

1 **RAIL TRANSIT NETWORK DESIGN SUPPORTED BY AN OPEN SOURCE**  
2 **SIMULATION LIBRARY: TOWARDS RELIABILITY IMPROVEMENT**

3  
4 Yilin Huang (corresponding author)  
5 Delft University of Technology  
6 Faculty of Technology Policy and Management  
7 Systems Engineering Group  
8 P/O Box 5015, 2600 GA Delft, the Netherlands  
9 Telephone: +31.1527.83822  
10 Fax: +31.1527.83429  
11 E-mail: [y.huang@tudelft.nl](mailto:y.huang@tudelft.nl)

12  
13 Alexander Verbraeck  
14 Delft University of Technology  
15 Faculty of Technology Policy and Management  
16 Systems Engineering Group  
17 P/O Box 5015, 2600 GA Delft, the Netherlands  
18 Telephone: +31.1527.83805  
19 Fax: +31.1527.83429  
20 E-mail: [a.verbraeck@tudelft.nl](mailto:a.verbraeck@tudelft.nl)

21  
22 Niels van Oort  
23 HTM Urban Public Transport  
24 Department of Research and Development  
25 P/O Box 28503, 2502 KM The Hague, the Netherlands  
26 Telephone: +31.7038.48518  
27 Fax: +31.7038.48476  
28 E-mail: [N.van.Oort@HTM.net](mailto:N.van.Oort@HTM.net)

29  
30 Hilbert Veldhoen  
31 HTM Urban Public Transport  
32 Department of Research and Development  
33 P/O Box 28503, 2502 KM The Hague, the Netherlands  
34 Telephone: +31.7038.48516  
35 Fax: +31.7038.48476  
36 E-mail: [H.Veldhoen@HTM.net](mailto:H.Veldhoen@HTM.net)

37  
38  
39 Word count: Abstract and Text (6174) + Figures/Tables (5\*250) = 7424  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Submitted for presentation at the 89th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board 2010 and for the  
52 publication at the Transportation Research Record  
53

54 Paper number 10-0310  
55 Revised Paper

1 **ABSTRACT**

2 Rail transit network design is extremely cumbersome and complex. Reliability should be adequately consid-  
3 ered at strategic, tactical and operational levels of the design, which requires skilled professionals as well as  
4 technological support. This paper describes an open source Java rail simulation library that supports distrib-  
5 uted microscopic multi-formalism simulation considering the impact of different aspects of the rail network  
6 design in one self-contained simulation package. It uses configurable components that represent the physical  
7 rail infrastructure and diverse control strategies as model building blocks. The fact that it is open source  
8 provides a unique possibility to improve the package, and it adds flexibility for further research. The case  
9 study presented shows that at the early design stages, analyzing the generated data provides designers with an  
10 overview to compare the impact of different design alternatives. Refined simulation studies are needed when  
11 more information is available. Further research is proposed to extend the library with components that allow  
12 for automatic model validation and calibration.

13  
14

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The development of public transportation is a crucial topic in modern society (1). How well a transit network provides users with cost-effective service is the key for competitiveness and attractiveness. In the UK, for example, about 25~35% of the people would use transit service more often if the service was improved (2). Reliability is one important dimension of transit quality of service (3). Many studies (3, 4, 5, 6) show that punctuality and travel time have a main influence on reliability. These performance indicators are sensitive to transit network structure and service frequency (7, 8). Therefore improving service reliability should be tackled at different stages of transit network design, i.e. not only at the operational level but also at strategic and tactical levels (9, 10, 11).

For large and complex rail networks, the planning and design are cumbersome and time-consuming; the same holds for the microscopic modeling of the networks. As such, model construction and modification require flexible model composition and configuration to enhance reusability. An open source component-based Java rail simulation library has been developed for this purpose. The library supports distributed microscopic multi-formalism rail simulation. Its main functionality is presented in this paper. A case study shows the application of the library in supporting rail transit network design. By studying design alternatives, designers could obtain a more insightful analysis. Such an approach leads to virtual integration of rail network planning and operations, and it potentially results in a more robust and reliable design. Reliability in transit networks can be classified into three categories (12): (i) schedule reliability (regarding departure times), (ii) travel time reliability, and (iii) connectivity reliability. The first two are the focus of this paper.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses transit network design concerning reliability issues, and the role of simulation in this regard. In Section 3 the motivation for developing the rail simulation library is explained. Section 4 gives an introduction to the library. Section 5 presents a case study for the Groningen project, in which a light rail line is to be constructed in a city of the Netherlands. Future research is described in section 6 to conclude the paper.

## 2. RAIL TRANSIT NETWORK DESIGN AND RELIABILITY ISSUES

In transit network design, service reliability should be adequately considered at strategic, tactical and operational levels (9). However, the attention to reliability issues has been mostly focused on the operational level, with a lack of sufficient research at the other two levels (9, 12). At the strategic level, long-term decisions are made, such as the design of transit route and networks; at the tactical level, decisions related to the service offered to users are made, such as frequencies and timetables (13, 14). Network design focuses on increasing redundancy and flexibility, while timetabling aims at increasing spare capacity to prevent delay propagation (10). Reliability is then measured as the match between the planning and the actual operations. Therefore two ways of improving reliability are possible: conducting operations in accordance with the planning, and adjusting the planning to be more realistic and easier to adhere to (9). Some reliability enhancing measures are relatively inexpensive to implement, e.g. preventing earlier departure and setting appropriate slack times (as long as no extra vehicle is required) (8); some others need more costly tradeoffs (1).

Contemporary transit network design requires skilled professionals as well as technological support. Important developments in transport modeling have taken place since the mid 1970s, and these are now better recognized (15). Simulation offers designers opportunities to experiment with the models, to analyze the system performance under given conditions, to discover potential problems and drawbacks, and to test strategies that could improve the reliability. As many design decisions are also made by transit authorities, the cooperation between the transit operators and the authorities is of importance. In this context, advanced animation and visualization capabilities can efficiently provide all involved parties a common platform for communication and understanding. Because simulation increasingly becomes a common decision support tool for rail network designers, and design alternatives (and changes) often ask for reconstruction and modification of the models, there is a growing need for component-based rail simulation models that are reusable and extensible and at the same time accessible in terms of cost. The Java rail simulation library discussed in this paper offers such model components. Using the library in HTM, the public transit company in The Hague, the Netherlands, shows that it is effective in providing reliability provision of transit network design, and assisting the organization in reaching agreements on the design issues.

## 3. THE NEED FOR A SELF-CONTAINED OPEN SOURCE RAIL SIMULATION LIBRARY

Since decades, we benefit from modern technology for complex decision support (15). However technology alone is not sufficient, there is still a huge gap between the needs of decision makers and the functionalities provided by decision support tools (16). In the field of rail transport network planning and design, a number

1 of simulation tools have been developed, e.g. simulation models of stations and terminals (17, 18, 19, 20, 21),  
2 and train network simulators such as SIMONE (22), Simon/TTS (23), TOPSim (24), SimMETRO (25), Open  
3 Track (26), VirtuOS (27), RailSys (28), UX-SIMU (29), and Multi-train simulator (30).

4 An open source rail simulation library has been developed at Delft University of Technology. The  
5 motivation of developing a new rail-based simulation tool is multi-faceted. First, some existing tools are  
6 designed to assess only a limited number of aspects (e.g. timetabling, signaling control) of the operations or  
7 to study a particular part (e.g. a station, a junction) of the rail system (30). It is impractical to carry out vari-  
8 ous studies with different tools (30). Some models have a high abstraction level (31), which may cause a  
9 significant difference between model outcomes and real transport operations on a lower abstraction level  
10 (32). Although rail-based operations can be decomposed into different aspects, all of them should be taken  
11 into consideration in a self-contained simulation package for analyzing rail-based transportation systems on  
12 the micro level (33). The microscopic modeling offers simulation experiments with high precision, which is  
13 important for exact running time calculation, timetable construction, and conflict detection and resolution  
14 (34). Second, very few rail simulation tools support tramway or light rail operations. To the authors' knowl-  
15 edge, one of the few examples is RailSys (35). In comparison with heavy rail operations, various differences  
16 occur when simulating light rail operations (35). Heavy rail vehicles drive in signaled blocks, while light rail  
17 vehicles also “drive on sight” (36). Given the large number of cities with tramway and light rail systems,  
18 there is a growing need for simulation tools that specifically aim at modeling light rail operations. Third, tools  
19 designed for diverse transport agencies are very specific to the individual agencies’ needs, often making the  
20 tools less suitable for other agencies or transport operators. This asks for generic simulation tools that can be  
21 applied for different situations and allow for analysis from different viewpoints, or tools that can be adapted  
22 or extended for such purposes. Fourth, commercial rail simulators generally have good performance, but they  
23 raise proprietary issues. Concerning inter-operability, it is difficult to modify these tools, link them with other  
24 tools or information systems such as databases or GIS (37). Cost is obviously another concern.

25 The research team therefore decided to develop an open source rail simulation library which allows  
26 for light rail simulation, considering the combined impact of different aspects of the infrastructure design in  
27 one self-contained simulation package. The fact that it is developed as an open-source project provides a  
28 unique possibility to improve the package, and it adds flexibility for further research. The package is avail-  
29 able for any party to conduct research.

#### 30 31 **4. THE RAIL SIMULATION LIBRARY**

32 The rail simulation library is component-based (37). It supports distributed microscopic rail simulations that  
33 use configurable components (different infrastructure and signaling control logic) as model building blocks.  
34 Statistical plotting, generation of output files, and animation help the users evaluate the simulation results.  
35 The previous studies, e.g. (37, 38), show that the tool is suitable to forecast rail operations and that it is  
36 helpful for improving the reliability of rail network design. During the past year, due to the emerging re-  
37 quirements for new functionalities, the simulation library has been adjusted and extended. The library pro-  
38 vides model components that are able to deal with “driving on sight”, which is an important aspect in tram-  
39 way and light rail operations (36). Another strength is that the library supports the co-existence of multiple  
40 formalisms. Both discrete and continuous behavior can be represented in the model at the same time. For  
41 example the state transition of a traffic light is discrete, and the movement of a vehicle is continuous. The  
42 multi-formalism feature is supported by DSOL (Distributed Simulation Object Library) (39), an open source  
43 general-purpose Java simulation library developed by the same research group. The rail simulation library is  
44 built as an extension of DSOL.


45 The rail simulation library has a service oriented architecture that consists of model components and  
46 simulation service components (37). The model components can be divided into a physical layer and a  
47 control layer. As such, a physical component can implement different control strategies, e.g. a traffic light can  
48 be configured to have a fixed time for state transition, or to change state depending on the traffic situation.

49 The model components such as tracks, traffic lights, stations (or stops) are positioned by real-world  
50 coordinates that can be obtained from CAD or GIS software while designing the infrastructure. If appropri-  
51 ately configured, the modeled infrastructure can precisely match the designed or the real one. The animation  
52 is able to plot maps as background. Some screen dumps of the library can be found in FIGURE 3.

53 A vehicle (or driver) can have a smooth, standard, or aggressive driving profile that determines how  
54 a vehicle moves. The driving profile assignment is based on a configurable ratio, e.g. 20% smooth, 60%  
55 standard, and 20% aggressive. The vehicle movement is modeled using differential equations solved by the  
56 Runge-Kutta integrator. Given the speed of a vehicle at time  $t_n$ , it computes the vehicle's speed and position

(distance) at time  $t_{n+1}$  based on the vehicle's acceleration changes during the integration time-step. The acceleration rates are chosen based on what objects the vehicle (or driver) “sees”. The objects being considered in the model are: traffic lights, changes of infrastructure (e.g. stops or stations, curves), speed limits, obstacles (e.g. a vehicle in front), and other objects (e.g. an intersection) that a vehicle must cross with reduced speed. Gradients are not yet considered in the model. In principle, at each integration time-step, the vehicle “checks” if there are any objects on the tracks in front of it. According to the objects it “sees”, the vehicle decides whether to accelerate, brake or cruise, then chooses the correct change rate according to the vehicle's speed from the corresponding driving profile. While driving, these objects may change state, e.g. a traffic light changes color or a vehicle changes position. If so, the object notifies the approaching vehicle using the publish-subscribe interaction scheme (40), an event-based asynchronous communication scheme that prevents disproportionate polling between objects (39). To reduce computation, only the objects within a certain distance (e.g. braking distance plus safety distance in front of the vehicle) are checked.

The speed profile (speed limits) along a route is normally defined by the transit authority according to road conditions. The speed limits are modeled by means of “speed signs”, although they almost do not exist in reality; rather, they are part of the instructions of the tram drivers. But using these virtual “speed signs”, users can easily add, delete, and change their position and their speed limit value. The speed reduction at curves, on the other hand, is hard coded in the model component. A curve's radius is saved in the “track” object when the object is instantiated, and the speed limit of a curve is derived from the radius automatically (FIGURE 1) using  $V_{max} = \sqrt{r \times 153 \times 0.65 / 11.8}$  ( $10 \leq r \leq 200$ ).



**FIGURE 1: Radius vs. maximum speed.**

On top of that, a distribution to the speed limits is added to represent the actual speed a tram reaches. Thus every time when a tram reaches an area, its actual “speed limit” (effective speed) is set by the distribution to represent the randomness caused by the street conditions and different driving habits of the drivers. The deviation of the distribution at each area is advised by the designers at HTM. For example, when the city center has a speed limit of 15 km/h, the effective speed is set to be 10~17km/h. But for free tracks where the speed limit is 50 km/h, the effective speed is set to be 45~55km/h ( $\pm 10\%$ ).

Signaling systems are modeled with different control strategies. There are components for absolute blocks and permissive blocks, in which sensors and signaling are modeled according to the corresponding regulations. There are also components that represent street traffic signaling. A transit vehicle may or may not have priority over other street traffic. When two transit vehicles have conflicts at intersections, negotiations of access right will take place based on their priority levels. To deal with different cases, distinct classes of traffic lights are necessary.

The probability distributions for dwell times at stops and waiting times at intersections can be configured individually for each location with respect to the time whether it is during peak or off-peak hours. Layover times of each vehicle at terminals are calculated based on the trajectory time of a specific line taking turning time and certain other factors into consideration.

1 Different characteristics of the model components are adjusted by parameter configurations. These  
 2 parameters typically use values derived from existing comparable services and subject-experts' advises. The  
 3 generated data files recording the movements, travel times, waiting times, and (t-v, t-x, x-v) graphs are  
 4 created for each vehicle, line, station or junction per direction. These files become new sources of informa-  
 5 tion for further analysis.

6  
 7 **5. A CASE STUDY: THE GRONINGEN PROJECT**

8 **5.1. Case Description**

9 Groningen is the largest city in the north of the Netherlands. The city transit authority plans to construct two  
 10 *RegioTram* lines to facilitate the growing transit service demand (41). Line 1 will start operation by 2014  
 11 between Central Station (CS) and Zernike (ZER). Line 2 is planned to start service in 2016. Currently, the  
 12 project focuses on finalizing the design of line 1. Line 1 has a length of about 6 km (FIGURE 2). The city  
 13 center, between Maagdenbrug (MB) and CS, has a pedestrian zone and a cycle network where exclusive lanes  
 14 for trams are not possible. And at two large crossings in the center, trams do not have priority over other  
 15 street traffic. Line 1 shall pass a narrow street (arrow①) where interlaced tracks (gauntlet tracks) will be built.  
 16 This is also the pathway for line 2, which joins line 1 at MB (arrow②). Between MB and CS, two lines share  
 17 the same route. Both lines have 7.5-minute headways. The interlaced part is the main focus of the study, as it  
 18 creates a bottleneck on the route. Taking these factors into consideration, some design alternatives were  
 19 devised. During the course of this project, several of them were improved and selected as strong candidates.  
 20 These are the ones that were simulated.



22 **FIGURE 2 Groningen RegioTram Line 1 route.**


23  
 24  
 25 ZER will serve as the main terminal, where vehicles will have longer layover used as slack and  
 26 breaks for drivers. Drivers need a pause of at least 10% of the driving time. The basic design of ZER is  
 27 shown in FIGURE 3 (a). Vehicles from direction ① can halt at both halting places, and then depart through  
 28 direction ② or ③ after layover. The “turning” of a bi-directional vehicle will need 2~3 minutes. An alterna-

1 tive is shown in (b), lighting is on the right side, and vehicles layover (and turn) at the circular tracks (posi-  
 2 tion②). The halting place on the left is for boarding.

3 Line 1 and line 2 merge at the MB (FIGURE 3, c): line 1 takes directions①②; line 2 takes direc-  
 4 tions③④. Here trams won't have priority over the other street traffic. Waiting times at directions②③④ are  
 5 around 40 seconds at peak and 20 seconds at off-peak. Vehicles at direction① need to wait only if there is  
 6 another vehicle at direction③. Traffic lights shall be harmonized in this regard.


7 FIGURE 3 (d, e) shows the interlaced track. It is expected to have a length of 80, 125, or 240 meters.  
 8 Trams will share this street with pedestrians. If trams from opposite directions encounter each other, waiting  
 9 is only permitted at stops, as passengers can then still board or alight.

10




11  
 12

**FIGURE 3 Simulation animation screen dump segments. The direction signs are added.**



(a) Standard acceleration and braking rate of light rail vehicles that operate on the city tramway at 600V DC



(b) Speed limits for line 1

13  
 14

**FIGURE 4 (a) Standard driving profile (b) Speed limits for line 1**

## 5.2. Model Configuration and Calibration

The time related variables are generated with probability distributions with respect to the given circumstances. The transit authority did a separate study for the traffic flow at peak and off-peak hours at the two large crossings in the city center. The results are used to calibrate the waiting times at these two crossings. Because no other data for Groningen is available, the authors choose to use the HTM TriTAPT data (42) of the tram operation in The Hague, as the two cities are deemed comparable. These data are used to calibrate the dwell time at stops and driving behavior in Groningen. The stops are classified into busy ones and less busy ones that use different halting time distributions.

The standard driving profile uses the acceleration and braking rate of light rail vehicles that operate on the city tramway at 600V DC (provided by HTM), as shown in FIGURE 4 (a). The maximum vehicle speed is assumed to be 50 km/h. Considering different driving behaviors and street conditions, each time a vehicle starts driving its actual speed limit is set to be the allowed speed (in that area) with a deviation. The speed limits for the line 1 route are shown in FIGURE 4 (b). The first row shows the general speed limits. The second row shows a speed limit reduction at Boterdiep (BD) due to mixed street traffic.

Each experiment had independent replications (with different seeds). The simulation run length is 19 hours (from 6 a.m. to 1 a.m.) which corresponds to the actual operation time of a day. The key performance indicators such as travel time, speed, waiting time, and delay of departure were recorded for each run.

## 5.3. Simulation Experiments and Results

Some optimistic runs were made first to have an estimation of the driving time. Line 2 was not simulated in this case. The basic model has the basic ZER design, 80-meter interlaced track, and the general speed limits. CS functioned as a normal stop without slack. The transit authority was beforehand indecisive over 5 or 6 vehicles for operation (corresponding trajectory times 37.5 and 45 minutes). The results showed an average travel time of 34.5 minutes with a standard deviation (Std-Dev) of 50 seconds, thus 5 vehicles are unable to provide reliable services considering turning times and 10% slack. The resulting travel time was also used to calibrate the departure time and slack at the terminals. The transit authority regarded the slack at CS as a negative influence on total travel time. However the authors argue that an appropriate slack time can compensate some travel time deviation and fewer vehicles would be necessary to accommodate disturbances (11).

Further experiments were configured to have 6 vehicles circulating in the system. The trajectory time was set to be 45 minutes: from ZER to CS 18.5 minutes, and 26.5 minutes for the other direction. Slack at CS can be maximum 2 minutes. (A long layover at CS may block other tram and bus lines.) Each experiment had 148 trajectories.

We first simulated the design alternatives of ZER. The two models have identical configuration except the turning point. The driving times between ZER and CS are presumably similar. The layover times were different, however. The basic design has a layover mean of 10 minutes (“turning” included), 42 seconds Std-Dev; the circular design has a mean of 8.5 minutes, 46 seconds Std-Dev. The latter design is meant to save the 2~3 minutes turning time to be subsequently used as slack. However, the layover position caused the vehicles to move to the boarding position a bit earlier before departure. As the layover times in both cases are already over 6 minutes, the benefit of the circular design does not appear to be distinct. The basic design is simpler (in terms of construction) and easier for passenger boarding. It is the ZER design used in the rest experiments.

Some additional experiments are listed in TABLE 1. They are combinations of speed reduction at BD, 3 lengths of the interlaced track, and operation with 1 or 2 lines between MB and CS. Std-Dev of the travel times are calculated, as travel time reliability is one of the measures of the service reliability (43, 44). Percentage Regularity Deviation Mean (PRDM) is calculated as  $PRDM_j = (\sum_i |H_{ij} - H'_{ij}| / H_{ij}) / n_j$ , where  $PRDM_j$  is the PRDM for stop  $j$ ,  $H_{ij}$  is the scheduled headway for vehicle  $i$  at stop  $j$ ,  $H'_{ij}$  is the actual headway for vehicle  $i$  at stop  $j$ , and  $n_j$  is the number of vehicles serving stop  $j$  (48).

In general, the results confirmed that using 6 vehicles for line 1 operation is feasible: in the worst case (under ordinary conditions), the travel time would sum up to 39.5 minutes (Exp. IX, Max), which still fits into the trajectory time of 45 minutes after adding 10% slack time. By ordinary conditions, we mean that the current model simulates stochastic traffic situations, but without heavy disturbances such as equipment failure in service, nor does it simulate the recovery from disruptions.

Operating only with line 1 poses little problems. Speed limit reduction at BD and 125m interlaced track slightly increase the driving time, but don't have negative impact on regularity. The reason could be that the reduced speed limit causes less variation in drivers' effective speed. The 240m interlaced track (Exp. VIII), however, introduces 30% more driving time deviation compared to others (Exp. I-IV). About 23% of

1 the vehicles have to wait at Oosterstraat (OS) to access Zuiderdiep (ZD); the waiting times range from several  
2 seconds to 1.5 minutes. From ZD to OS, 33% of the vehicles need to wait, and the waiting time is up to 0.75  
3 minute. Thus the irregularity at the later stops increases. OS-ZD rises from 6.0% to 10.2%; OS-ZD rises from  
4 5.3% to 8.7%.

5 Two lines operating together in the center (between MB and CS) would cause more conflict, as one  
6 can expect. For the 80m and 125m interlaced tracks (Exp. V-VII), about 6~7% of the vehicles at each direc-  
7 tion have to wait for the access. The waiting times range from 10 seconds to more than 1 minute. Generally,  
8 the waiting time at OS to GroteMarkt (GM) direction is longer than at GM-OS. This is likely caused by the  
9 longer waiting distance at OS-GM. The 240m interlaced track (Exp. IX) forms a bottleneck for the two lines.  
10 The waiting time in front of the interlaced track is up to 1.5 minutes, and the amount of waiting vehicles is  
11 one third at each direction. The driving time deviation doubled compares to that of Exp. I-VII at direction  
12 ZER-CS, 40% for the other direction. The regularity worsens accordingly, the most irregular among all the  
13 experiments.

14 The short slack time at CS could mitigate some irregular arrivals. The irregularity accumulated from  
15 ZER to CS is brought down at ZD by the slack of 0.5~2.5 minutes. But the effect is limited when the discrep-  
16 ancy exceeds the possible slack. In the case of the 240m interlace track, for example, the slack is not able to  
17 lighten the PRDM by more than 5%. Despite this, the results show a better overall regularity at stops between  
18 CS and ZER than the original one that did not implement slack time at CS. The layover at ZER provides  
19 5.4~11.5 minutes for slack (over 85% vehicles could have more than 8.2 minutes) which appears to be  
20 effective in terms of restoring regularity.

21 The extension of the interlaced track to 125 meters doesn't have much influence on the travel time,  
22 nor does the speed limit reduction at BD. But the 240m version does yield more differences, both when  
23 operating with 1 and with 2 lines. As the interlaced track is at the forefront of direction CS-ZER, it could be  
24 considered to reduce waiting time variance at ZD-OS (as a first step), which would benefit the rest stops of  
25 direction CS-ZER. Watching the animation of the experiments, one would notice that vehicle bunching  
26 occurs often when both lines are in operation. Coordination at MB is necessary to achieve minimal waiting  
27 times (48) as both lines share route. Measures to minimize waiting time variance and driving time variance  
28 (45) include exclusive lanes (46), priority of trams at crossings (47) where possible, holding point (11) e.g. at  
29 ZD, coordination (48) at shared tracks. For this project, further simulation studies will be done to assess the  
30 impact of these measures on the design.

## 31 6. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

32 In rail transit network planning and design, the use of the open source Java simulation library shows a lot of  
33 potential. The library supports distributed microscopic multi-formalism simulation that provides flexible  
34 component composition as model building blocks. The model has been validated throughout the development  
35 and by case studies (37, 38). Not only does the library support rail transport design from an engineering  
36 perspective, its advanced animation and visualization capabilities also makes it an efficient means of commu-  
37 nication and enforces common understanding between transit authorities, service providers, as well as other  
38 parties involved. The case study in this paper shows an example of generating data for analysis at an early  
39 network design stage. While little data for this particular case is available, the tram operation data from a  
40 comparable city is used to configure and calibrate the model parameters. The generated data provide new  
41 sources of information. By analyzing the output, the designers can gain an overview to compare the impact of  
42 different scenarios. More simulation studies are needed to further evaluate the measures that can be used to  
43 improve reliability, and refined parameter configuration and calibration will be necessary when more data are  
44 collected as the project moves forward.

45 Future research will explore the possibilities to extend the library with components that allow for  
46 more customer-oriented reliability analysis, i.e. to analyze the inter-connection dependencies and delay  
47 propagations caused by such dependencies in a complex network. The authors plan to model the full light rail  
48 transit network of The Hague, the Netherlands, in which automation of model validation and calibration will  
49 be performed based on the comparison of model output and the real operation data. By doing so new opera-  
50 tion data can be incorporated dynamically into the model to simulate more reliable strategy modifications.

## 51 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

52 This research is performed in cooperation with HTM Urban Public Transport, Project Bureau RegioTram,  
53 and Delft University of Technology, Faculty of Technology Policy and Management, Systems Engineering  
54 Group and Faculty of Civil Engineering, Department of Transport and Planning.  
55  
56

1 **TABLE 1 Line 1 Simulation Results**

<b>Experiment</b>	<b>I</b>		<b>II</b>		<b>III</b>		<b>IV</b>		<b>V</b>		<b>VI</b>		<b>VII</b>		<b>VIII</b>		<b>IX</b>	
BD	50km/h		35km/h		50km/h		35km/h		50km/h		50km/h		35km/h		50km/h		50km/h	
Interlaced Track	80m		80m		125m		125m		80m		125m		125m		240m		240m	
Lines	1		1		1		1		1 and 2		1 and 2		1 and 2		1		1 and 2	
<b>Travel Time</b>	Z-C	C-Z	Z-C	C-Z	Z-C	C-Z	Z-C	C-Z	Z-C	C-Z	Z-C	C-Z	Z-C	C-Z	Z-C	C-Z	Z-C	C-Z
Mean	17.2	16.3	17.3	16.5	17.2	16.4	17.3	16.5	17.3	16.5	17.4	16.4	17.3	16.5	17.4	16.4	17.8	16.6
Std-Dev	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.6	1.0	0.7
Max	19.2	18.1	18.9	18.4	18.7	18.2	19.2	18.4	19.1	17.73	19.3	18.2	19.1	18.3	19.7	18.1	20.8	18.7
85 percentile	17.7	16.8	17.8	17.1	17.7	16.9	17.7	17.0	17.8	16.9	18.0	17.0	17.9	17.1	18.2	17.0	18.8	17.2
15 percentile	16.7	15.9	16.8	16.0	16.7	16.0	16.9	16.0	16.8	15.9	16.8	15.9	16.8	16.0	16.7	15.8	16.8	16.0
Min	16.0	15.3	16.1	15.4	15.9	15.1	16.2	15.2	16.3	15.2	16.2	15.1	16.2	15.5	16.2	15.4	16.2	15.1
<b>Layover</b>	ZER	CS	ZER	CS	ZER	CS	ZER	CS	ZER	CS	ZER	CS	ZER	CS	ZER	CS	ZER	CS
Mean	10.1	1.4	9.8	1.3	10.1	1.4	9.9	1.3	10.0	1.4	10.0	1.4	9.8	1.3	9.7	1.2	9.3	1.2
Std-Dev	0.7	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.7	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.5	1.0	0.4
Max	11.5	2.3	11.1	2.1	11.7	2.5	11.5	2.3	11.3	2.4	11.2	2.3	11.0	2.4	11.5	2.3	11.1	2.4
85 percentile	10.7	1.8	10.5	1.8	10.6	1.9	10.5	1.7	10.6	1.9	10.7	1.9	10.5	1.7	10.5	1.8	10.2	1.7
15 percentile	9.5	1.0	9.3	0.9	9.4	0.9	9.2	0.9	9.4	0.9	9.2	1.0	9.1	0.9	8.9	0.8	8.2	0.8
Min	7.3	0.6	7.7	0.5	8.2	0.5	8.0	0.6	6.8	0.6	7.5	0.5	7.6	0.6	7.2	0.5	5.4	0.5
<b>PRDM</b>																		
ZER*	-	6.7%	-	6.8%	-	6.1%	-	6.0%	-	7.7%	-	7.0%	-	6.5%	-	9.5%	-	12.5%
Campus*	2.6%	6.4%	2.7%	6.6%	2.6%	5.6%	2.9%	5.7%	2.7%	7.6%	2.6%	7.0%	2.7%	6.1%	2.5%	9.1%	2.6%	12.1%
Ringweg	3.2%	6.2%	3.5%	6.6%	3.2%	5.5%	3.1%	5.5%	3.4%	7.5%	3.3%	6.7%	3.3%	6.0%	2.7%	9.1%	3.3%	11.8%
SC Pad.	3.3%	6.1%	3.6%	6.8%	3.3%	5.5%	3.1%	5.2%	3.7%	7.2%	3.5%	6.6%	3.4%	6.1%	3.1%	9.0%	3.6%	11.7%
SC Sel.	3.5%	5.9%	3.7%	6.8%	3.4%	5.4%	3.4%	5.1%	4.2%	7.2%	4.0%	6.6%	3.7%	6.0%	3.4%	9.2%	4.0%	11.6%
NS*	3.8%	5.6%	4.0%	6.4%	3.6%	5.2%	3.6%	4.8%	4.3%	7.0%	4.3%	6.2%	4.0%	5.5%	3.5%	9.3%	4.5%	11.6%
Korreweg	4.2%	5.3%	4.3%	5.9%	4.5%	4.9%	3.9%	4.6%	5.0%	6.7%	5.0%	5.8%	4.4%	5.2%	4.5%	8.9%	5.3%	11.2%
BD	4.5%	5.1%	4.5%	5.5%	4.4%	4.7%	3.9%	4.3%	5.2%	6.4%	5.1%	5.9%	4.6%	5.2%	5.0%	9.0%	5.3%	11.2%
GM*	4.9%	4.7%	4.7%	4.9%	4.8%	4.2%	4.4%	4.1%	6.2%	6.1%	5.7%	5.2%	4.8%	4.9%	5.3%	8.8%	6.4%	11.0%
Oosterst.	5.4%	4.4%	5.3%	4.6%	5.5%	3.8%	4.5%	3.6%	7.2%	5.4%	6.7%	4.6%	5.3%	4.5%	6.0%	8.7%	10.0%	11.5%
Zuiderdiep*	5.8%	3.5%	5.4%	3.7%	5.5%	3.4%	4.7%	3.1%	7.5%	4.7%	6.9%	4.0%	5.7%	3.9%	10.2%	5.3%	14.4%	10.9%
CS*	6.2%	-	6.2%	-	5.9%	-	5.2%	-	8.2%	-	7.0%	-	6.4%	-	10.8%	-	14.7%	-
<b>Vehicles waited at interlaced track</b>																		
	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	6.8%	6.8%	6.8%	8.8%	6.7%	23.0%	33.1%	33.8%	37.2%

- 2
- 3 *BD: Speed limit at Boterdiep.*
- 4 *Travel time and layover time are in minutes.*
- 5 *\*Busy stops.*

1 **REFERENCES**

- 2 1 Guihaire, V. and J.K. Hao. Transit Network Design and Scheduling: A Global Review. *Transportation*  
3 *Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Vol. 42, No.10, 2008, pp. 1251-1273.
- 4 2 Price, D. *The Beacon Council Scheme Round 5: Better Local Public Transport*. Office of the Deputy  
5 Prime Minister, Local and Regional Government Research Unit, Department for Transport. London,  
6 UK, 2003.
- 7 3 Friman, M., B. Edvardsson, and T. Gärling. Perceived Service Quality Attributes in Public Transport:  
8 Inferences from Complains and Negative Critical Incidents. *Journal of Public Transportation*, Vol. 2,  
9 No. 1, 1998, pp. 67-89.
- 10 4 Friman, M., B. Edvardsson, and T. Gärling. Frequency of negative critical incidents and satisfaction  
11 with public transport services. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2001, pp. 95-  
12 114.
- 13 5 Hensher, D.A., P. Stopher, and P. Bullock. Service quality - developing a service quality index in the  
14 provision of commercial bus contracts. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Vol. 37,  
15 No. 6, 2003, pp. 499-517.
- 16 6 Thompson, K., and P. Schofield. An investigation of the relationship between public transport perform-  
17 ance and destination satisfaction. *Journal of Transport Geography*, Vol.15, 2007, pp. 136-144.
- 18 7 Turnquist, M.A. and L.A. Bowman. The Effects of Network Structure on Reliability of Transit Service.  
19 *Transport Research Part B: Methodological*, Vol. 14, No. 1-2, 1980, pp. 79-86.
- 20 8 Rietveld, P., F.R. Bruinsma, and D.J. van Vuuren. Coping with unreliability in public transport chains: A  
21 case study for Netherlands. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Vol. 35, No. 6, 2001,  
22 pp. 539-559.
- 23 9 Oort, N. van and R. van Nes. Improving reliability in urban public transport in strategic and tactical  
24 design. In *Proceedings of the 87th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board*, CD-ROM,  
25 2008, 08-0581.
- 26 10 Tahmasseby, S. *Reliability in Urban Public Transport Network Assessment and Design*. PhD Thesis.  
27 Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands, 2009.
- 28 11 Oort, N. van, J.W. Boterman and R. van Nes. Effect of driving-time determination and holding points on  
29 reliability. In *Proceeding of the 11th International Conference on Advanced Systems for Public Trans-*  
30 *port*, 2009.
- 31 12 Tahmasseby, S., R. van Nes and N. van Oort. Reliability Assessment of Urban Rail Transit Networks:  
32 Methodology and Case Study. In *Proceedings of the 89th Annual Meeting of the Transportation Re-*  
33 *search Board*, CD-ROM, 2009, 09-0458.
- 34 13 Israeli Y. and A. Ceder. Public transport assignment with passenger strategies for overlapping route  
35 choice. *Transportation & Traffic Theory*, 13th ISTTT. Elsevier Science & Pergamon, 1996, pp. 561-588.
- 36 14 Desaulniers, G. and M.D. Hickman. Public Transit. *Handbooks in Operations Research and Manage-*  
37 *ment Science*, Vol. 14, Transportation, North Holland, 2007, pp. 69-128.
- 38 15 Ortúzar, J.D. and L.G. Willumsen. *Modelling Transport*. 3rd ed. John Wiley & Sons, 2001.
- 39 16 Keen, P.G., and H.G. Sol. *Decision Enhancement Services: Rehearsing the Future for Decisions that*  
40 *Matter*. IOS Press, 2008.
- 41 17 Higgins, A., L. Ferreira, and E. Kozan. Modeling single line train operations. *Transportation Research*  
42 *Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 1484, 1995, pp. 9-16.
- 43 18 Carey, M., and D. Lockwood. A Model, Algorithms and Strategy for Train Pathing. *The Journal of the*  
44 *Operational Research Society*, Vol. 46, No. 8, 2005, pp. 988-1005.
- 45 19 Carey, M., and S. Carville. Testing schedule performance and reliability for train stations. *Journal of the*  
46 *Operational Research Society*, Vol. 51, No. 6, 2002, pp. 666-682.
- 47 20 Carey, M., and S. Carville. Scheduling and platforming trains at busy complex stations. *Transportation*  
48 *Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Vol. 37, No. 3, 2003, pp. 195-224.
- 49 21 Rizzoli, A. E., N. Fornara, and L. M. Gambardella. A simulation tool for combined rail/road transport in  
50 intermodal terminals. *Journal of Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, Vol. 59, No. 1-3, 2002, pp.  
51 57-71.
- 52 22 Middelkoop, D., and M. Bouwman. Simone: Large Scale Train Network Simulations. In *Proceedings of*  
53 *the 2001 Winter Simulation Conference*, 2001, pp. 1042-1047.
- 54 23 Wahlborg, M. Simulation models: Important aids for Banverket's planning process. *Computers in*  
55 *Railways*, Vol. V, No. 1, 1996, pp.175-181.

- 1 24 Sandblad, B., A. Andersson, K.-E. Jonsson, P. Hellström, P. Lindström, J. Rudolf, J. Storck, and M.  
2 Wahlborg. A train traffic operation and planning Simulator. *Advances in Transport*, No. 7, 2000, pp.  
3 241-248.
- 4 25 Koutsopoulos, H.N., and Z., Wang. Simulation of Urban Rail Operations: Application Framework.  
5 *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 2006, 2007, pp.  
6 84-91.
- 7 26 Nash, A. and D. Huerlimann. Railroad simulation using Open Track. *Advances in Transport*, No. 15,  
8 2004, pp. 45-54.
- 9 27 Kavicka, A. and V. Klima. Simulation support for railway infrastructure design and planning processes.  
10 *Advances in Transport*, No. 7, 2000, pp. 447-456.
- 11 28 Bendfeldt, J.-P., U. Mohr, and L. Müller. RailSys, a system to plan future railway needs. *Advances in*  
12 *Transport*, No. 7, 2000, pp. 249-255.
- 13 29 Kaas, A. Punctuality model for railways. *Advances in Transport*, No. 7, 2000, pp. 853-860.
- 14 30 Ho, T., B. Mao, Z. Yuan, H. Liu, and Y. Fung. Computer simulation and modeling in railway applica-  
15 tions. *Computer Physics Communications*, Vol. 143, No. 1, 2002, pp.1-10.
- 16 31 Vromans, M.J.C.M., R. Dekker, and L.G. Kroon. Reliability and heterogeneity of railway services.  
17 *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol. 172, No. 2, 2006, pp. 647-665.
- 18 32 Ferreira, L. Planning Australian freight rail operations: An overview. *Transportation Research Part A:*  
19 *Policy and Practice*, Vol. 31, No. 4, 1997, pp. 335-348.
- 20 33 Krueger, H., E. Vaillancourt, A.M. Drummie, S.J. Vucko, and J. Bekavac. Simulation within the railroad  
21 environment. In *Proceedings of the 2000 Winter Simulation Conference*, 2000, pp. 1191-1200.
- 22 34 Hansen, I.A. and J. Pachel, eds. *Railway Timetable & Traffic: Analysis, Modelling, Simulation*. Eurail-  
23 press, 2008.
- 24 35 Rudolph, R. Operational simulation of light rail systems. In *Proceedings of the European Transport*  
25 *Conference*, 2000, pp. 167-178.
- 26 36 Overton, D.T. Traffic signal control of LRV's. *IEE Colloquium on Light Rapid Transit On-Street*, 1989,  
27 pp. 9/1-9/3.
- 28 37 Kanacilo, E.M. and A. Verbraeck. Simulation services to support the control design of rail infrastruc-  
29 tures. In *Proceedings of the 2006 Winter Simulation Conference*, 2006, pp. 1372-1379.
- 30 38 Kanacilo, E.M. and N. van Oort. Using a rail simulation library to assess impacts of transit network  
31 planning on operational quality. *Computers in Railways*, Vol. XI: Computer System Design and Opera-  
32 tion in the Railway and Other Transit Systems, No. 103, 2008, pp. 35-43.
- 33 39 Jacobs, P.H.M. *The DSOL simulation suite: Enabling multi-formalism simulation in a distributed*  
34 *context*. PhD Thesis. Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands, 2005.
- 35 40 Eugster, P.T., P.A. Felber, R. Guerraoui, and A.-M. Kermarrec. The many faces of publish/subscribe.  
36 *ACM Computing Surveys*, Vol. 35, No. 2, 2003, pp. 114-131.
- 37 41 *Raamwerk RegioRail*, Project RegioTram, Groningen, the Netherlands, 2008. (In Dutch)
- 38 42 Muller, T.H.J., and P.G. Furth. Trip Time Analyzers: Key to Transit Service Quality. *Transportation*  
39 *Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 1760, 2001, pp. 10-19.
- 40 43 Oort, N. van and R. van Nes. Line Length Versus Reliability: Network Design Dilemma in Urban Public  
41 Transport. Accepted by *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research*  
42 *Board*, 2009.
- 43 44 Liu, R. and S. Sinha. Modelling Urban Bus Service and Passenger Reliability. *The Third International*  
44 *Symposium on Transportation Network Reliability*, 2007.
- 45 45 Oort, N. van and R. van Nes, Controlling Operations of Public Transport to Improve Reliability: Theory  
46 and Practice. Accepted by *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research*  
47 *Board*, 2009.
- 48 46 Cham, L.C. *Understanding bus service reliability: A practical framework using AVL/APC data*, Mas-  
49 ter's Thesis. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technol-  
50 ogy, 2006.
- 51 47 Muller, T.H.J. and P.G. Furth. Conditional bus priority at signalized intersections: better service with  
52 less traffic disruption. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*,  
53 No. 1731, 2000, pp. 23-30.
- 54 48 Oort, N van and R. van Nes. Regularity analysis for optimizing urban transit network. *Public Transport*,  
55 Vol. 1, No. 2, 2009, pp.155-168. Springer Berlin.
- 56