
From: Ney, Scott
Sent: 12 November 2007 07:58
To: Chandler, Jason
Cc: Dolan, Alan; Gibb, David
Subject: RE: 21981: Update on modelling

Jason -

See below.

From: Warren Murphy [mailto:Warren.Murphy@tpi-world.com]
Sent: 09 November 2007 12:06
To: Chandler, Jason; Dolan, Alan
Cc: Ney, Scott; Jones, Carla; Bakir, Firas; smithr@pbworld.com
Subject: 21981: Update on modelling

Jason et al

You need to be aware that we continue to meet with delay on the modelling as a result of city centre junction issues.

Here are issues as they stand at the moment:

1. The first pass of VISUM and VISSIM were completed in August. VISSIM traffic flows were passed to PB Manchester to optimise traffic signals in Linsig. The Linsig results threw up problems at Lothian Road/South Charlotte Street and Mound junctions which reiterated the results of the Advanced Modelling Work done by TPI in the spring/summer. These issues were raised with tie/CEC. Lothian Road/South Charlotte Street has now been resolved. Repercussions of the Mound modelling continues (as below). Agree.
2. There were other problem points thrown up in the recent linsig work such as Baltic Street/Bernard Street, which have been raised with CEC and actions - by Halcrow Roads - put in place to try to address... (Scott, i don't know how Roads are doing on this?) This is being incorporated in conjunction with a change request for additional work in the area. VO to Halcrow has been signed off by yourself and they should be progressing this according to V22 of the programme..
3. This week, Tie has asked JRC to model three alternative options in lieu of the Council's decision NOT to reopen Frederick Street as a result of future problems at Mound. These are all broadly based on diverting Queensferry Road buses via George Street, Charlotte Square and Hope Street. This type of solution should do a lot to help tram along Princes Street. JRC are expected to report next week. Section 1C roads is being progressed in line with this (ie all through movements at The Mound, stop to remain where it is). I submitted a letter to tie on Friday indicating this very issue and that SDS are awaiting instruction on how this is to be resolved in the wider area.
4. Meantime Tie have asked me to draw up a (revised) proposal for Wider Area Modelling based on a discussion we had the other day. I will write this and discuss with Alan. However, until we get a clear instruction on both CEC's preferred design for Picardy Place and re-routing of buses via George Street there is a danger that we will get sucked into continuous testing and retesting of Wider Area Impacts alternatives. As discussed, as a result of the Critical Issues meeting, SDS are trying to put together a meeting on Picardy Place this week to discuss the preliminary issues that we have seen. There is an change request to SDS to change to the T, however, I know that there is also a revision to this change request, with the details, I believe, coming from the fall out of the meeting this week. See above for Mound.
5. Until ALL road design issues are resolved satisfactorily and the Wider Area Impacts are known we can't start the next and final iteration of models. This will need to include things like the Forth Ports area design. Halcrow VOs have been signed off for Forth Ports and they should now be progressing in accordance with V22 of the programme. This will allow Warren to have a basis to develop the modelling programme moving forward. However, the constraint will most likely be receipt of instruction from tie on the wider area (that is only my suspicion at this point), however, we need to raise this as a critical issue, as it will impact our ability to do the final IDC and submit for technical approval, as I do not believe that CEC will approve any technical designs until the entire bigger picture is resolved.

Jason - please confirm how the wider area issues are to be resolved in context with the programme and deliverables. I am progressing all of the deliverables (and submitting as complete) in context with the works "within the LOD" for the tram. CEC will, however, be acutely interested in knowing if the wider area impacts / designs(?) will also be included with these submittals. The answer right now is no, but I foresee this as a question / comment from CEC once they realise what is going on. Probably just that I need a quick brief on how this is being addressed, as I have only made myself aware at this point, but do not know the details.

6. Both me and JRC are acutely aware that the programme (SDS Version 17) is now a work of fiction. We (me and JRC) are seeking to meet with tie (Alasdair and Keith) to see if we can't pin the programme down again, however to be fair the main reason for the delay appears to be in the time it is taking to get issues such as Picady Place and Mound resolved at CEC/TEL level. Until these are sorted tie can't really sanction the running of the High Level model to pass results down to our own junction assessment work.....

An interesting point here. Is there any intent to re-baseline (Section 1) due to the changes so that things are not to be seen as "late"?

Warren

Transportation Planning (International) Ltd : Registered in England No. 3232614

Emails and any attachments from Transportation Planning (International) Ltd. are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the email and then delete it without making copies or using it in any way.

Although any attachments to the message will have been checked for viruses before transmission you are urged to carry out your own virus check before opening any attachments, since Transportation Planning (International) Ltd. accept no responsibility for loss or damage caused by software viruses.