, where smaller values are more desirable (Cox Jr. 2012). This is because it does not satisfy the mirror property. Despite this drawback, the Atkinson EDE has been considered within a facility location framework. However, Barbati and Bruno (2017) conclude that it is not possible to optimize the Atkinson EDE in a combinatorial optimization model for problems of any practical size.

Barbati and Bruno (2017) conduct a computational study on small instances for the eleven measures mentioned above. They find that the log variance, Theil’s entropy coefficient, and the Atkinson EDE are extremely complex to calculate and state that it is not possible to introduce them into a combinatorial optimization model. Similarly, a recent survey on formulating fairness in optimization models (Xinying Chen and Hooker 2023) omit both Theil’s coefficient and the Atkinson EDE because of the computational challenge they pose.

2.3 The Kolm-Pollak EDE

2.3.1 Development and application.

The six key properties of a ranking metric described in Section 2.2 have been used to assess and compare existing and newly-defined metrics for suitability in environmental justice applications (Levy et al. 2006). It was in this vein that Maguire and Sheriff (2020) introduced the Kolm-Pollak EDE based on Kolm–Pollak preferences (Kolm 1976a,b). The Kolm-Pollak EDE is the only metric that satisfies all of the key properties of an amenity or burden ranking metric, and thus is the preferred metric for environmental justice applications.

Following the publication of Maguire and Sheriff (2020), the Kolm-Pollak EDE has become the choice inequality metric in a variety of applications. For example, Rocco et al. (2023) used the Kolm-Pollak EDE to rank different network restoration strategies and also “propose several areas of future research incorporating the EDE measure in more comprehensive network restoration studies.” One of these topics has already been considered in Rocco and Barker (2023). In an entirely different field, a recent article dedicated to identifying twenty key research questions proposes that the Kolm Pollak EDE could be used to study microbial inequality in urban environments (Robinson et al. 2022). Other important community burdens being measured using

the Kolm-Pollak EDE include urban heat exposure (Hsu et al. 2021) and emissions (Mansur and Sheriff 2021). Finally, Logan et al. (2021) provide a case study of 10 US cities to demonstrate how the Kolm-Pollak EDE can be used to rank cities with respect to access to amenities, such as supermarkets.

2.3.2 Mathematical description.

When applied to a distribution of distances, an equally distributed equivalent (EDE) represents the mean distance that gives the same level of welfare when distributed equally among the population as the current unequal distance distribution. In other words, an EDE provides the center of the distribution, but with a penalty for “bad” values (large distances, in this example) to more accurately characterize the experience of the population as a whole.

Like other EDEs, the Kolm-Pollak EDE depends on a user-defined parameter, $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$. In typical applications, $|\epsilon|$ is assigned a value between 0.5 and 2. If larger values in the distribution are desirable, such as a distribution of incomes, then $\epsilon > 0$ and the Kolm-Pollak EDE always falls between the mean and the minimum of the distribution (i.e., small values are penalized). If larger values are undesirable, such as a distribution of distances to a grocery store, then $\epsilon < 0$, and the Kolm-Pollak EDE is always at or above the mean, but below the maximum of the distribution (i.e., large values are penalized).

Larger values of $|\epsilon|$ represent more aversion to inequality. When $\epsilon < 0$, as $|\epsilon|$ tends to infinity, the Kolm-Pollak EDE approaches the maximum value of the distribution. On the other hand, as ϵ approaches 0, the value of the Kolm-Pollak EDE approaches the mean of the distribution. In this way, minimizing via a p -center model and minimizing via a p -median model can both be interpreted in the context of minimizing the Kolm-Pollak EDE. Moreover, solutions obtained by minimizing the Kolm-Pollak EDE in a facility location model with a chosen ϵ can be viewed as being on a continuum between solutions obtained from a p -center model and solutions obtained from a p -median model (we are able to visualize this property in Section 6.4).

The inequality aversion parameter, ϵ , must be normalized for use in the Kolm-Pollak EDE by including the factor,

$$\alpha := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N z_i^2}, \quad (2)$$

where z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N represent the values in the distribution. Thus, the normalized version of ϵ , which we refer to as κ , is defined as $\kappa := \alpha\epsilon$. Using this notation, the Kolm-Pollak EDE is defined as:

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{z}) := -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e^{-\kappa z_i} \right]. \quad (3)$$

Example 1. Table 1 contains distributions of distances for four residential areas, each with a population of one: $p_r = 1$ for $r \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. The four distributions share the same mean, but get increasingly less equitable. Although these distributions vary greatly in terms of the experience of the population, a mean-minimizing facility location model would not distinguish among them.

3 Equitable facility location model

To quantify the quality of access of a geographic region to an amenity, we use the Kolm-Pollak EDE applied to the distribution of distances that each member of the population must travel to reach a facility that offers that amenity. We assume that residential data is aggregated (at the census block level, for example), so we include a parameter to weight distances according

Distribution	z_1	z_2	z_3	z_4	Mean	St. Dev.	Max	Kolm-Pollak		
								$\epsilon = -1$	$\epsilon = -2$	$\epsilon = -50$
1	100	100	100	100	100	0	100	100	100	100
2	50	75	125	150	100	46.5	150	106.7	112.7	146.8
3	0	0	200	200	100	115.5	200	124.0	143.4	197.2
4	0	0	0	400	100	200	400	142.9	190.9	389.0

Table 1: The mean distance is 100 for all four distributions, while the Kolm-Pollak scores are larger for less equitable distributions, increasingly so as $|\epsilon|$ increases. Observe that for large values (here we calculate $|\epsilon| = 50$ as an example) the Kolm-Pollak scores approach the maximum of the distribution.

to number of residents. Let p_r represent the population of residential area $r \in R$, and let z_r represent the distance that residents of r must travel to reach a facility. In this case, the Kolm-Pollak EDE is,

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{z}) = -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{r \in R} p_r e^{-\kappa z_r} \right], \quad (4)$$

where $T := \sum_{r \in R} p_r$, the total population over all residential areas, and $\kappa = \alpha \epsilon$, where

$$\alpha = \frac{\sum_{r \in R} p_r z_r}{\sum_{r \in R} p_r (z_r)^2}. \quad (5)$$

We model the distance traveled by residents of $r \in R$ as $z_r := \sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} d_{r,s}$ (where $y_{r,s}$ is as defined in Section 2), so we have,

$$\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{y}) = -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{r \in R} p_r e^{-\kappa \sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} d_{r,s}} \right]. \quad (6)$$

We can simplify this expression for use in an optimization model, which is a necessary step given the size of the instances we wish to solve.

The scaling parameter, α , depends on our optimization variables. Retaining α (and therefore κ) as a variable would lead to computationally intractable models, at least for the sizes of problems we seek to solve. However, treating α as a constant is reasonable: in doing so, we still minimize a Kolm-Pollak EDE, only sacrificing precise control over a user-defined parameter, $|\epsilon|$ the level of aversion to inequality. For example, the user may have intended to choose an inequality aversion level of $\epsilon = -1$, however, because we scale using a distribution defined by the problem data, ϵ is only scaled approximately for the optimal distribution. This means that the optimal solution obtained by the model optimizes the Kolm-Pollak EDE with a level of inequality aversion that only approximates what the user originally prescribed.

Nevertheless, once we have obtained an optimal solution, it can be used to calculate the true value of ϵ that was optimized, and we can compare this to the intended level of inequality aversion. Given that the choice of the inequality aversion parameter is somewhat subjective, it could be that we are happy with the approximation. If not, we can re-solve the model with an updated (more accurate) α -approximation. In our experiments, we found that by performing only one iteration of this kind, the optimal solution got very close to the desired level of inequality aversion; moreover, the original optimal Kolm-Pollak score (before the α -update) tends to be already very close to “correct”. In this way, model solution quality is very robust to scaling approximations. See Section 4 for mathematical details and the computational study investigating α -approximation.

Once we treat α (and therefore κ), as a constant, we are able to claim that optimizing $\mathcal{K}(\mathbf{y})$ is equivalent to optimizing the function,

$$\check{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{r \in R} p_r e^{-\kappa \sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} d_{r,s}}.$$

In this context, equivalent means that the optimal solution set is the same in both cases and that it is easy to recover the optimal value of \mathcal{K} from the optimal value of $\check{\mathcal{K}}$.

First recall that in our setting, $\epsilon < 0$, and so we can remove the positive constant $-\frac{1}{\kappa}$ for optimizing \mathcal{K} . Then observe that because the natural logarithm function is monotonically increasing, we can equivalently minimize the argument of the function. Finally, dropping the positive constant $\frac{1}{T}$ gives us $\check{\mathcal{K}}$. We formally define the Kolm-Pollak facility location model (KP) as follows, using the same notation as defined for (p-Med) above:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(KP)} \\ \text{minimize} \quad & \check{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{r \in R} p_r e^{-\kappa \sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} d_{r,s}}, \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \text{(1b)} - \text{(1f)}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Proposition 1. *Suppose $y_{r,s} \in \{0, 1\}$ for all $s \in S$, $r \in R$, and $\sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} = 1$ for all $r \in R$. Then*

$$\sum_{r \in R} p_r e^{-\kappa \sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} d_{r,s}} = \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{s \in S} p_r y_{r,s} e^{-\kappa d_{r,s}}.$$

Proof. Fix $r \in R$. There is exactly one $s \in S$ such that $y_{r,s} = 1$ because of our assumption that $\sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} = 1$. Let $s' \in S$ be that index so that we have $y_{r,s'} = 1$ and $y_{r,s} = 0$ for all $s \neq s'$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} p_r e^{-\kappa \sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} d_{r,s}} &= p_r e^{-\kappa(0d_{r,1} + \dots + 1d_{r,s'} + \dots + 0d_{r,|S|})} \\ &= p_r e^{-\kappa d_{r,s'}} \\ &= 0p_r e^{-\kappa d_{r,1}} + \dots + 1p_r e^{-\kappa d_{r,s'}} \\ &\quad + \dots + 0p_r e^{-\kappa d_{r,|S|}} \\ &= \sum_{s \in S} p_r y_{r,s} e^{-\kappa d_{r,s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $r \in R$ was chosen arbitrarily, it follows that the desired equality holds. \square

Replacing $\check{\mathcal{K}}$ with the linear version, which we denote $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, we obtain the Kolm-Pollak linear proxy model:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(KPL)} \\ \text{minimize} \quad & \bar{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{y}) := \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{s \in S} p_r y_{r,s} e^{-\kappa d_{r,s}}, \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \text{(1b)} - \text{(1f)}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Corollary 1. *(KPL) has the same set of optimal solutions as (KP).*

An optimal Kolm-Pollak EDE score (using the approximate value for α), \mathcal{K}^* , can be recovered from an optimal objective value of (KPL), $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^*$, as follows:

$$\mathcal{K}^* = -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{1}{T} \bar{\mathcal{K}}^* \right). \tag{9}$$

3.1 Model extensions

In this section, we discuss how a few common facility location modeling scenarios can be applied within the (KPL) model.

3.1.1 Facility costs.

Suppose we wish to incorporate a “fixed-charge” of c_s for opening facility $s \in S$. The simplest way to incorporate facility fixed-charges into the (KPL) model is to add a budget constraint of the form, $\sum_{s \in S} c_s x_s \leq b$, where b represents the overall facility budget. This constraint might replace constraint (1b), depending on the modeling scenario.

If the c_s and $d_{r,s}$ parameters represent values with the same units (dollars or meters, for example), then we might wish to incorporate a fixed-charge term into the (KPL) objective function directly. However, because the $d_{r,s}$ values do not appear in their standard units in the (KPL) objective function (due to dropping the log function), we must take care to add the fixed-charges, c_s , so that they have the appropriate weight relative to the $d_{r,s}$ values. We tackle this modeling scenario in detail in Section 5. If c_s and $d_{r,s}$ represent different values (say cost and distance, respectively), then a multi-objective approach would more appropriate for capturing the fixed-charge expression as an additional objective; see [Cho et al. \(2017\)](#) for a survey of multi-objective optimization techniques.

3.1.2 Facility capacities.

Facility capacities are a natural consideration in many facility location applications. If C_s represents the number of customers that can be served at facility s , the constraints,

$$\sum_{r \in R} p_r y_{r,s} \leq C_s x_s, \quad \forall s \in S, \quad (10)$$

ensure that the capacity of every opened facility is respected.

3.1.3 Split demands.

In some applications it makes sense to allow the total demand of customer $r \in R$ to be served by multiple open facilities. Allowing for split demands is a natural consideration when service facilities have capacities, so it might not be possible for each customer to be assigned to the closest open facility. We allow for split demands by relaxing the integrality of the $y_{r,s}$ variables; i.e., by replacing equation (1f) with $y_{r,s} \in [0, 1]$.

Interestingly, when the $y_{r,s}$ variables are relaxed to the continuous interval $[0, 1]$, Proposition 1 no longer holds, but (KPL) may actually be preferred over (KP) as the more accurate model. Recall that for a given $r \in R$, $\sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} = 1$ (1d).

First consider the original, nonlinear Kolm-Pollak expression,

$$-\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{r \in R} p_r e^{-\kappa \sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} d_{r,s}} \right].$$

For a fixed $r \in R$, the expression $\sum_{s \in S} y_{r,s} d_{r,s}$ represents a weighted average of the distances from r to each of the facilities assigned to r . The distribution of distances measured by this Kolm-Pollak expression includes this weighted average distance for each of the p_r people residing in census block r . Note that poor distances may be obscured in the weighted average of distances that is taken before the Kolm-Pollak expression is applied. This is not the case in the expression minimized by (KPL).

We obtain the expression that is minimized by (KPL) by substituting the linear proxy into the Kolm-Pollak EDE:

$$-\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{r \in R} \sum_{s \in S} p_r y_{r,s} e^{-\kappa d_{r,s}} \right].$$

In this version of the Kolm-Pollak expression, the weighted average defined by $y_{r,s}$ for a given r is applied to the collection of Kolm-Pollak terms of the form $p_r e^{-\kappa d_{r,s}}$, rather than to the distances directly. In other words, (KPL) models the scenario as if $p_r y_{r,s}$ people travel to facility s at a distance of $d_{r,s}$. Because $p_r y_{r,s}$ may be fractional, the expression minimized by (KPL) is not technically a Kolm-Pollak score. However, this expression is a more accurate model of the Kolm-Pollak EDE in the case of split demands than the expression minimized by (KP), because distances are appropriately penalized.

(KPL) with the $y_{r,s}$ variables relaxed has the same structure as (KPL) except with many binary variables replaced by continuous variables, so we would expect its computational performance to be at least as good as the computational performance of (KPL).

4 Estimating the scaling parameter

To minimize the Kolm-Pollak EDE via (KPL), we must approximate α , the factor used to scale the inequality aversion parameter ϵ . The “true” value of α corresponds to the distribution of distances characterized by an optimal solution to the optimization model, which we do not have a priori. Therefore, we estimate the optimal distribution, and α , using the problem data. The consequence of fixing α at the outset is that we do not have complete control over the chosen level of aversion to inequality represented by the optimal Kolm-Pollak score. This is because our approximate scaling, α , results in a value of $\kappa = \alpha\epsilon$ that corresponds to only an approximate value of the originally intended inequality aversion.

To computationally explore the impact of approximating α (on both the aversion to inequality represented by the optimal distribution and on the optimal Kolm-Pollak score itself), we used five election polling scenarios. Data for the polling scenarios is summarized in Table 2. $|R|$ indicates the number of census blocks (residential areas), $|S|$ indicates the number of potential polling sites, and k indicates the number of polling sites selected (which matches the number of polling sites used in the given election year). The potential polling sites have varying capacities so we use the (KPL) model with constraint (10). We set the desired aversion to inequality, denoted ϵ_0 , equal to -2 for all scenarios.

Scenario	City	Election	$ R $	$ S $	k	Number of Variables
1	Salem	2016	3102	92	8	285,476
2	Richmond	2016	6208	211	65	1,310,099
3	Atlanta	2016	8364	387	126	3,237,255
4	Cincinnati	2016	7670	517	256	3,965,907
5	Baltimore	2020	9238	901	201	8,324,339

Table 2: A summary of the five polling scenarios used to test the sensitivity of the (KPL) model to α approximations.

As a pre-processing step, we estimated the optimal distribution of distances by assigning each census block to the closest existing polling location. We used this distribution of distances to calculate an approximate value of α , which we denote α_a^{in} . Let $(KPL)_a$ represent the model (KPL) with $\kappa = \kappa_a := \alpha_a^{in} \epsilon_0$. Let α_a^{out} denote the value of α associated with the optimal solution to $(KPL)_a$. We can calculate the aversion to inequality represented by the optimal solution to $(KPL)_a$ as $\epsilon_a := \kappa_a / \alpha_a^{out}$. Comparing ϵ_0 and ϵ_a is a useful way to check the accuracy of α_a^{in} .

The closer α_a^{in} approximates α , the closer ϵ_a will be to ϵ_0 . In Table 3, we see that ϵ_a ranges between -1.56 and -0.55 . The desired level of aversion (-2) is not maintained by any of the optimal solutions.

Scenario	ϵ_0	ϵ_a	$\epsilon_{\mathcal{K}}$	α_a^{in}	$\alpha_a^{out} = \alpha_{\mathcal{K}}^{in}$	$\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}^{out}$
1	-2	-1.56	-2.00	0.000192	0.000246	0.000246
2	-2	-0.90	-2.00	0.000212	0.000474	0.000474
3	-2	-0.74	-1.98	0.000179	0.000485	0.000488
4	-2	-0.55	-2.01	0.000171	0.000616	0.000614
5	-2	-1.42	-2.01	0.001277	0.001797	0.001789

Table 3: Exact and approximate values of the aversion to inequality associated with the approximate solution where ϵ_0 is the “desired” aversion to inequality.

It is reasonable to expect that the distribution of distances associated with an optimal solution to $(\text{KPL})_a$ will produce a more accurate α -estimate. Thus, we solve (KPL) again, this time with $\kappa = \kappa_{\mathcal{K}} := \epsilon_0 \alpha_{\mathcal{K}}^{in}$, where $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}^{in} := \alpha_a^{out}$. We denote this version of (KPL) as $(\text{KPL})_{\mathcal{K}}$. We compute the aversion to inequality associated with the optimal solution to $(\text{KPL})_{\mathcal{K}}$ as $\epsilon_{\mathcal{K}} := \kappa_{\mathcal{K}} / \alpha_{\mathcal{K}}^{out}$, where $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}^{out}$ is calculated using the optimal distribution of distances. In Table 3, we see that $\epsilon_{\mathcal{K}}$ is very close to -2 for every scenario: as expected, $\alpha_{\mathcal{K}}^{out}$ provides a very good approximation to α .

Due to the high quality of its α -approximation, $(\text{KPL})_{\mathcal{K}}$ generates high-quality solutions in the sense that the desired level of aversion to inequality is very nearly preserved by its optimal solutions. Thus, we used optimal solutions to $(\text{KPL})_{\mathcal{K}}$ as a benchmark to test the quality of optimal solutions to $(\text{KPL})_a$. In Table 4, we compared the Kolm-Pollak EDE values associated with optimal solutions to $(\text{KPL})_a$ and $(\text{KPL})_{\mathcal{K}}$. The third column, labeled $|\Delta|$, reports the absolute difference between the optimal Kolm-Pollak EDEs (in meters). The values in the last column, labeled “gap”, are found by dividing Δ by the Kolm-Pollak EDE associated with $(\text{KPL})_{\mathcal{K}}$. For each of these five scenarios, $(\text{KPL})_a$ produced near-optimal solutions.

Scenario	KP EDE			
	$(\text{KPL})_a$	$(\text{KPL})_k$	$ \Delta $	gap
1	6541.81	6541.81	0.00	0.0000
2	2256.18	2259.49	3.31	0.0015
3	2198.29	2191.37	6.92	0.0032
4	5585.93	5571.38	14.54	0.0026
5	571.21	566.15	5.06	0.0089

Table 4: KP EDEs obtained via $(\text{KPL})_a$ are close to the best-known KP EDEs, which were obtained via $(\text{KPL})_{\mathcal{K}}$. Distances are measured in meters.

We chose to use polling scenarios for this analysis (as opposed to the food desert study described in Section 6) because four of the polling scenarios optimally locate many more locations, and the polling models allow all existing sites to relocate. This means that the initial α -approximations are far less accurate than in the food desert application in which we assume existing supermarkets remain open and the maximum value of k is 10. In fact, the Kolm-Pollak score improved by a mile or more in every polling instance, so the distribution of distances before and after optimization was quite different. Although small, this study provides some assurance that optimal solutions are not highly sensitive to variations in α , or equivalently, to varying levels of aversion to inequality.

Despite this, some modelers may wish to have more control over the aversion to inequality represented by the optimal solution, and our experiments point to the following strategy. Given a

desired aversion to inequality, ϵ_0 , solve (KPL) using a value of α that is estimated using problem data, α_{in} . Next, calculate the aversion to inequality represented by the optimal distribution of distances: $\epsilon_{out} = \frac{\alpha_{in}\epsilon_0}{\alpha_{out}}$, where α_{out} is calculated using the optimal distribution of distances. If the user is not happy with the aversion to inequality that the solution represents, they may resolve the model with the more accurate α -approximation, α_{out} . According to our experiments, the next optimal solution is likely to correspond to an aversion to inequality that is very close to ϵ_0 .

5 Facility fixed-charge penalties

It is rarely the case that all potential locations are equally suitable. For example, in the equitable polling locations application, early voting sites are open on many days leading up to an election and this can be disruptive to normal operations at the selected sites. Thus, when this model was used to provide analysis for advocacy groups and election boards in preparation for the 2024 United States presidential election (see the code base at [Agarwala et al. \(2023\)](#)), fire stations and churches were supplied as potential early voting sites in Gwinnett County, Georgia, but were only to be selected if their inclusion would be particularly impactful with respect to voter access. Similarly, if an urban planning board for a particular city were selecting supermarket locations to improve food access, some potential locations would be less suitable than others due to land costs or other practical considerations.

In this section, we present a method for applying a facility-based fixed-charge penalty, c_s , in the same units as the $d_{r,s}$, so that penalized location $s \in S$ will be selected only if it improves the optimal Kolm-Pollak score by at least c_s units. This model has two avenues by which error in the size of the distance penalty may be introduced. Careful analysis of both types of error leads to a modeling strategy aimed at keeping the penalty error low.

Suppose $U \subseteq S$ is a set of less-desirable potential locations. For each $s \in U$, let $c_s \geq 0$ represent the number of units of improvement in the Kolm-Pollak score that would need to be realized (versus an optimal score not using site s) to select location s . We want to incorporate these preferences in the (KPL) model by penalizing the optimal Kolm-Pollak score by $\sigma := \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s$ units. However, we cannot do this directly because the objective function, (8), does not minimize the Kolm-Pollak score directly. The following result provides the value that the (KPL) linear objective function, $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$, must be penalized by for the associated Kolm-Pollak score, \mathcal{K} , to be penalized by σ meters.

Theorem 1. *Let $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ represent the unpenalized objective value of (KPL). Let \mathcal{K} represent the associated unpenalized Kolm-Pollak score: $\mathcal{K} = -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln\left(\frac{1}{T}\bar{\mathcal{K}}\right)$. Then adding a penalty of,*

$$\rho := T e^{-\kappa\mathcal{K}}(e^{-\kappa\sigma} - 1), \quad (11)$$

to $\bar{\mathcal{K}}$ is equivalent to adding a penalty of $\sigma \geq 0$ units to \mathcal{K} .

Proof. Note that $\bar{\mathcal{K}} = T e^{-\kappa\mathcal{K}}$. Converting the penalized linear objective function value to a Kolm-Pollak score, we obtain the appropriately penalized Kolm-Pollak value:

$$-\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln\left(\frac{1}{T}(\bar{\mathcal{K}} + \rho)\right) = -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln\left(e^{-\kappa\mathcal{K}} + e^{-\kappa\mathcal{K}}(e^{-\kappa\sigma} - 1)\right) = \mathcal{K} + \sigma. \quad \square$$

Now we have the following model for penalizing less-desirable potential service locations. The new variable v captures the nonlinear portion of the penalty via the pressure of the minimizing objective:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{(KPL}^p\text{)} \\ & \text{minimize } \bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \bar{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{y}) + T e^{-\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}}}(v - 1), & (12) \\ & \text{subject to } v \geq e^q; & (13) \end{aligned}$$

$$q = -\kappa \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s; \quad (14)$$

(1b) – (1f).

In (12), $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ is a parameter approximating \mathcal{K}^* , the unpenalized Kolm-Pollak score associated with an optimal solution to (KPL^p): $\mathcal{K}^* := -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln\left(\frac{1}{T} \bar{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{y}^*)\right)$, where $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is optimal to (KPL^p). Moreover, to use a linear optimization solver, we must linearize the one-dimensional exponential function in (13). Let σ^{max} represent the largest possible value that $\sigma = \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s$ can take for a feasible solution, (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) , to (KPL^p). We can accomplish the linearization by replacing (13) with a set of lower-bounding tangent lines constructed at points (q, e^q) , for $q \in \beta = \{\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n\}$, where $0 = \beta_0 < \beta_1 < \dots < \beta_{n-1} < -\kappa \sigma^{max} \leq \beta_n$, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{(KPL}^t\text{)} \\ & \text{minimize } \bar{\mathcal{K}}^p(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := \bar{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{y}) + T e^{-\kappa \hat{\mathcal{K}}}(v - 1), & (12) \\ & \text{subject to } v \geq e^{\beta_i} + e^{\beta_i}(q - \beta_i), & (15) \\ & \qquad \qquad \qquad \forall i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}; \\ & q = -\kappa \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s; & (14) \\ & \text{(1b) – (1f).} \end{aligned}$$

The accuracy of the penalty term, i.e., how far it deviates from the penalty value we intended to apply, depends both on the quality of the approximation, $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$, in the objective function (12) and on the linearization points, β , chosen for (15). In Appendix A, we analyze the error in the penalty term introduced by each of these approximations, leading to guidance on choosing $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ and β to keep the error low. To describe that guidance, we require the following definitions.

Definition 1. Let (KPL)^{all} denote the unpenalized model, (KPL), with all potential locations from (KPL^p) included. Let (KPL)^{rem} denote (KPL) with all penalized potential locations removed from consideration, and assume that there are enough remaining locations (at least k) so that the model is feasible. Suppose $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is optimal to (KPL)^{all} and define $\mathcal{K}^{all} := -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln(\bar{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{y}^*))$. Define \mathcal{K}^{rem} similarly using an optimal solution to (KPL)^{rem}.

Assume that we construct the tangent lines (15) at equally spaced points on the interval of interest. Let w represent the width of these subintervals. To keep the error in the penalty term low, our analysis suggests the following:

- *Parameter approximation error:* Set $\hat{\mathcal{K}} := \mathcal{K}^{all}$.
- *Linearization error:*
 - If all penalized locations have the same penalty, c , choose linearization points to be equally spaced at a width of $w := -\kappa c$ to eliminate the linearization error altogether.
 - Otherwise, choose w so that $A(w) \leq 1 - e^{\kappa \varepsilon}$ to achieve a linearization error no more than ε , where $A(w) := e^{\frac{w e^w}{e^w - 1} - 1} - \frac{w e^w}{e^w - 1}$. For context, $A(0.01) \approx 10^{-5}$ and $A(0.001) \approx 10^{-7}$.

See Appendix A for a detailed analysis of error in the penalty term, including bounds on both types of error.

Another implementation consideration is how to choose an appropriate penalty size so that penalized locations are only selected if they add value, but are not selected if other, more desirable sites, could achieve a similar level of access. If, for example, an application domain expert can ascertain that a specific fire station is worth using as a polling location if it improves the Kolm-Pollak score of the community by at least 20 meters, this quantity can be used directly as the penalty. However, in the majority of instances, this is probably unrealistic to expect. In

this case, we recommend the following based on our analysis. Choose

$$c_s = c := \frac{\mathcal{K}^{rem} - \mathcal{K}^{all}}{N}, \text{ for all } s \in U,$$

where N represents the number of less-desirable locations that were selected when solving $(KPL)^{all}$. This has the additional benefit of allowing us to avoid any linearization error by choosing $w = -\kappa c$.

We conclude this section by presenting an example to demonstrate the practical relevance of using this strategy to penalize less-suitable potential sites. Note that we can use the optimal solution to $(KPL)^{all}$, obtained in the process of selecting c , to calculate a better approximation for α (the inequality-aversion scaling parameter) for the penalized model.

Example 2. (Access to early voting) We solved 19 instances of $(KPL)^t$, the linear version of $(KPL)^p$ to optimally locate $k \in \{12, 13, \dots, 30\}$ early voting sites in Gwinnett County, Georgia. Potential locations included 12 early voting locations from the 2020 and 2022 elections, and 145 potential new early voting locations including community centers, libraries, churches, and fire stations, many of which were election-day polling centers. We applied penalties to the 77 churches and 5 fire stations in the set of potential locations so that these locations would only be selected if a “good enough” solution could not be found using the other categories of building. We did this using the strategy explained in the previous paragraphs, with c and w chosen as described. We also required that every solution select at least 10 of the 12 existing early voting locations because moving polling locations can negatively impact turnout.

Table 5 summarizes the results, and Figure 1 visualizes the results for the case of selecting $k = 20$ early voting sites. As we can see in Figure 1, $(KPL)^t$ obtains a very similar distribution of distances using only two penalized sites as (KPL) obtains using eight penalized sites. This feature allows decision-makers to achieve a near-optimal solution while using very few less-desirable sites. In Table 5, we see a similar trend for all values of k . The penalty errors that arise from approximating the parameter $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ are quite small, ranging from 0 to 2.3 meters.




Figure 1: Gwinnett County early voting sites. Red dots represent less-suitable sites (churches and fire stations). Filled dots represent existing early voting sites. Darker background shading indicates residential areas that are farther from an early voting site. Map (a) displays the optimal solution to $(KPL)^{rem}$: less-suitable sites are not included as potential locations. In map (b), eight less-suitable sites are selected by $(KPL)^{all}$: all sites are included but no penalties are applied. In map (c), the penalized model, $(KPL)^t$, achieves a near-optimal Kolm-Pollak score with only 2 less-suitable sites.

k	(KPL ^{rem})	(KPL ^{all})		(KPL ^t)		gap	per-site penalty	
	\mathcal{K}^{rem}	$ P $	\mathcal{K}^{all}	$ P $	\mathcal{K}^t		desired	error
12	4953.8	2	4896.2	1	4925.8	0.01	28.8	0.0
13	4645.5	3	4514.8	1	4515.7	0.00	43.6	0.0
14	4446.4	3	4275.2	1	4285.4	0.00	57.1	0.2
15	4257.0	3	4066.7	1	4084.4	0.00	63.4	0.4
16	4061.9	4	3856.9	1	3876.5	0.01	51.2	0.4
17	3877.2	4	3630.7	1	3658.2	0.01	61.6	0.6
18	3719.7	5	3450.6	2	3480.8	0.01	53.8	0.6
19	3621.3	6	3312.6	2	3369.3	0.02	51.5	1.0
20	3524.0	8	3197.4	2	3262.7	0.02	40.8	0.9
21	3428.0	7	3098.3	2	3188.8	0.03	47.1	1.5
22	3358.5	6	3013.3	2	3123.4	0.04	57.5	2.2
23	3304.3	7	2937.7	2	3064.4	0.04	52.4	2.3
24	3253.7	9	2864.6	2	3009.3	0.05	43.2	2.1
25	3211.7	12	2800.5	4	2889.1	0.03	34.3	1.0
26	3162.5	12	2736.4	4	2841.0	0.04	35.5	1.3
27	3125.7	12	2681.4	4	2784.8	0.04	37.0	1.3
28	3091.5	12	2631.2	3	2775.4	0.05	38.4	1.9
29	3060.7	14	2583.0	5	2667.4	0.03	34.1	1.0
30	3036.4	15	2541.1	5	2620.4	0.03	33.0	0.9

Table 5: The Kolm-Pollak scores (\mathcal{K}) and the number of fire stations and churches ($|P|$) selected by optimal solutions to three models in the Gwinnett County early voting application. Note that (KPL^{rem}) chooses no less-suitable sites, but leads to the highest Kolm-Pollak score. (KPL^{all}) achieves the best possible Kolm-Pollak scores, while (KPL^t) achieves near-optimal Kolm-Pollak scores with fewer less-suitable sites, as measured by “gap”: $\frac{\mathcal{K}^t - \mathcal{K}^{all}}{\mathcal{K}^{all}}$. The Kolm-Pollak scores, the per-site desired penalty, and the per-site penalty error are all measured in meters.

6 Computational experiments

We performed computational experiments to test how (KPL) compares with the p-median model, (p-Med), and the p-center model, (p-Ctr), both in the context of solve time and the properties of optimal solutions. Our test instances are from a real-world, equitable facility location application. In this section, we describe the problem data and the computational environment, then present and discuss the results of our experiments.

6.1 Test problem description

Our test problems are from a study on food deserts in which we analyzed supermarket accessibility in the 500 largest cities across the United States. The study addressed key questions such as, “Where should we strategically place new stores to optimize equitable access, given that we can open a maximum of k new stores?” and “What is the minimum number of new stores required to achieve the average level of Equitable access in the United States?”. The answers to those questions are presented in a separate article (Horton et al. 2024); in this document, we approach the study from a purely methodological standpoint.

For each city included in the study, the “customers”, or residential areas, are the centroids of census blocks from the 2020 census. The set of locations where a grocery store may be opened is the set of centroids of census block *groups* in the city, a larger geographic area than census blocks. In addition to census block group centroids, we include existing supermarket locations, which we retrieved from OpenStreetMap (OSM 2017) using their ‘overpass-turbo.eu’ portal and the tag ‘store = supermarket’. The model assumes existing stores will remain operational (i.e., the variables corresponding to existing locations are set equal to 1). For each of the 500 cities, we optimally located $k = 1, 5,$ and 10 new supermarkets using three different facility

location models: (KPL) with $\epsilon = -1$, (p-Med), and (p-Ctr). Thus, we solved 4500 instances total, 1500 instances of each model.

To calculate network distances between residential areas and supermarkets (existing and potential), we adopted the method outlined by Logan et al. (2019), which leverages the Open Source Routing Machine (OSRM), see Luxen and Vetter (2011), to retrieve the distance of the shortest walking path from each origin to each existing and potential store location. This method accounts for geographical barriers, such as freeways, waterways, and railroad tracks, making it preferable to traditional Euclidean or Manhattan distance measurements.

Our largest instances correspond to New York City (NYC), New York, the city with the largest population in the United States, with 30,095 residential areas, 657 existing supermarkets, and 7,618 potential supermarket locations. The NYC models had more than 248 million decision variables. The data sets of the five largest cities (by population) are summarized in Table 6.

City	Population	Existing Supermarkets	Number of Variables
New York, NY	8,784,592	657	248,975,936
Los Angeles, CA	3,849,235	537	108,306,340
Chicago, IL	2,733,239	316	106,859,845
Houston, TX	2,215,641	427	61,658,801
Philadelphia, PA	1,593,147	172	28,086,301

Table 6: Summary of data from five largest cities in the food deserts study.

6.2 Computational environment

We implemented the food desert models in Python using the optimization modeling language Pyomo, as described in Hart et al. (2011) and Bynum et al. (2021), and solved the models using the linear mixed-integer optimization solver, Gurobi (Gurobi Optimization, LLC 2023).

We solved most instances on a high-performance computing cluster, an Advanced Micro Devices (AMD) 7502 CPU processor with 64 cores and 512 GB of memory, allocating one out of the 64 available cores to each instance. The New York instances required more memory. For those, we used an AMD 7502 CPU processor with 64 cores and 2 TB of memory.

6.3 Solve times

Figure 2 presents the solve time data for the food desert instances. The solve times correspond to the “wall time” for each instance, the length of time between when the solver is called and when a solution is returned. All instances solved to optimality using Gurobi’s default MIP gap of 0.0001 (0.01%). The top row of Figure 2 compares the solve times of (p-Med) and (KPL), while the second row compares solve times of (p-Ctr) and (KPL). The columns of Figure 2 represent scenarios where $k = 1, 5$, and 10 new stores are optimally located in each city.

Each circle in Figure 2 corresponds to optimally locating the indicated number of new stores in a single city. The circles are sized according to the number of integer variables in the model; for a given city, the number of decision variables is the same across all values of k and all three models. In each chart, the horizontal and vertical axes represent solve times in seconds displayed on a log scale. The horizontal axis represents the (KPL) solve time in all charts, while the vertical axis represents the (p-Med) solve time in the top row, and the (p-Ctr) solve time in the bottom row. The color of each circle indicates which model solved the instance faster.

In the top row of Figure 2, we see that (p-Med) and (KPL) had similar solve times across all instances, with each model “winning” about half the time. Even as the number of new stores increased, the solve times for (p-Med) and (KPL) remained similar. As expected, (KPL) typically solved significantly faster than (p-Ctr).




Figure 2: Food desert application solve times for (p-Med), (p-Ctr), and (KPL) on 500 largest U.S. cities for $k = 1, 5, 10$ additional supermarkets. Note that solve times are displayed on a log scale; (p-Ctr) often takes roughly 10 times longer to solve than (KPL).

To highlight a specific case, we report the solve times in minutes for the New York City instances in Table 7. For all values of k , the (KPL) model took longer to solve than the (p-Med) model, but substantially less time to solve than the (p-Ctr) model. For $k = 1$, (KPL) took around an hour to solve, 19 minutes or 48% longer than (p-Med). However, the two models had much closer performance for the other values of k , with time differences of 7.2 seconds and 5.3 minutes for $k = 5$ and $k = 10$, respectively, both of which represent very small percent differences (less than 0.05%).

k	(KPL)	(p-Med)	(p-Ctr)
1	57.3	38.6	83.5
5	122.5	122.4	231.6
10	146.2	140.9	286.4

Table 7: Solve times (in minutes) for the New York City instances.

6.3.1 Numerical considerations: large objective coefficients

(KPL) has a larger range of objective coefficients than (p-Med), which may cause numerical instability in optimization solvers, although we note that we did not encounter this problem with any of the food desert instances. However, Gurobi issued a “large coefficient” warning for polling Scenario 5 (described in Section 4). The range of objective coefficients were reported as $[2 \times 10^{-6}, 7 \times 10^{28}]$ for $(KPL)_\alpha$. The new value of α introduced in $(KPL)_\mathcal{K}$ exacerbated the problem, leading to the coefficient range of $[2 \times 10^{-6}, 2 \times 10^{42}]$ and caused the solve time to increase from 1.5 hours to 12.7 hours. Thus, modelers applying (KPL) should be aware of the potential for ballooning objective coefficients.

One simple way to address this problem is to reduce the value of $|\epsilon|$ by a small amount. The computational results presented in Section 4 demonstrated that optimal solutions are not very sensitive to small changes in κ , while small changes in κ can have a very big impact on the range of objective coefficients. Another possibility for mitigating ballooning objective coefficients, especially when multiple facilities are being opened, is to omit $y_{r,s}$ variables for (r,s) assignments that could never occur in an optimal solution, i.e., those for which $d_{r,s}$ is larger than some fixed threshold, d_{max} . Choosing a value of d_{max} that is large enough to ensure that no potentially beneficial assignments are excluded varies by problem, and must be considered carefully.

6.4 Properties of optimal solutions

Each optimal solution to a food desert scenario defines a distribution of distances that residents must travel to reach their assigned supermarket. In this section, we compare statistics of the distributions of distances corresponding to optimal solutions to (KPL), (p-Med), and (p-Ctr).

Figure 3 provides an overview of the mean distance traveled by residents to reach their closest grocery store in optimal solutions to (p-Ctr), (p-Med), and (KPL) with $\epsilon = -1$. The 500 largest cities are represented in each of the three charts, which display scenarios with $k \in \{1, 5, 10\}$ new stores. The cities are sorted along the horizontal axis according to the mean distance achieved by the optimal solution to (KPL), so the three colored shapes (circle, square, and triangle) representing optimal solutions to (KPL), (p-Med), and (p-Ctr) for a single city appear in a vertical line. Notably, the average distance for (p-Ctr) is consistently higher than that of both (p-Med) and (KPL), while the average distances for (p-Med) and (KPL) closely align.



Figure 3: Average walking distances for residents to nearest supermarket in optimal solutions of (p-Med), (p-Ctr), and (KPL) models for 500 largest U.S. cities.

Figure 4 is similar to Figure 3 except that it presents the maximum (rather than mean) distance traveled in each optimal distribution of distances. The horizontal axis is sorted according to the maximum distance in an optimal solution to (KPL). (p-Med) consistently yields significantly higher maximum distances compared to both (p-Ctr) and (KPL). While (KPL) optimal solutions correspond to greater maximum distances when compared to (p-Ctr), (KPL) still results in a substantial improvement over the maximum distances in (p-Med) optimal solutions.

We are interested in the type of optimal solutions these models produce as well as their quality. In Figure 5, we illustrate geographic differences in solutions from the three models by plotting optimal solutions obtained in the instance of Oakland, CA with $k = 5$. The locations chosen by each model are consistent with what we would expect. (p-Med) selects locations in high-population areas, ignoring residents who are far from a grocery store. (p-Ctr) only selects locations near residents who are currently far from a grocery store, regardless of whether a facility in that location will improve things for the majority of the population. The solution





Figure 4: Maximum walking distances for any resident to nearest supermarket in optimal solutions of (p-Med), (p-Ctr), and (KPL) models for 500 largest U.S. cities.

from (KPL) balances the best qualities from the other two solutions, selecting locations that will improve the experience of the worst-off residents *and* a majority of residents.



(a) Solution to (p-Med)

(b) Solution to (KPL)

(c) Solution to (p-Ctr)

Figure 5: Oakland, CA grocery store locations. The smaller blue dots represent current grocery store locations. The larger highlighted dots represent the sites chosen to locate the five new grocery stores by the respective model. Darker background shading indicates residential areas with a higher population density and lighter shading indicates lower population density (note that this is different from Figure 1 in which shading represents distance).

6.4.1 Polling location application

We completed a much smaller study using the five election polling scenarios described in Section 4 that further highlights key properties of optimal solutions to (KPL). Rather than using the cluster as described in Section 6.2 to solve the polling scenarios, we completed the experiments using a personal laptop (a 2020 MacBook Pro with the Apple M1 chip and 16 GB of RAM). We again implemented the models in Python using Pyomo (Hart et al. 2011, Bynum et al. 2021), and solved them using Gurobi (Gurobi Optimization, LLC 2023). For all instances, we set the MIP gap to 0.005 (0.5%) and the time limit to three hours. Recall that for this study, we used a greater aversion to inequality, $\epsilon = -2$, and allowed all existing locations to move, so there was more room for improvement in optimal solutions to all models.

Table 8 provides four summary statistics (Kolm-Pollak EDE, mean, maximum, and standard

deviation) for the distribution of distances corresponding to optimal solutions to the three models. The (p-Ctr) model applied to Scenario 5 did not solve to optimality within the three hour time limit. Figure 6 shows the distributions of distances the populations of each city must travel to reach their assigned polling location under optimal solutions to each of the models. In both the table and the figure, we see that the (KPL) solutions either very nearly match or improve on every summary statistic versus optimal solutions to the (p-Ctr) and (p-Med) models. The relatively poor performance of the (p-Ctr) solutions with respect to population access to amenities is apparent in Figure 6.




Figure 6: Cumulative percentage of population within x meters of assigned polling location.

Scenario	Model	KP EDE	Mean	Max	St. Dev.
1	(KPL)	6541.81	3087.90	18164.1	1734.13
	(p-Med)	8074.17	2796.79	22780.1	1873.23
	(p-Ctr)	11655.60	10281.16	18164.1	4249.91
2	(KPL)	2256.18	1573.41	6764.5	920.08
	(p-Med)	2278.3	1569.93	6764.5	973.58
	(p-Ctr)	5199.72	4805.95	6764.5	1576.32
3	(KPL)	2198.29	1605.90	6585.2	857.68
	(p-Med)	2216.91	1601.98	6585.2	878.20
	(p-Ctr)	4934.76	4549.96	6585.2	1497.15
4	(KPL)	5585.93	1073.50	11380.9	768.37
	(p-Med)	6707.20	1072.08	14876.8	771.60
	(p-Ctr)	5896.42	5311.81	11426.9	1994.96
5	(KPL)	571.21	454.21	2389.2	215.49
	(p-Med)	2249.23	445.60	5218.0	241.31
	(p-Ctr)	—	—	—	—

Table 8: Statistics of the distance distributions defined by the optimal solutions obtained by different models. Note that $\epsilon = -2$ both in the (KPL) model and in the calculation of the KP EDE. (KPL) provided a better solution with respect to maximum distance than (p-Ctr), but the difference is within the optimality gap of 0.5% that we set for these instances.

6.5 Discussion of computational results

We have seen that (KPL) scales to very large practical problems, performing similarly to the (p-Med) model, which is a common choice in facility location applications. One concern a city planner may have when choosing to use (KPL) over (p-Med) may be the fear of sacrificing average distance (overall welfare) in order to find an equitable solution (supporting those with

the poorest access). Indeed, that is what we see in the (p-Ctr) solutions: the optimal (p-Ctr) travel distances are longer on average, often significantly longer. However, in the instances we have studied, (KPL) consistently offers the best of both worlds: near-optimal mean distances *and* a better outcome for the worst-off residents versus minimizing average distance directly.

This trend is highlighted In Table 9. When considering the 4500 food desert instances, we see that for all values of k , on average across all cities, less than 10 meters in mean distance must be sacrificed in order to realize more than 400 meters of improvement in maximum distance. As expected, the improvements are more pronounced as more supermarkets are opened.

(KPL) versus (p-Med) optimal distributions	$k = 1$	$k = 5$	$k = 10$
Average increase in mean distance (meters)	+8.859	+7.206	+5.7756
Average decrease in maximum distance (meters)	-431.832	-489.088	-531.498

Table 9: Comparing decrease in maximum distance versus increase in mean distance for (KPL) versus (p-Med) optimal solutions. Averages are taken over the 500 “food deserts” cities when adding k new supermarkets.

7 Conclusion

In this article, we introduced a new approach to equitable facility location. Although the problem has been a common topic in the optimization literature for many years and several metrics have been proposed, a consensus on how to measure equity in these models has been elusive due to the difficulty of incorporating existing metrics into scalable optimization models.

Our method addresses this issue by using the Kolm-Pollak Equally Distributed Equivalent (EDE): the metric that has been identified recently in the environmental justice literature as the most appropriate for ranking distributions of disamenities, such as pollution exposure, or in our case, distance to a public facility or service. We present an integer linear facility location optimization model that is equivalent to optimizing over the nonlinear Kolm-Pollak EDE. We then extend this model to allow the user to penalize less-desirable choices for the location of facilities. Extensive computational tests demonstrate that our model scales to very large, practical problem instances and that it delivers high-quality, equitable optimal solutions that balance protecting the worst-off residents with minimizing the mean distance of a resident to a facility.

We also address several implementation details with the goal of supporting modelers who wish to apply the (KPL) facility location model. (1) We introduce and interpret the linear Kolm-Pollak version of the split-demands model, which extends the use-case to another common facility location context. (2) The model requires approximating, α , the value that is used to scale the Kolm-Pollak inequality aversion parameter to the problem data. We discuss methods for approximating α , but also demonstrate through computational tests that the model is robust to reasonable α -approximations. (3) We derive a model for introducing penalties on less-desirable potential locations. This model requires estimating a parameter and approximating a nonlinear function. We thoroughly analyze the error introduced by both, leading to modeling strategies that keep the penalty error low.

We believe that the linear Kolm-Pollak EDE facility location model should be considered for any facility location application for which equity is a concern. We hope that we have provided a useful road map for modelers who wish to apply and adapt the methods we present here.

There are plenty of avenues for future methodological advances. In the facility location context, we have not yet analytically characterized the impact of α -approximations. Also, our applications of interest have led us to study per-site penalties, but per-site incentives could be

useful in other contexts. There are also other optimization applications in which the Kolm-Pollak EDE could be an appropriate metric. We expect to see the Kolm-Pollak EDE appear in the operations research literature with increasing frequency due to its importance in the environmental justice domain.

8 Acknowledgements

This work used computing resources at the Center for Computational Mathematics, University of Colorado Denver, including the Alderaan cluster, supported by the National Science Foundation award OAC-2019089.

References

- Adger, W. N. (1997). *Income inequality in former centrally planned economies: Results for the agricultural sector in Vietnam*. Citeseer.
- Agarwala, S., Rosenberg, C., and Skipper, D. (2023). Equitable Polling Locations.
- Alem, D., Caunhye, A. M., and Moreno, A. (2022). Revisiting gini for equitable humanitarian logistics. *Socioecon. Plann. Sci.*, 82:101312.
- Allison, P. D. (1978). Measures of inequality. *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 43(6):865–880.
- Atkinson, A. (1970). On the measurement of inequality. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 2(3):244–263.
- Barbati, M. and Bruno, G. (2017). Exploring similarities in discrete facility location models with equality measures. *Geographical Analysis*, 50(4):378–396.
- Barbati, M. and Piccolo, C. (2016). Equality measure properties for location problems. *Optim. Lett.*, 10(5):903–920.
- Blackwood, D. and Lynch, R. G. (1994). The measurement of inequality and poverty: A policy maker’s guide to the literature. *World development*, 22(4):567–578.
- Bynum, M. L., Hackebeil, G. A., Hart, W. E., Laird, C. D., Nicholson, B. L., Sirola, J. D., Watson, J.-P., and Woodruff, D. L. (2021). *Pyomo—optimization modeling in python*, volume 67. Springer Science & Business Media, Third edition.
- Cho, J.-H., Wang, Y., Chen, I.-R., Chan, K. S., and Swami, A. (2017). A survey on modeling and optimizing multi-objective systems. *IEEE Commun. Surv. Tutor.*, 19(3):1867–1901.
- Church, R. and ReVelle, C. (1974). The maximal covering location problem. *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, 22:101–118.
- Chvatal, V. (1979). A greedy heuristic for the set-covering problem. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 4(3):233–235.
- Cox Jr., L. A. T. (2012). Why income inequality indexes do not apply to health risks. *Risk Analysis*, 32(2):192–196.
- Current, J., Daskin, M., Schilling, D., and Others (2002). Discrete network location models. *Facility location: Applications and theory*, 1:81–118.
- Drezner, T., Drezner, Z., and Guyse, J. (2009). Equitable service by a facility: Minimizing the Gini coefficient. *Comput. Oper. Res.*, 36(12):3240–3246.
- Drezner, Z. and Hamacher, H. W. (2004). *Facility Location: Applications and Theory*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Eiselt, H. A. and Laporte, G. (1995). Objectives in location problems. *Facility Location*, pages 151–180.
- Erkut, E. (1993). Inequality measures for location problems. *Comput. Oper. Res.*
- Farahani, R. Z. and Hekmatfar, M. (2009). *Facility Location: Concepts, Models, Algorithms and Case Studies*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Fields, G. S. and Fei, J. C. (1978). On inequality comparisons. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 303–316.
- Gini, C. (1921). Measurement of inequality of incomes. *Econ. J. Nepal*, 31(121):124–126.
- Gupta, S., Moondra, J., and Singh, M. (2023). Which Lp Norm is the fairest? approximations for fair facility location across all “p”. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, EC ’23, page 817, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Gurobi Optimization, LLC (2023). Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual.
- Hakimi, S. L. (1964). Optimum locations of switching centers and the absolute centers and medians of a graph. *Operations Research*, 12(3):450–459.
- Hakimi, S. L. (1965). Optimum distribution of switching centers in a communication network and some related graph theoretic problems. *Oper. Res.*, 13(3):462–475.
- Hale, T. S. and Moberg, C. R. (2003). Location science research: A review. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 123(1):21–35.

- Halpern, J. (1976). The location of a center-median convex combination on an undirected tree. *Journal of Regional Science*, 16(2):237–245.
- Hart, W. E., Watson, J.-P., and Woodruff, D. L. (2011). Pyomo: modeling and solving mathematical programs in python. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 3(3):219–260.
- Horton, D., Logan, T., Skipper, D., and Speakman, E. (2024). Hundreds of grocery outlets needed across the united states to achieve walkable cities.
- Hsu, A., Sheriff, G., Chakraborty, T., and Manya, D. (2021). Disproportionate exposure to urban heat island intensity across major us cities. *Nature Communications*, 12(1).
- Karsu, Ö. and Morton, A. (2015a). Inequity averse optimization in operational research. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 245(2):343–359.
- Karsu, Ö. and Morton, A. (2015b). Inequity averse optimization in operational research. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 245(2):343–359.
- Kolm, S.-C. (1976a). Unequal inequalities. I. *J. Econ. Theory*, 12(3):416–442.
- Kolm, S.-C. (1976b). Unequal inequalities. II. *J. Econ. Theory*, 13(1):82–111.
- Lejeune, M. A. and Prasad, S. Y. (2013). Effectiveness-equity models for facility location problems on tree networks. *Networks*, 62(4):243–254.
- Levy, J. I., Chemerynski, S. M., and Tuchmann, J. L. (2006). Incorporating concepts of inequality and inequity into health benefits analysis. *Int. J. Equity Health*, 5:2.
- Logan, T., Anderson, M., Williams, T., and Conrow, L. (2021). Measuring inequalities in urban systems: An approach for evaluating the distribution of amenities and burdens. *Computers, Environment and Urban Systems*, 86:101590.
- Logan, T., Williams, T., Nisbet, A., Liberman, K., Zuo, C., and Guikema, S. (2019). Evaluating urban accessibility: leveraging open-source data and analytics to overcome existing limitations. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science*, 46(5):897–913.
- Luxen, D. and Vetter, C. (2011). Real-time routing with openstreetmap data. GIS '11, page 513–516. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Maguire, K. and Sheriff, G. (2020). Health risk, inequality indexes, and environmental justices. *Risk Analysis*, 40(12):2661–2674.
- Mandell, M. B. (1991). Modelling effectiveness-equity trade-offs in public service delivery systems. *Manage. Sci.*, 37(4):467–482.
- Mansur, E. T. and Sheriff, G. (2021). On the measurement of environmental inequality: Ranking emissions distributions generated by different policy instruments. *Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists*, 8(4).
- Marsh, M. T. and Schilling, D. A. (1994). Equity measurement in facility location analysis: A review and framework. *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 74(1):1–17.
- McAllister, D. M. (1976). Equity and efficiency in public facility location. *Geographical Analysis*, 8(1):47–63.
- Mulligan, G. F. (1991). Equality measures and facility location. *Pap. Reg. Sci.*, 70(4):345–365.
- Neff, R. A., Palmer, A. M., McKenzie, S. E., and Lawrence, R. S. (2009). Food systems and public health disparities. *Journal of hunger & environmental nutrition*, 4(3-4):282–314.
- O’Brien, R. J. (1969). Model for planning the location and size of urban schools. *Socioecon. Plann. Sci.*, 2(2):141–153.
- Ogryczak, W. (2009). Inequality measures and equitable locations. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 167(1):61–86.
- Olivier, P., Lodi, A., and Pesant, G. (2022). Measures of balance in combinatorial optimization. *4OR*, 20(3):391–415.
- OSM (2017). OpenStreetMap: Planet dump retrieved from <https://planet.osm.org> . <https://openstreetmap.org>. Accessed: 2022-03-21.
- Robinson, J. M., Redvers, N., Camargo, A., Bosch, C. A., Breed, M. F., Brenner, L. A., Carney, M. A., Chauhan, A., Dasari, M., Dietz, L. G., Friedman, M., Grieneisen, L., Hoisington, A. J., Horve, P. F., Hunter, A., Jech, S., Jorgensen, A., Lowry, C. A., Man, I., Mhuireach, G., Navarro-Pérez, E., Ritchie, E. G., Stewart, J. D., Watkins, H., Weinstein, P., and Ishaq, S. L. (2022). Twenty important research questions in microbial exposure and social equity. *mSystems*, 7(1):e01240–21.
- Rocco, C. M. and Barker, K. (2023). A bi-objective model for network restoration considering fairness and graph signal-based functions. *Life Cycle Reliability and Safety Engineering*, 12(4):299–307.
- Rocco, C. M., Nock, D., and Barker, K. (2023). A fairness-based approach to network restoration. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 53(6):3890–3894.
- Savas, E. S. (1978). On equity in providing public services. *Manage. Sci.*, 24(8):800–808.
- Xinying Chen, V. and Hooker, J. N. (2023). A guide to formulating fairness in an optimization model. *Ann. Oper. Res.*, pages 1–39.

A Penalty error analysis

A.1 Penalty error introduced by parameter approximation

Let $\sigma^* := \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s^* \geq 0$ represent the penalty associated with stores selected by optimal solution $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ to (KPL^p). Let $\hat{\sigma}$ represent the actual penalty (approximating σ^*) that is applied to an optimal Kolm-Pollak score by (KPL^p). Let $\Delta := \hat{\mathcal{K}} - \mathcal{K}^*$ represent the signed error in approximating \mathcal{K}^* by $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$.

Theorem 2. *The error in the penalty applied to an optimal Kolm-Pollak score by (KPL^p) is,*

$$\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) := \hat{\sigma} - \sigma^* = -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{\kappa\sigma^*} + e^{-\kappa\Delta}(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) \right). \quad (16)$$

Proof. Suppose $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is optimal to (KPL^p). Let $\bar{\mathcal{K}}^* := \bar{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{y}^*)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}^* + \hat{\sigma} &= -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\bar{\mathcal{K}}^* + T e^{-\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}}} (e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - 1) \right) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{1}{T} \left(T e^{-\kappa\mathcal{K}^*} + T e^{-\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}}} (e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - 1) \right) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{-\kappa\mathcal{K}^*} + e^{-\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}} - \kappa\sigma^*} - e^{-\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}}} \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{-\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}} - \kappa\sigma^*} (1 + e^{-\kappa\mathcal{K}^* + \kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}} + \kappa\sigma^*} - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) \right) \\ &= \hat{\mathcal{K}} + \sigma^* - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*} + e^{\kappa\sigma^*} e^{\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{K}} - \mathcal{K}^*)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

so that,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma} - \sigma^* &= \hat{\mathcal{K}} - \mathcal{K}^* - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*} + e^{\kappa\sigma^*} e^{\kappa(\hat{\mathcal{K}} - \mathcal{K}^*)} \right) \\ &= \Delta - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*} + e^{\kappa\sigma^*} e^{\kappa\Delta} \right) \\ &= \Delta - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{\kappa\Delta} (e^{-\kappa\Delta} (1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) + e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{\kappa\sigma^*} + e^{-\kappa\Delta} (1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following result provides some useful properties of the penalty approximation error, $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $\sigma^* > 0$ is fixed:*

- (1) $\hat{E}(0, \sigma^*) = 0$ and $|\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)|$ is increasing in $|\Delta|$.
- (2) If $\hat{\mathcal{K}} > \mathcal{K}^*$ then $\hat{\sigma} > \sigma^*$ (locations are over-penalized) and

$$0 < |\Delta|(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) < |\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)| < |\Delta|.$$

- (3) If $\hat{\mathcal{K}} < \mathcal{K}^*$ then $\hat{\sigma} < \sigma^*$ (locations are under-penalized) and

$$0 < |\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)| < \min \left\{ |\Delta|(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}), \sigma^* \right\}.$$

Suppose $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$ is fixed:

- (4) $\hat{E}(\Delta, 0) = 0$ and $|\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)|$ is increasing in σ^* .

Proof.

(1) Suppose $\sigma^* > 0$ is fixed. We have

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta\Delta} \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) = \frac{e^{-\kappa\Delta}(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*})}{e^{-\kappa\Delta}(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) + e^{\kappa\sigma^*}} = \frac{e^{-\kappa\Delta}}{e^{-\kappa\Delta} + \frac{1}{e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - 1}}.$$

Recalling that $\kappa < 0$, we have that $e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} > 1$, so that $\frac{\delta}{\delta\Delta} \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) \in (0, 1)$. Thus, $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$ is increasing (though not quickly) in Δ . It is straightforward to evaluate $\hat{E}(0, \sigma^*) = 0$. Thus, when $\Delta > 0$, $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) > 0$ and $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) = |\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)|$ is increasing in $|\Delta|$. Similarly, when $\Delta < 0$, $\hat{E}(0, \sigma^*) < 0$ and $-\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) = |\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)|$ is increasing in $|\Delta|$.

(2) Suppose $\sigma^* > 0$ is fixed. From above, $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) > 0$ when $\Delta > 0$. The tangent line to the univariate function $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$ at $\Delta = 0$ is $\ell(\Delta) = \Delta(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*})$. Recalling again that $\kappa < 0$,

$$\frac{\delta^2}{\delta\Delta^2} \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) = \frac{-\kappa e^{-\kappa\Delta}}{(e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - 1) \left(e^{-\kappa\Delta} - \frac{1}{e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - 1} \right)^2} > 0,$$

for all $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$. Thus, $\Delta(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) \leq \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$ for all $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$, and, in particular, when $\Delta > 0$, $|\Delta|(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) = \Delta(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) < \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) = |\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)|$. From the proof of Theorem 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) &= \Delta - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*} + e^{\kappa\sigma^*} e^{\kappa\Delta} \right) \\ &= \Delta - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*} (1 - e^{\kappa\Delta}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

In this case, $\kappa\sigma^* < 0$ and $\kappa\Delta < 0$, so $e^{\kappa\sigma^*}(1 - e^{\kappa\Delta}) \in (0, 1)$. Thus, $|\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)| = \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) < \Delta = |\Delta|$.

(3) For $\Delta < 0$, we have that $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) < 0$, so $\Delta(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) \leq \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$ implies that $|\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)| < |\Delta|(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*})$. Because $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$ is increasing in Δ and $\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow -\infty} \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) = -\sigma^*$, $|\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)| < \sigma^*$.

(4) Now suppose that $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$ is fixed. We can evaluate $\hat{E}(\Delta, 0) = 0$. To show that $|\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)|$ is increasing in σ^* , evaluate

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta\sigma^*} \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) = \frac{e^{-\kappa\Delta} e^{\kappa\sigma^*} - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}}{e^{-\kappa\Delta} + e^{\kappa\sigma^*} - e^{-\kappa\Delta} e^{\kappa\sigma^*}} = \frac{e^{\kappa\sigma^*}}{\frac{1}{1 - e^{\kappa\Delta}} - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}}.$$

Recalling that $\kappa < 0$, we have $e^{\kappa\sigma^*} \in (0, 1)$. Suppose $\Delta > 0$. Then $\kappa\Delta < 0$, which means $\frac{1}{1 - e^{\kappa\Delta}} > 1$. It follows that $\frac{\delta}{\delta\sigma^*} \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) > 0$. From above, we know that $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) > 0$ in this case, so $|\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)| = \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$ is increasing in σ^* . Suppose $\Delta < 0$. In this case, $\kappa\Delta > 0$, so $\frac{1}{1 - e^{\kappa\Delta}} < 0$, which means $\frac{\delta}{\delta\sigma^*} \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) < 0$ and $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$ is decreasing in σ^* . However, when $\Delta < 0$, $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) < 0$, so $|\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)|$ is increasing in σ^* . \square

Remark 1. Some consequences of Theorem 3 are as follows:

- The bounds in the $\Delta > 0$ case imply that $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$ is unbounded as Δ approaches infinity. In fact, it can be shown that $\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)$ approaches $\Delta - \sigma^* - \frac{1}{\kappa}(e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - 1)$ asymptotically as Δ approaches infinity.
- The upper bound on the size of the error in the $\Delta < 0$ case implies that there will never be a negative penalty (i.e., a “bonus”), for selecting an undesirable location.

There are two natural choices for $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$: \mathcal{K}^{all} and \mathcal{K}^{rem} , as defined below.

Definition 2. Let $(KPL)^{all}$ denote the unpenalized model, (KPL) , with all potential locations from $(KPL)^p$ included. Let $(KPL)^{rem}$ denote (KPL) with all penalized potential locations removed from consideration, and assume that there are enough remaining locations (at least k) so that the model is feasible. Suppose $(\mathbf{x}^*, \mathbf{y}^*)$ is optimal to $(KPL)^{all}$ and define $\mathcal{K}^{all} := -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln(\bar{\mathcal{K}}(\mathbf{y}^*))$. Define \mathcal{K}^{rem} similarly using an optimal solution to $(KPL)^{rem}$.

Proposition 2. Assuming the same value of the parameter α is used in $(KPL)^{all}$, $(KPL)^{rem}$, and $(KPL)^p$,

$$\mathcal{K}^{all} \leq \mathcal{K}^* \leq \mathcal{K}^{rem}.$$

Proof. The optimal solution to (KPL^p) is feasible to $(\text{KPL})^{all}$. Thus, $\mathcal{K}^{all} \leq \mathcal{K}^*$. The optimal solution to $(\text{KPL})^{rem}$ is feasible to (KPL^p) and corresponds to the same objective function value in both $(\text{KPL})^{rem}$ and (KPL^p) because none of the locations are penalized in either model. Thus, $\mathcal{K}^* \leq \mathcal{K}^{rem}$. \square

According to Theorem 3, the lower bounding approximation, \mathcal{K}^{all} , is likely to be the better choice for $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$. In this case, we can compute bounds on $|\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*)|$ for various possible values of σ^* that are independent of Δ . We require the following notation.

Definition 3. Let $\sigma^{all} := \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s^{all}$ for an optimal solution $(\mathbf{x}^{all}, \mathbf{y}^{all})$ to $(\text{KPL})^{all}$.

Theorem 4. Suppose $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}^{all}$ in (KPL^p) . Then undesirable locations are under-penalized, and

$$\sigma^* - \hat{\sigma} \leq |\Delta|(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) \leq \sigma^{all}(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) \leq \sigma^{all}(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^{all}}).$$

Proof. In this case, $\Delta \leq 0$ and the first inequality follows from Theorem 3 and Proposition 2. The second and third inequalities require demonstrating that $|\Delta| \leq \sigma^{all}$ and $\sigma^* \leq \sigma^{all}$, respectively.

$(\mathbf{x}^{all}, \mathbf{y}^{all})$ is feasible to (KPL^p) . If $(\mathbf{x}^{all}, \mathbf{y}^{all})$ is optimal to (KPL^p) , then $\Delta = 0$ and there is no error in the penalty approximation: $\hat{E}(0, \sigma^*) = 0$. In other words, $T e^{-\kappa(\mathcal{K}^{all} + \sigma^{all})}$ represents an upper bound on the optimal objective value of (KPL^p) :

$$T e^{-\kappa(\mathcal{K}^* + \hat{\sigma})} \leq T e^{-\kappa(\mathcal{K}^{all} + \sigma^{all})}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{K}^* + \sigma^* + \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) = \mathcal{K}^* + \hat{\sigma} \leq \mathcal{K}^{all} + \sigma^{all}.$$

Rearranging, we have $|\Delta| = \mathcal{K}^* - \mathcal{K}^{all} \leq \sigma^{all} - \hat{\sigma}$. By Theorem 3, $\hat{\sigma} \geq 0$, so we have $|\Delta| \leq \sigma^{all}$.

Next, using the facts that $\Delta \leq 0$, $\kappa < 0$, and $\sigma^* \geq 0$, we have,

$$\hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) = \Delta - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}(1 - e^{\kappa\Delta})) \geq \Delta.$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}^{all} + \sigma^* &= \mathcal{K}^* + \sigma^* + \mathcal{K}^{all} - \mathcal{K}^* \\ &= \mathcal{K}^* + \sigma^* + \Delta \\ &\leq \mathcal{K}^* + \sigma^* + \hat{E}(\Delta, \sigma^*) \\ &\leq \mathcal{K}^{all} + \sigma^{all}, \end{aligned}$$

which means that $\sigma^* \leq \sigma^{all}$, as required. \square

A.2 Penalty error introduced by linearization

Next we analyse the error in the penalty term introduced by approximating e^q , $q = -\kappa \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s = -\kappa\sigma$, via lower-bounding tangent lines in (KPL^t) . Let $\check{\sigma}$ represent the penalty applied to an optimal Kolm-Pollak score by (KPL^t) . Thus, $\check{\sigma}$ is an under-approximation of $\hat{\sigma}$ from the previous subsection.

The constraints (15) and the minimizing objective function together approximate e^q with the piecewise linear function, $g : [0, \sigma^{max}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined as follows:

$$g(q) := \begin{cases} 1 + q, & \text{for } q \in [0, q_{0,1}); \\ e^{\beta_i} + e^{\beta_i}(q - \beta_i), & \text{for } q \in [q_{i-1,i}, q_{i,i+1}), i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n-1; \\ e^{\beta_n} + e^{\beta_n}(q + \beta_n) & \text{for } q \in [q_{n-1,n}, -\kappa\sigma^{max}], \end{cases}$$

where $q_{i,j}$ represents the value of q for which $e^{\beta_i} + e^{\beta_i}(q - \beta_i) = e^{\beta_j} + e^{\beta_j}(q - \beta_j)$.

In practice, the penalties, c_s , would often be the same, or would only take on a few different values. If the penalties are all the same ($c_s = c, \forall s \in U$), we can choose linearization points so that (KPL^t) is an exact formulation of (KPL^p).

Proposition 3. *If $c_s = c$ for all $s \in U$, and $\beta_i := -\kappa ci$, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, \min\{k, |U|\}$, then $\check{\sigma} = \hat{\sigma}$.*

Proof. Due to (1e), for all feasible $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{|S|})$, $q = -\kappa \sum_{s \in U} c x_s$ can only take the values of the selected linearization points. At these values of q , the approximating tangent lines match the exponential expression, e^q , exactly. \square

When it is not efficient to choose a linearization point for every possible value of $q = -\kappa \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s$ (i.e., when there are more than a few unique penalty values), we would like to choose linearization points β_i so that the approximation error is small. Tangent lines do not closely approximate exponential functions in general (Proposition 4 and Corollary 2). However, the linearization provides a very close approximation in this application (Proposition 5 and Theorem 5).

Proposition 4. *For $b \in \mathbb{R}$, let $L_b := e^b + e^b(x - b)$ represent the tangent line to $f(x) = e^x$ at the point (b, e^b) . Let $g : [a, a + w] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the piecewise linear function $g(x) := \max\{L_a(x), L_{a+w}(x)\}$. The maximum error between e^x and $g(x)$ on $[a, a + w]$ is,*

$$\max_{x \in [a, a+w]} e^x - g(x) = e^a \left(e^{\frac{we^w}{e^w-1}-1} - \frac{we^w}{e^w-1} \right).$$

Proof. The maximum error occurs at the intersection of lines L_a and L_{a+w} ; i.e., at $x = a + \frac{we^w}{e^w-1} - 1$. Some algebra leads to the expression above. \square

Corollary 2. *Let $g : [a, a + w] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the piecewise linear function $g(x) := \max\{L_a(x), L_{a+w}(x)\}$. For a fixed width, w , the maximum error between e^x and $g(x)$ on $[a, a + w]$ grows exponentially in a .*

Thus, if a is large, choosing w small enough to have a reasonably small error between e^x and its lower-bounding tangent lines will introduce numerical problems in a computational setting. However, in practical instances, the argument of the exponential expression in the penalty expression, $q = -\kappa \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s$, is bounded above by $|\epsilon|$, so that we can achieve a very close approximation to e^q with a numerically stable choice of w . (Recall that ϵ , the aversion to inequality parameter, is negative and typically takes values between -0.5 and -2 .)

Proposition 5. *Let $D = \{d_r : r \in R\}$ be the distribution of distances that is used to calculate α , and let μ_D represent the population weighted mean of D , $\mu_D := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{r \in R} p_r d_r$. If $\sigma_{max} \leq \mu_D$, then $q = -\kappa \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s \leq |\epsilon|$.*

Proof. Observe that

$$-\kappa \sum_{s \in U} c_s x_s \leq -\kappa \sigma^{max} \leq -\kappa \mu_D = -\epsilon \alpha \mu_D = -\epsilon \frac{(\sum_{r \in R} p_r d_r)^2}{T \sum_{r \in R} p_r d_r^2} \leq |\epsilon|,$$

where the final inequality is due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. \square

Remark 2. *It is not guaranteed that the hypothesis of Proposition 5 holds in general, but it is a reasonable assumption in practical instances of (KPL^t). The hypothesis holds if $\max_{s \in U} c_s \leq \frac{\mu_D}{\min\{k, |U|\}}$. In order for location s to have a chance of being selected by the model, penalty c_s must be much, much less than the anticipated optimal Kolm-Pollak score, which can be roughly approximated by μ_D : $c_s \ll K^* \approx \mu_D$. Moreover, it is likely that k , the number of locations to optimally place, and/or, $|U|$, the number of locations to penalize, are fairly small.*

Proposition 5 indicates that the exponential expression e^q can be closely approximated by tangent lines in (KPL^t) and we can derive bounds directly on the error in the Kolm-Pollak

penalty that is introduced by the tangent line approximation. We assume that the linearization points are equally spaced at a width of $w < 1$ apart. For context with regards to (19), $A(0.01) \approx 10^{-5}$ and $A(0.001) \approx 10^{-7}$.

Theorem 5. For $w \in (0, 1)$, suppose $\beta_i = iw$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$, where $nw > -\kappa\sigma^{max}$. Then $\ddot{\sigma} \leq \hat{\sigma}$ and

$$|\ddot{E}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^*)| := \hat{\sigma} - \ddot{\sigma} \quad (17)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 - \frac{A(w)}{1 + e^{\kappa\sigma^*} (e^{\kappa\Delta} - 1)} \right) \quad (18)$$

$$\leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln(1 - A(w)), & \text{if } \Delta \leq 0; \\ \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln(1 - 1.25A(w)), & \text{if } \Delta > 0 \text{ and } \hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}^{rem}, \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $A(w) := e^{\frac{we^w}{e^w-1}-1} - \frac{we^w}{e^w-1}$.

As a consequence of the $\Delta \leq 0$ case of (19) (keeping in mind that $\kappa < 0$), we obtain the following guidance on the selection of w when the penalty values vary.

Corollary 3. Suppose $\varepsilon > 0$ and $w \in (0, 1)$ is chosen so that $A(w) \leq 1 - e^{\kappa\varepsilon}$. If $\beta_i = iw$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$, where $nw > -\kappa\sigma^{max}$, then $\ddot{\sigma} \leq \hat{\sigma}$. Moreover, if $\Delta \leq 0$ then $|\ddot{E}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^*)| \leq \varepsilon$.

Proof of Theorem 5. We begin by deriving an expression for $\hat{\sigma}$ and a bound for $\ddot{\sigma}$. First,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}^* + \hat{\sigma} &= -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left[\frac{1}{T} \left(\bar{\mathcal{K}}^* + T e^{-\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}}} (e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - 1) \right) \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{-\kappa\mathcal{K}^*} + e^{-\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}}} (e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - 1) \right), \\ &= \mathcal{K}^* - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 + e^{-\kappa\Delta} (e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - 1) \right), \end{aligned}$$

so that $\hat{\sigma} = -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} + 1 - e^{-\kappa\Delta} \right)$. Let $err(q^*, w)$ represent the error between e^{q^*} , $q^* = -\kappa\sigma^*$, and the lower bound provided by constraints (15). We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}^* + \ddot{\sigma} &= -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left[\frac{1}{T} \left(\bar{\mathcal{K}}^* + T e^{-\kappa\hat{\mathcal{K}}} (e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - err(q^*, w) - 1) \right) \right] \\ &= \mathcal{K}^* - \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 + e^{-\kappa\Delta} (e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} - err(q^*, w) - 1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

According to Proposition 4, $0 \leq err(q^*, w) \leq e^{\beta_i} A(w) \leq e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} A(w)$, where $q^* \in [\beta_i, \beta_{i+1}]$. Note that $A(w)$ is increasing for $w \geq 0$, $A(0) = 0$, and $A(1) \approx 0.208$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{\sigma} &= -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} + 1 - e^{-\kappa\Delta} - e^{-\kappa\Delta} err(q^*, w) \right) \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} + 1 - e^{-\kappa\Delta} - e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} A(w) \right) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\ddot{\sigma} \leq \hat{\sigma}$ because $err(q^*, w) \geq 0$, and for (18),

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\sigma} - \ddot{\sigma} &\leq -\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} + 1 - e^{-\kappa\sigma^*} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} + 1 - e^{-\kappa\Delta} - e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} A(w) \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(\frac{e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} + 1 - e^{-\kappa\Delta} - e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)}A(w)}{e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} + 1 - e^{-\kappa\sigma^*}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 - \frac{e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)}A(w)}{e^{-\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} + 1 - e^{-\kappa\sigma^*}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 - \frac{A(w)}{1 + e^{\kappa(\Delta+\sigma^*)} - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln \left(1 - \frac{A(w)}{1 + e^{\kappa\sigma^*}(e^{\kappa\Delta} - 1)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

For the first part of (19), if $\Delta \leq 0$, then $1 + e^{\kappa\sigma^*}(e^{\kappa\Delta} - 1) \geq 1$, so that $\hat{\sigma} - \ddot{\sigma} \leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln(1 - A(w))$. For the second part of (19), if $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}^{rem}$, then $\mathcal{K}^* + \sigma^* \leq \mathcal{K}^* + \hat{\sigma} \leq \mathcal{K}^{rem} + 0$, where the first inequality is due to Theorem 3 and the second is due to the optimality of (KPL^p). Thus, $0 \leq \sigma^* \leq \mathcal{K}^{rem} - \mathcal{K}^* = \Delta$, and we have,

$$1 + e^{\kappa\sigma^*}(e^{\kappa\Delta} - 1) \geq 1 + e^{\kappa\Delta}(e^{\kappa\Delta} - 1) \geq 0.75.$$

□

The following is a direct result of Theorem (4), Proposition (3), and Theorem (5).

Corollary 4. *If $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}^{all}$ and the linearization values are a fixed width of w apart in (KPL^t), then less-desirable locations are underpenalized and the cumulative error in the penalty applied to the optimal Kolm-Pollak score satisfies*

$$0 \leq \sigma^* - \ddot{\sigma} \leq \sigma^{all} \left(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*} \right) + \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln(1 - A(w)).$$

If, in addition, $c_s = c$, for all $s \in U$, and $w = -\kappa c$, then

$$0 \leq \sigma^* - \ddot{\sigma} \leq \sigma^{all} \left(1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*} \right).$$

Example 3. (Penalty error bounds) We solved four realistic instances of (KPL^t) using the data for Santa Rosa, California from the food desert application described in detail in Section 6. In all instances, the linearization points were chosen to be a fixed width apart, differing only in the width, w . We set $k = 10$, $\epsilon = -1$, $\kappa = -\alpha = -6.93 \times 10^{-4}$, and $\hat{\mathcal{K}} = \mathcal{K}^{all} \approx 1273.5382$ m (meters). We chose U to be the set of locations optimal to (KPL)^{all} and $c_s = c = 4.8609 \approx \frac{\mathcal{K}^{rem} - \mathcal{K}^{all}}{10}$, for all $s \in U$, so that $\sigma^{all} = 48.609$ m. The optimal locations selected by (KPL^t) were the same for all instances and included two penalized locations, as displayed in Figure 7. For all instances, $\mathcal{K}^* \approx 1280.1363$ m, $\Delta = \hat{\mathcal{K}} - \mathcal{K}^* \approx -6.5981$ m, and $\sigma^* = 9.7217$ m. Note that $-\kappa\sigma^{max} \approx 0.0337$, so we explore values of w as large as 0.01.

Tables 10 and 11 contain bounds on the error in the Kolm-Pollak penalty introduced by approximating $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ and by the linear approximations, respectively, in (KPL^t). Table 12 contains combined error bounds, as well as the actual observed separate and combined errors for each instance.

σ^*	4.861	9.722	14.583	19.443
$\sigma^* - \hat{\sigma} \leq$	0.163	0.326	0.489	0.651

Table 10: Bounds on penalty error arising from $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ -approximation: $\sigma^{all} (1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*})$.

Note that all of the analysis in this section refers to overall penalty error, rather than per-location error. Of course, one could divide any of the error expressions or bounds by the number of locations represented by σ^* to find a per-location error expression or bound.




Figure 7: Optimal locations of 10 additional supermarkets in Santa Rosa, California. Red dots represent penalized sites, and blue dots represent existing grocery store locations as well as sites selected that are not penalized. Highlighted dots represent locations selected by the respective model. Darker background shading indicates residential areas that are farther from a facility. Map (a) displays the optimal solution to (KPL^{all}). The locations selected here are the locations we penalize or remove in the subsequent models. In map (b), we see the optimal solution to (KPL^{rem}). We have removed the ten locations selected by (KPL^{all}), and ten different, non-penalized locations are selected. In map (c), the penalized model, (KPL^t), we observe that two penalized sites are selected along with eight non-penalized sites.

w	$-c\kappa$	0.0001	0.001	0.01
$\hat{\sigma} - \check{\sigma} \leq$	0^\dagger	1.804×10^{-6}	1.805×10^{-4}	0.0181

Table 11: Bounds on penalty error arising from linearization: $\frac{1}{\kappa} \ln(1 - A(w))$. [†]The error is zero by Proposition 3.

w	$\sigma^* - \hat{\sigma}$	$\hat{\sigma} - \check{\sigma}$	$\sigma^* - \check{\sigma}$	$\sigma^* - \check{\sigma} \leq$
$-c\kappa$	0.0321	0	0.0321	0.326
0.0001	0.0321	9.70×10^{-7}	0.0321	0.326
0.001	0.0321	4.99×10^{-5}	0.0322	0.327
0.01	0.0321	7.68×10^{-3}	0.0398	0.344

Table 12: $\sigma^* - \hat{\sigma}$ is the error introduced by approximating the parameter $\hat{\mathcal{K}}$ (which does not depend on w). $\hat{\sigma} - \check{\sigma}$ is the error introduced by the linearization. $\sigma^* - \check{\sigma}$ is the combined error. The bounds for the combined error (in the last column) are given by $\sigma^{all} (1 - e^{\kappa\sigma^*}) + \frac{1}{\kappa} \ln(1 - A(w))$. The actual combined error is quite small in all cases (recall that the penalty units are meters).