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ABSTRACT

In this paper, we describe the development and use of a discrete-event simulation model of the central subway portion of MBTA’s Boston Green Line light rail rapid transit system. The model was used to investigate a number of operational and scheduling issues; initially, it was used to study the effect on the train schedule of unexpected delays at station platforms for individual trains. The model was developed in GPSS/PC and animated using Proof.

2.1 Model Inputs

The following inputs were required for the Green Line simulation:
- Signal block length
- Maximum permissible speed for each block
- Station platform location, length, and number of berths
- Train performance characteristics; tractive effort curves
- Operating rules relating to approaching and passing signals displaying various aspects
- Routing for each service line
- Headways at portals for each service line
- Nominal dwell times for each station
- Station dwell function relating actual dwell to headway and nominal dwell

This information was input directly at the PC terminal using data supplied by the MBTA and PB’s field observations.

2.2 Model Operation

Trains on each line are generated in accordance with the headway information input to GPSS/PC. At the user’s option, trains can be generated strictly in conformity with the headway (e.g., exactly three minutes apart) or using a randomization function whose distribution conforms to the observed distribution of arrival or departure times.

The model moves from one ‘event’ to the next, where an event is defined as a change in status of a train. Passing from one block to another, stopping at a station, and moving through a switch are examples of such events. In the MBTA study, trains were generated at the inbound portals of the Central Subway. They moved through the system following the appropriate routing for their service line and left the simulation at the outbound portal. Train operations are in accordance with the operating rules input to GPSS, which prevent two trains from attempting to occupy the same space at the same time. Thus, for example, the first train arriving at Copley Junction will get the right-of-way, and trains whose moves through Copley Junction would interfere with the first train will be held until the track is clear following passage of the first train.

If the simulation is allowed to run without intervention to test strategies or to generate interim reports, a two-hour time period can be simulated with the GPSS/PC Model in 15 to 20 minutes on an IBM PS/2 Model 60, depending on complexity of the scenario. Interactive intervention in GPSS/PC slows the process somewhat, but at worst we have only found it necessary to schedule an hour of 80386-based PC time to simulate 2.5 to 3.0 hours of system operation.

When the model was converted to GPSS/H (for ease of use in animating with Proof), we found that the same two-hour time period could be simulated in less than five minutes on the identical PC. In general, GPSS/H was approximately 10 times faster on compile times, and about five times faster on run times, than GPSS/PC. (The model consisted of about 800 GPSS blocks and 1,000 lines of code total.)

2.3 Model Outputs

The simulation records train arrival and departure times at station platforms, green, yellow, and red signals encountered, and other parameters indicating overall system performance in the specified configuration. The movement of individual trains is also plotted on a CAAD system as string lines (time-space diagrams). Summary tables are prepared showing the amount of time each train on each service spent in the portion of the system being simulated, enabling analysis
of performance under various assumptions about delays and intervention strategies. Table 1 is an example of a run-time summary by service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTD GREEN LINE SIMULATION</th>
<th>DELAY DETAILS: LOC: 1</th>
<th>BOYSTOWN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DELAY TIME</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>ELAPSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>09</td>
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</tbody>
</table>

A Proof layout file was developed to represent the total track network for the central subway portion of the Boston Green Line, with all stations, interlockings (switches and crossovers), and traffic control signals. Since GPSS/H has built-in statements to output to files, it was quite easy to add statements to the model to produce the animation trace file. In general, when a train began moving into a track circuit (signal block), the simulation model would write a command to the trace file telling Proof to place the train object at the beginning of the corresponding "path" and to start moving at a specified speed. While the GPSS transaction was in an ADVANCE block representing travel time to the next signal, the object would move to the end of the associated Proof path (representing the signal block) and either stop (if the signal was Red), slow down (if the signal was Yellow), or continue to full speed (if the signal was Green). More complex logic was needed at station platforms, which might have multiple, dedicated or non-dedicated, load/unload points. In general, very little change to model logic was required to animate the simulation.

In contrast to GPSS/H, with GPSS/PC a modeler must resort to calling a FORTRAN routine to write the trace file. In addition, with its integer clock, GPSS/PC may present problems with objects "jumping" on the screen, unless the time unit is chosen sufficiently small or care is taken to artificially adjust (decrease) train speed so that the GPSS transaction representing a train completes its ADVANCE time interval; if train speed were too high, the next signal would not be reached and the train object would simply continue past the end of the train layout path. Otherwise, the train would begin its time advance representing travel time on its next signal block before the train object in Proof reached the end of its current path (representing its current signal block). The newest release of Proof removes this problem by allowing a user to specify either speed or time duration for an object moving on a path.)
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The animation was used to debug and verify the model, especially train movement at interlockings (switches and crossovers) and in stations. The animation was also used to convince model users of the model's validity, and to dramatically portray the results of the simulation.

3. CASE STUDY

Possibly the most complex light rail line operating in the United States, the Central Subway portion of MBTA's Green Line currently carries four distinct routes, with four outer termini (two of which operate some scheduled turnback service) and three scheduled in-town termini. Figure 2 is a schematic of the Green Line. Extra trains are also inserted in the schedule at the discretion of supervisory staff. Peak-hour headways now are on the order of 70 seconds. Our microcomputer-based simulation accurately reflected such aspects of the system as:

- train performance
- speed limits by block
- block lengths
- signal system characteristics
- platform lengths and number of berths
- interlocking plant performance
- dwell times as a function of headways (if a train is delayed, it will make a longer stop when it arrives at a station)

The simulation was run for a baseline case of scheduled headways without variation, to establish the Central Subway's performance under "no problem" conditions. Figure 1 shows an example of the basic, no-delay string line. The scenario showed the bunching of trains and occasional headway gaps that occur in reality as a function of delays at interlockings and similar system-related factors. It also showed that over time, the system had tendency to self-regulate. Several delay scenarios were then run to study the impact of abnormal headway gaps on the various routes. One, two-and-a-half, and five-minute delays were tested at selected stations. Simulations were also run to test the impact of overall dwell reductions such as might be achieved with more doors per car or high-platform loading. Results were analyzed for realism and potential responses.

3.1 Results

Table 1 exhibits a Summary Run Time Table from one simulation run. For this particular run, train #28 on route B (service line 1) experienced abnormal delays of 300 seconds, beyond the normal station dwell time, at each of two stations, Boylston and Copley. The train number and service line for the train to experience an abnormal delay, the length of any abnormal delays and delay location were all specified as user input data. Note that in Table 1, for each service line, the train data has been sorted from smallest to largest elapsed time, where elapsed time is the total time a train spent in the underground portion of the network being simulated. Note also, that in Table 1, in time, out time and elapsed time are in minutes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Run Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>36 to 50 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>44 to 57 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>35 to 54 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>56 to 65 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between routes reflects the different distances traveled to the various inbound terminals, but the key point is the variation in running times for an individual route. Clearly, it is necessary to compare the effects of delays and strategies with the "normal" run of events reflected in the "no delay" scenario. Nominal running times may be non-representative of actual conditions.

Second, a one-minute delay for a train at each of two stations, such as might be associated with a minor door problem, made no appreciable difference in the operation. In fact, subway running times were actually slightly better. However, these tests were simulated with randomization in train start times, and it proved difficult to distin-
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In the hands of a team of experienced transit systems analysts, GPSS is an excellent adjunct to the system concept planning and design process. Since its operations are transparent to the user, it is very easy to identify the assumptions that cause particular phenomena in system performance. For example, a chronic bottleneck in MBTA operations is caused by the track configuration at Government Center station. A series of "what-if" runs incorporating different track configurations or different run-through patterns can assist in determining whether service can be expedited effectively by changing the downtown terminals of some routes, or whether nothing short of a major rebuild of the Government Center turnaround area could possibly improve the situation measurably. Simple modification of some of the input parameters will provide answers in short order.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In addition to the Green Line work, PB has applied this program in simulating operations on CTA's Loop Elevated under various route combinations, primarily in the context of accommodating the Southwest Line when it begins operations. We have also used GPSS/PS and GPSS/H to simulate the effects of single-track operations at MARTA. In all cases, it provided a realistic set of answers to questions about system configuration and operations. We have found it to be a very cost-effective tool for analyzing transit systems in both planning and operational stages. Its flexibility allows one to describe the transit line being analyzed in the simplest terms that will suffice, or to insert as much detail as necessary to analyze service performances. The fact that it provides multi-train, multi-route, multi-stop capability makes it especially powerful.
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