MEETING NOTES:
M8 WOODSIDE MODELLING

1 May 2025

ATTENDEES

Transport Scotland: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]

WSP: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]

Apologies: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]

1.1.1 Modelling Specification Report

Additional clarity provided on proposed interaction with LATIS service. [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] recommended that WSP speak directly with Systra (rather than having [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] / TS in the middle) unless there was a point of disagreement. In the past, it has been helpful to have an in-person meeting to facilitate collaborative modelling and data analysis. Timeframes of model outputs and data extraction are important to feed into methodology specification to ensure they are feasible.

Action: WSP to determine appropriate timing and attendees for in-person meeting.

1.1.2 Car Kilometre Reduction Target

The modelling implications of the recent announcement regarding the perceived abandonment of the 2030 20% car km reduction target was discussed. This policy is to be revisited over the summer, but will not be agreed in time for the scenarios to be redeveloped. It was agreed, in line with internal TS steer, that the 'with policy' scenario would still be used, with relevant caveats in place. However, the level of uncertainty associated with this policy brings uncertainty to the long-range outcomes as modelled.

1.1.3 Available Models

Confirmation of use of the SRTM as key modelling input. Discussion on use of operational/micro-simulation models. Current proposal is to not use them due to lack of reassignment and likely to overestimate impacts. They have not bene completely ruled and it was acknowledged that they are useful to test variants of preferred option categories and operation of varying traffic management proposals. [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] noted they are not part of LATIS but he can obtain access to them if required.

1.1.4 National Rail and Tom-Tom Data

The National Rail and Tom-Tom datasets should provide useful data sources for compiling Origin-Destination data. [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] and [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] to be getting logins in the coming days for the TomTom database they have recently obtained. Further exploration and testing of this is required to understand what uses this dataset can applied to.

Action: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] to engage with [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] to facilitate data access.

1.1.5 Modelling Approach Options

Discussion of modelling options across the business case development presented several options. Either Options 1 or 2 are viable at this stage; consideration should be given as to the risk impact of each as part of the overarching risk workshop approach. Acknowledgement that there is a small difference in time between options 1 & 2 and decision on this is not pressing at this stage.

There is an ongoing update of SRTM in the next 6-12 months – this is not anticipated to impact this commission.

Proposal of using full VDM runs for testing of variants within preferred option category for OBC was acknowledged.

Consideration needs to be given as to whether traffic management approach to construction would influence the option selection process- this will define at what stage it is undertaken.

1.1.6 Strategic Steer

The main focus of the Strategic Business Case will be to demonstrate what Glasgow will ‘feel’ like during and following the implementation of each of the high-level option categories. A BCR would not be particularly precise or useful as part of this narrative. It was suggested that use of models would be for qualitative then quantitative at SBC stage.

Discussion around the ‘Do minimum’ was undertaken – as there is existing failing infrastructure, this is not as straightforward as it would be with a new scheme. There will need to be a creative approach to the business case to account for this. [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] suggested we need to go to IDM to understand their needs and what they are expecting to help inform this.

Proposed narrative around a ‘counterfactual’ as an alternative, which will help contextualise the modelling data and other analysis.

MEETING NOTES:

M8 WOODSIDE MODELLING

23 May 2025

ATTENDEES

WSP:

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] (Principal, Modelling Lead)
[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] (TD Transport Modelling)
[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] (Mobility lead)

Systra:

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] ((Manage the LATIS commission for SYSTRA's involvement – built SRTM)

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] (AD commercial lead for Paramics at Systra – working on elements of Woodside Viaduct - mainly focusing on surface traffic work) – Systra

Transport Scotland:

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] **(Transport Scotland)** – Senior TP – help manage LATIS and access to model; work with SYSTRA and others on updating and maintaining the models - Transport Scotland

Premise of the meeting – how to understand how to access the models

Glasgow City model isn't with LATIS – it's with the council – it's focused on what you're doing with the slips and what's going on underneath – request would go direct through Glasgow City Council

Clyde Strategic Microsimulation Model is LATIS – 2014, S-Paramics – would need to be re-based to bring into current version of the software.

Precedent for approach in which strategic model outputs (assignment, demand suppression) are fed into Paramics model. Possible use would be to compare traffic management options for the detailed assessment for OBC.

There are calibration reports from 2014; there are also some versions from 2018. A lot of inconsistencies in the data.

There are counts on the ramps from Kingston Bridge to on-off ramps.

Additional data would be beneficial.

The Glasgow City Paramics model is 2017 base year – some observed data associated with that.

The availability of data informs the modelling approach that we use. Understanding what's already been run through SRTM would be helpful.

There was some SRTM work done about what a long-term closure would do – economic and re-routing effects.

Multi-modal element might be too complicated for the end of the summer, but Systra felt like it was feasible.

VDM 24 hours to run depending on scenario, whereas demand assignment 1 hr. Not something that's going to take two weeks to do.

Q: At this stage have we reviewed the network and the local area and determined if it's appropriate to use the model as is?

A: Network review is underway, specification of network changes to develop current situation to be sent to Systra.

Two key things have taken place since the model: loop at Great Western Road has new access; they've also allowed the right turn from Garscube Road. Because closure is in place at junction 17. Particular need to double check the flow in the model at the west end of the extent of Woodside.

Traffic flows can flip significantly depending on the matrix. Advantage of fixed matrix is ability to add more zones.

Network review and update to do minimum are underway – underway within the next week.

Would like to avoid splitting zones if possible.

Modelling Approach Option 1: • **Use of existing model runs** • **No additional modelling undertaken**	• Utilise existing models with options, which have already been run through full VDM • Dependent on options available and detail of closures • Lesser risk to SBC programme
Modelling Approach Option 2 • **Update coding of existing SRTM runs and produce 'fixed' trip assignment using with/without policy achievement**	• Would not include demand response to closures • Lesser risk to SBC programme
Modelling Approach Option 3 • **Update coding of existing SRTM scenarios with Full VDM runs**	• Provides full demand response to closures • Ability to specify more detailed coding of options for SBC • Disproportionate level of detail for option categories • Unlikely to be feasible within SBC programme– multiple iterations of VDM potentially required

If Systra could give us an estimate of how long it would take to do a fixed trip and VDM for scenarios that we specify, that is helpful.

Options 2 and 3 are most likely. Need to update the base model before we can get useful scenarios – there aren't suitable off-the-shelf scenarios which rules out option 1.

Suggested methodology:

1. Update network to current situation 2025 and run through VDM.
2. Test M8 closure with fixed trip assignment
3. Further updates to local network
4. Full run of removal of M8 through VDM for options
5. Identify further options if necessary

Full closure test is more appropriate for full model run considering the level of impact expected on demand Would prefer to use full model run for each – more rigorous / holds up to scrutiny.

Timescales for delivery depend on how many years we're modelling as part of this, and whether it's all scenarios or just one.

Likely it's just 2 years – one for opening year andone for economic.

Latest year available for analysis is 2045 – there is a 2035 available

Most studies do 2030 and 2045 due to the nice 15-yr gap.

Q: How will we identify the network changes for each of the schemes? How is it managed?

A: Either point out the locations and say 'this doesn't match up with current layout' and they can code it up to match existing layout; or we can be very prescriptive and sending A nodes, B nodes, etc. Typically the test itself is more prescriptive. E.g. coding lane reduction requires prescription (speed flow curves, sat flows etc.)

The closure test is quite extreme – let's make some updates and re-run that – it might actually break the network.

Quick and dirty high-level test closure – see where the changes are. Which local junctions become overwhelmed with additional traffic and see whether it is plausible

Would allow us to compare a local validation with the most up to date observed counts.

Because of COVID, 2025 demand is still lower than 2019 and then recovers

What are the outputs we're looking for the first few tests? Flow changes and network delays - journey time changes are most tangible impact

Actions:

- Systra to provide timeline associated with different options to see how it fits into our existing programmes.
- WSP to compare the existing situation to the model
- WSP to confirm programme for model outputs - Would like to have finalised model outputs by mid-September (WSP to confirm their programme as well)

[redacted – out of scope of request]

[redacted – out of scope of request]

AGENDA & MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	UK0028364.4298	**MEETING DATE**	17 June 2025
PROJECT NAME	Woodside Viaduct Permanent Repairs Design	**VENUE**	WSP Glasgow Queen St (Mull)
CLIENT	Transport Scotland	**RECORDED BY**	[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
MEETING SUBJECT	M8 Woodside Viaduct Permanent Intervention Project Progress Meeting		

PRESENT	Transport Scotland: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] WSP: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
APOLOGIES	[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
DISTRIBUTION	As above
CONFIDENTIALITY	**Confidential**

Key Discussion Points

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
7	**Finance**	
8	We will need to provide a Systra scope and they can provide a forecast	WSP to agree scope of works with Systra to allow for send forecast to be produced.

LATIS Model Access meeting: 22/7/2025

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] **(Principal, Modelling Lead) – WSP**

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] **(Manage the LATIS commission for SYSTRA's involvement – built SRTM) – Systra**

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] **(AD commercial lead for Paramics at Systra – working on elements of Woodside Viaduct - - mainly focusing on surface traffic work) – Systra**

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] **(TD Transport Modelling) – WSP**

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] **(Business Case Lead WSP)**

Premise of the meeting – Discussion on scope for the SBC modelling

[redacted - out of scope of request]

[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] listed proposed model scenarios:

1. 2025 Existing scenario
2. M8 open, J17 Open, Phoenix Rd closed – (2030 & 2045)
3. M8 closed local open – (2030 & 2045)
4. M8 contra flow J17 closed, Phoenix Rd closed – (2030 & 2045)
5. Fully open – (2030 & 2045)
6. Fully open refined (single structure – (2030 & 2045)
7. M8 removed (at grade junctions) – (2030 & 2045

Discussion on network specification for existing 2025 scenario (2 lanes)

Systra suggested VDM run for 2030 & 2045 DM and M8 full closure (2, 3 & 5 above)

VDM runs take 24 hours

Fixed assignment for all further tests

Mid-September timeline requires for modelling to be rationalised to accommodate September end date for SBC modelling:

- Run 'with policy' only
- Run 2030 forecast year only
- Apply simple capacity reduction to M8 to represent contra flow TM option (no. 4 above)

Systra to supply model outputs to WSP in csv/dat files, WSP to detail what these are for model outputs for SBC. WSP to discuss proposing study area for links

Actions:

- WSP to send list of suggested scenarios to Systra for costing
- WSP to provide GIS shapefile on scope of network updates
- WSP to send network specifications of existing option to Systra for comment and to include in costing
- Systra to provide costing to WSP/TS
- WSP to discuss rationalising options with wider team for SBC outputs

AGENDA & MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	UK0028364.4298	**MEETING DATE**	17 September 2025
PROJECT NAME	Woodside Viaduct Permanent Repairs Design	**VENUE**	WSP Glasgow Queen St (Harris)
CLIENT	Transport Scotland	**RECORDED BY**	[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
MEETING SUBJECT	M8 Woodside Viaduct Permanent Intervention Project Progress Meeting		

PRESENT	Transport Scotland: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] WSP: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
APOLOGIES	Transport Scotland: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] WSP: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
DISTRIBUTION	As Above
CONFIDENTIALITY	**Confidential**

Key Discussion Points

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
3	**Progress Update**	**[Additional Information].**
	Mobility Team **Model Review- Ensure the M74 is fully represented in the model. Generate a more detailed heat map and circulate both the 1000 and 5000 vehicle models**	

AGENDA & MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	UK0028364.4298	**MEETING DATE**	19 November 2025
PROJECT NAME	Woodside Viaduct Permanent Repairs Design	**VENUE**	WSP Glasgow Queen St (Skye)
CLIENT	Transport Scotland	**RECORDED BY**	[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
MEETING SUBJECT	M8 Woodside Viaduct Permanent Intervention Project Progress Meeting		

PRESENT	Transport Scotland: (TS) [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] WSP: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
APOLOGIES	Transport Scotland: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
DISTRIBUTION	As Above
CONFIDENTIALITY	**Confidential**

Key Discussion Points

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
3	**Progress Update**	
	Mobility GIS portal being developed to allow traffic flow modelling visualisations shared. This display allows us to see effects of traffic on alternative motorways and redistribution to local roads.	

AGENDA & MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	UK0028364.4298	**MEETING DATE**	19th November 2025
PROJECT NAME	Woodside Viaduct Permanent Repairs Design	**VENUE**	WSP Glasgow Queen St
CLIENT	Transport Scotland	**RECORDED BY**	[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
MEETING SUBJECT	SBC Presentation Meeting		

PRESENT	Transport Scotland: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] WSP: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
APOLOGIES	[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
DISTRIBUTION	
CONFIDENTIALITY	**Confidential**

Key Discussion Points

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
2	SBC Comments	
	• Strategic traffic model has been analysed for the effects of M8 Woodside Viaducts closure. The results are currently being validated. Initial results indicate that traffic flows might not be as adversely affected by a full closure scenario as previously assumed. Detailed modelling and internal checks are ongoing.	

AGENDA & MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	UK0028364.4298	**MEETING DATE**	10 December 2025
PROJECT NAME	Woodside Viaduct Permanent Repairs Design	**VENUE**	WSP Glasgow Queen St (Harris)
CLIENT	Transport Scotland	**RECORDED BY**	[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
MEETING SUBJECT	M8 Woodside Viaduct Permanent Intervention Project Progress Meeting		

PRESENT	Transport Scotland: (TS) [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] WSP: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
APOLOGIES	Transport Scotland: [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
DISTRIBUTION	As Above
CONFIDENTIALITY	**Confidential**

Key Discussion Points

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
3	**Progress Update**	

	Mobility Mobility team are considering number of traffic lanes to be modelled. Commitment to 4 lanes has been made publicly but limited number of alternative scenarios are being considered as part of permanent works. All options to be subject to detailed stakeholder considerations. SRTM model is currently overestimating traffic flows by about 30% which is considered outside normal tolerances. This model has apparently been challenged in previous schemes at public enquiry. New STRM is still currently delayed. Recalibration of model is possible with recently observed data. The inaccuracies in the model were not expected. WSP to confirm additional cost for Systra to undertake validation to minimise risk of future challenge on this basis. TS to confirm that this should progress so that programme is not affected.	WSP WSP TS

AGENDA & MEETING NOTES

PROJECT NUMBER	UK0028364.4298	**MEETING DATE**	21 January 2026
PROJECT NAME	Woodside Viaduct Permanent Repairs Design	**VENUE**	WSP Glasgow Queen St (Skye)
CLIENT	Transport Scotland	**RECORDED BY**	[redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
MEETING SUBJECT	M8 Woodside Viaduct Permanent Intervention Project Progress Meeting		

PRESENT	**Transport Scotland: (TS)** [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs] **WSP:** [redacted under regulation 11(2) of the EIRs]
APOLOGIES	
DISTRIBUTION	As Above
CONFIDENTIALITY	**Confidential**

ITEM	SUBJECT	ACTION
3	**Progress Update**	
	SRTM Validation – SRTM validation exercise was signed off by TS and is underway. TS queried why updating to the model was required; KL highlighted the age of the model and the significant changes to transport context since it was produced, which result in a risk to the conclusions generated and utilised in the business case. Existing traffic model has not been updated due to planned upgrade/modernisation of network model; Timescales are currently unconfirmed for the availability of new model. The additional validation exercise will reduce risk of challenge to OBC modelling conclusions.	