<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Document Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30/11/16</td>
<td>AECOM/ERC</td>
<td>Email chain inc November 2016 STAG and Demand Forecasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15/03/17</td>
<td>TS/ERC</td>
<td>Email chain inc attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31/08/17</td>
<td>AECOM</td>
<td>Email inc comments register, July 2017 STAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23/11/17</td>
<td>ERC/TS</td>
<td>Email chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13/12/17</td>
<td>AECOM/TS</td>
<td>Latis request inc form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>09/01/18</td>
<td>AECOM/TS</td>
<td>Email re Latis Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19/12/17</td>
<td>TS/ERC</td>
<td>Email re STAG considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>08/01/18</td>
<td>AECOM/TS/SPT</td>
<td>Email chain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>02/02/18</td>
<td>TS/ERC</td>
<td>Email chain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi [Name]  

Ahead of our meeting on the 9th Dec at Buchanan House, please see attached revised STAG submission and demand forecasts for Barrhead South. Apologies for the file size.

Aecom is coordinating another meeting to discuss the demand modelling and how the SRTM might further support assumptions.

Happy to discuss otherwise see you on the 9th.

Best regards

[Name]  
Major Development & Transportation Projects Co-ordinator
Environment Department
Tel: [Number]
Mobile: [Number]

East Renfrewshire
www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

Please consider the environment - do you need to print this email?

From: [Name]  
Sent: 30 November 2016 10:54
To: [Name]
Subject: FW: Barrhead STAG updated report

From: [Name]  
Sent: 25 November 2016 14:28
To: [Name]
Subject: Barrhead STAG updated report
Attached is the updated STAG report and Appendix E [the demand forecasting]. I’ll look to get a meeting set up with the two [redacted] over the next week or so in advance of your SPT meeting.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

Associate Director, Transportation
Carolyn Miller
AECOM
Aurora
120 Bothwell Street
Glasgow
G2 7JS
Tel: 0141-248-0300
aecom.com

Built to deliver a better world

LinkedIn Twitter Facebook Instagram

Fortune World's Most Admired Companies 2018

******************************************************************************

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are not necessarily the view of East Renfrewshire Council. It is intended only for the person or entity named above. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify the author by replying to this e-mail and then erasing the e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, review, dissemination, distribution or copying of the e-mail is strictly prohibited.

Please be advised that East Renfrewshire Council's incoming and outgoing e-mail is subject to regular monitoring.

This footnote also confirms that this e-mail message has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
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----------------------------------------

This email has been received from an external party and has been swept for the presence of computer viruses.
Very grateful for this – we’ll review the points and look to arrange a meeting with you to discuss them in the next couple of weeks.

Best regards

Major Development & Transportation Projects Co-ordinator
Environment Department
Tel:
Mobile:

Please consider the environment - do you need to print this email?

Please find attached the response on the redrafted Barrhead report for your consideration.

Happy to look at dates for a meeting if you wish to discuss these and the comments you will have received from others.

Kind Regards,

Major Transport Infrastructure Projects
Technical Analysis Branch
T: M:
Thanks for copying me into this. I think the points you raise here are valid.

Happy to discuss further if required.

Regards,

Please find attached the response on the redrafted Barrhead report for your consideration.

Happy to look at dates for a meeting if you wish to discuss these and the comments you will have received from others.

Kind Regards,

Major Transport Infrastructure Projects
Technical Analysis Branch

Transport Scotland
Buchanan House, 58 Port Dundas Road
Glasgow, G4 0HF

Transport Scotland, the national transport agency
Còmhlaist Alba, buidheann náiseanta na cónchail
Subject: FW: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG
Importance: High

Dear Both

I am most disappointed not to have received comments back on our redrafted STAG for Barrhead South.

After submission of the redrafted report at the end of November last year, incorporating Transport Scotland’s comments and additional patronage impact assessments requested, along with the comments of Network Rail and SPT, at our subsequent meeting on 9th December you reported that comments could be provided within 3/4 weeks. Even allowing for the Christmas break we are now some 12 weeks without any response or advice of an alternative timescale. As a result, development of this City Deal funded project has been significantly delayed.

As you will be aware, there is substantial public expectation about the socio-economic benefits to be gained from the Council's approved suite of projects to be funded under the City Deal initiative. The opportunity to both achieve these benefits and counter the surface transport issues that could arise on the local and strategic road network, not least the M77 corridor, without a viable rail transport option, is now at risk and due in the main, as far as I can see, simply to Transport Scotland’s uncertainty over how it plans to resolve operational issues at Glasgow Central within the next 10 years.

Can I please ask that a formal response from Transport Scotland to the STAG Report we have submitted, which has received positive comments from a wide range of stakeholders, is provided at your earliest opportunity. If there are objections, these need to be voiced clearly and professionally so that the communities affected can be informed accordingly and so that the Council can make an informed decision about the way in which it delivers solutions to the socio-economic problems facing its residents and so that the Glasgow City Region PMO can be notified of the reason for the delay in project development.

Kind regards

Major Development & Transportation Projects Co-ordinator
Environment Department
Tel: 
Mobile:

East Renfrewshire
www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

Please consider the environment - do you need to print this email?

From: 
Sent: 19 January 2017 10:03 
To: 
Cc: 
Subject: RE: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG

Hi:

Happy New Year to you too. Hope you had a good break.
We’re just finalising our comments and should be issuing our response to you next week.

Regards,

[Redacted]

Technical Analysis Branch
Major Transport Infrastructure Projects (MTRIPS)
Transport Scotland
Tel: [Redacted]
Email: [Redacted]

---

From: [Redacted]
Sent: 18 January 2017 12:36
To: [Redacted]
Subject: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG

Hi [Redacted]

Happy New Year.

I wondered if you are yet in a position to send through your comments on the Barrhead South STAG, so that we can revise the content accordingly.

Best regards

[Redacted]

Major Development & Transportation Projects Co-ordinator
Environment Department
Tel: [Redacted]
Mobile: [Redacted]

---

East Renfrewshire

www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

Please consider the environment - do you need to print this email?

********************************************
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********************************************
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Barrhead South appraisal report. We note that the appraisal is attempting to pull together a wide range of previous reports and data into one coherent report. However we consider it does not provide sufficient or robust evidence of the problems and opportunities in the area to allow development of SMART transport planning objectives and robust appraisal of options.

The emphasis of the report focusses on trying to develop a rationale for a new rail station and feels solution led. We consider that Bus options in particular have not been given due consideration and have been sifted out of the appraisal process too early. The scoring of options at the pre-appraisal sift stage appears to be inconsistent and should be fully reviewed.

The following comments are focussed primarily on the Pre-Appraisal process as effort is needed to strengthen this before following the changes through the remainder of the appraisal.

Specific Points

2.7.2 - A map would be useful to illustrate the junctions experiencing peak hour congestion as otherwise it is not clear how these issues affect Barrhead South. No evidence of the congestion, or the extent of the queues, delays or other impacts has been provided.

There are inconsistencies with Figure 8 and the accompanying text which need to be corrected (e.g. the A773 is marked on the map but the B773 discussed in text and the B769 is on the map but the A769 is discussed in the text etc).

2.7.4.1 - Figure 10 Barrhead Bus Routes – Is not very clear and therefore does not contribute to understanding of study area.

Discussion around bus journey times would be helpful in order to understand levels of accessibility. In particular, journey times for Barrhead South to Barrhead Rail Station or stations further down the line; and Barrhead South to Glasgow would help to start highlight any accessibility inequalities.

Personal security concerns are highlighted as a major constraint on evening use of public transport however no evidence of this is provided. It is not mentioned in the Consultation Appendix as being an issue (personal security issue due to drug related crime is mentioned, but not that it restricts evening use of public transport). Similarly,
evidence is needed to support claims that local residents are using taxis rather than public transport.

Given the distance between Barrhead South and Barrhead Station, it would be useful to have a better understanding of the bus links between the two areas including total journey times and total cost of travel to Glasgow City Centre. For example, it appears that Barrhead South is linked to the existing rail station via the No. 51 bus service which operates at a 10 minute frequency and approximately a 20 minute journey time thereby providing access to rail services to Glasgow with a total journey time of approximately 45 mins, compared to the direct bus from Barrhead South to the City Centre (No. 3) which has a journey time of around 49 minutes. An understanding of how these journey times/costs compare to other areas around Glasgow would help to set the context and could provide evidence of accessibility issues.

3.3.1 - Reference is again made to “relatively high proportions of taxi and/or minicab usage”. Evidence is required to substantiate these claims. For example, how many people at consultation said it; is it backed up by other data sources, e.g. Census or Scottish Household Survey etc? Also, what is the journey purpose of these taxi trips, are they for shopping, leisure, commuting?

It is acknowledged that there is a significant difference between levels of car ownership across East Renfrewshire with Barrhead South having substantially more people with no access to a car than the local authority average, however the figures for Barrhead South, and the whole of Barrhead, are considered comparable with Scotland as a whole.

3.3.2 - The Travel to Work section infers employment destinations based on the distance travelled to work or study from the 2011 Census. It is recommended that origin-destination data from the Census is used as this will improve the quality of the data.

3.4 - It is stated that safety concerns were repeatedly raised at consultation events yet no evidence has been provided to substantiate this. Appendix A, which provides details of the key issues that emerged from consultation, mentions the stepped lanes being a concern however there is no mention of road traffic accidents or pedestrian access to the country park being a concern of the public.

3.4.1 - Reference is made to Braeside Road – please check the reference as there does not appear to be a street of this name in Barrhead South.

3.4.2 - As commented upon above, Appendix A makes no reference regarding the safety and security concerns around accessing the country park. Is there evidence that demonstrates this is a problem?
Table 9 - The scoring in Table 9 appears to be inconsistent and should be fully reviewed. Bus options in particular appear to score lower compared to other options which has resulted in them being sifted out of the process without due consideration. In several cases the scoring does not appear to be correct. For example:

- the introduction of new bus services to Barrhead South only scores as a minor positive against objectives 1 and 2, however a new bus terminus (but without any service enhancements) scores as moderately positive against the same objectives.
- the introduction of new bus services to Barrhead South is scored as having no impact on the accessibility of the country park for local communities yet surely this would help promote access to the park to people in the Barrhead area?
- linking the M77 and the GSO to Barrhead scores as a moderate positive in terms of sustainable access to the country park – this would improve access for vehicles, but not necessarily sustainable access.
- Cycle options scores as having no impact on addressing the transport inequalities – we acknowledge that the impact would be slight, but there would be a positive impact all the same.

The above is not an exhaustive review of the sifting scoring issues, but highlights some of the issues and the whole table should be reviewed for consistency.

6.5 - As noted under our option sifting comments above, we consider several options have been sifted out of the process too early and that therefore the sifting exercise should be revisited. Bus options in particular are sifted out too early and should be given due consideration on a comparable scale with the other options.

Issues such as revenue funding should not be used to remove options at this stage, the pre-appraisal option generation is to identify potential solutions to the identified problems. Operational and financial issues are addressed later in the process. It should be noted that under the City Deal agreement Local Authorities are responsible for the operation and maintained of the proposals as well as the direct infrastructure costs. This needs to come through consideration of all options.

‘Insufficient demand’ is listed as a reason for sifting out several of the bus options yet no evidence for this has been provided. Given the resident population of Barrhead South, along with the substantial proposed development, it would be expected that a potential demand would exist at this stage in option development. The lack of potential demand for any bus options will also need to be explained in the context of considering the rail option.

Rail Option - The following initial comments highlight some of our emerging thoughts regarding the appraisal and reporting of the rail station option within the report.

Page 78 - The report indicates that a new station at Barrhead South is expected by 2019, however this is not considered to be a realistic timescale taking into account
4.2 – **We consider that** There is a general lack of evidence in the report to substantiate the problems that are highlighted. Before proceeding further, the pre-appraisal sections of the report should be revisited.

4.2.3 - We note the assertion that a new development is categorised in the appraisal as a problem rather than an opportunity. The report should include a clear understanding of what new or improved infrastructure each development is required to deliver through planning conditions. The report should also indicate why the individual and/or cumulative impacts remain a problem following implementation of conditioned improvements.

Table 5 - Whilst Table 5 provides a useful summary of the apparent evidence base used to identify the problems and opportunities, there is little to no detail of this evidence in the preceding chapters.

5.3 - Although the previous consultation is noted, other than a meeting with East Renfrewshire Council, SPT and Transport Scotland in 2013, there has been no consultation on this project for seven years. Even then, the consultation events in 2009 were with specific groups rather than the general public. Additionally the 2009 events appear to have been focussed on the proposed Local Plan and were not specific to issues affecting Barrhead South. Given that consultation is cited as the evidence for a number of the identified problems and opportunities this reduces the credibility that can be attributed to the statements made.

5.4 - In order to be able to comment on the validity of the objectives we need a better understanding of the specific evidence which demonstrates the problems and opportunities which will then lead to the formation of the objectives. In their current form, it is suggested that objective 1 is split in two as it is trying to address two separate issues.

Table 7 - Once the problems have been evidenced and objectives reviewed, Table 7 should present a useful link between the two. The table, in its current form, however does have some issues and should be checked. For example, it is not clear how the lack of high skill and high value employment opportunities in Barrhead links to the Dams to Darnley accessibility objectives.

Chapter 6 - As with the objectives, it is not possible to comment fully on the option generation until the problems and opportunities have been evidenced and objectives established. However, it is clear that the options generated do cover a wide range of solutions across a variety of modes.
the process for delivering a station which includes detailed appraisal work, design, GRIP processes and funding requirements.

**Page 78** - The report suggests that further feasibility studies are required to investigate the impact of a new station on the network/timetabling/overcrowding. Will these studies help support / inform the consideration of the current options or potentially identify new or amended options?

**Page 119** – Within the Demand Forecasting Summary it is suggested that the Neilston Line will require an increase in rolling stock to reduce crowding on services but does not clearly demonstrate the requirements, costs etc. The summary also noted 1.2 minute dis-benefit of journey time but if the Barrhead line is used, the journey time implication should take account of stopping services, increase in footfall at stations, including Glasgow Central Station, and it may therefore be more realistic to use 3-4 minutes dis benefit.

**Page 144** - Cost of station 2016 prices £10.95 million. Operation and maintenance costs are recognised as being an additional factor, however the report does not provide any indicative figures to accompany its packages, as well as any additional costs re rolling stock. See earlier comment under 6.5 on city deal agreement relating to projects financing.

**Page 158** - The report acknowledges that further work is required, and the forthcoming Strathclyde Regional Transport Model will allow improved assessment to be undertaken to consider the impact of the packages identified. When will this additional work be available, and what impact, if any, is the transport model expected to have on the options currently being progressed?

The demand forecasting and crowding analysis for provision of a new rail station at Barrhead South shows that the station would accelerate crowding on the Neilston line. It is suggested this crowding issues may be in part addressed by a flattening of peak demand profile. What are the options for flattening peak demand profile to address crowding issues? How will this affect other services on this route?
From: [Redacted]
Sent: 31 August 2017 08:58
To: [Redacted]
Subject: FW: Updated Barrhead South STAG
Attachments: 170705 ERC Barrhead_STAG.pdf; 170705 Barrhead South STAG Comments Register for issue.docx

Hi [Redacted],

I hope you are well.

I attach an updated copy of the Barrhead STAG report in advance of our meeting and also a comments register which presents the comments you fed back to East Renfrewshire along with the action undertaken to address those comments.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

Associate Director, Transportation
Director of Public Works
AECOM
Aurora
120 Bothwell Street
Glasgow G2 7JS
Tel: [Redacted]
aecom.com

Built to deliver a better world

LinkedIn  Twitter  Facebook  Instagram

-----------------------------
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>This should be treated as a separate document. - Please emphasize the importance of this section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>These are selected consultation findings from previous stages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.3.2   | OD data are now also open to users and the information is now presented in.

**Figure 2**: Shows the flow of traffic and travel time percentages. The text continues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3</td>
<td>There are potential consultation findings from previous stages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4</td>
<td>Information about the current and recent proposal of consultation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.7.4.1 | A short summary of the consultation and data provided. The summary of this.

**Figure 3**: A diagram showing the flowchart of the consultation process. The text continues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4.2</td>
<td>These are selected consultation findings from previous stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4.3</td>
<td>There are potential consultation findings from previous stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4.4</td>
<td>This should be treated as a separate document. - Please emphasize the importance of this section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4**: A detailed breakdown of the consultation process, highlighting key points. The text continues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4.5</td>
<td>Information about the current and recent proposal of consultation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.7.4.6 | A short summary of the consultation and data provided. The summary of this.

**Figure 5**: A comprehensive flowchart showing the consultation process in detail. The text continues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4.7</td>
<td>These are selected consultation findings from previous stages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4.8</td>
<td>There are potential consultation findings from previous stages.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6**: A detailed breakdown of the consultation process, highlighting key points. The text continues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page 76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **This is the introduction for the ERC and working words: what drives the problem for the ERC**

As noted above, the key reason for dropping the options presented in this document is that they are no longer relevant. The purpose of the ERC is to address the technical challenges that are faced by the operators in the field. The options presented in this document are not relevant to the current state of the art, and they are no longer the focus of the ERC.

The options have been reviewed and updated. (Note that it is now Table 12)
| Page 156 | The demand for new products and services is a strong factor in the economy. Now is the time to expand and explore new markets. |
| Page 157 | Companies can also use business case justification to ensure the project is financially viable. The project should be able to prove that it will be profitable. |
| Page 158 | The project management plan is important in ensuring the project is successful. A well-structured plan will help to ensure that the project is completed on time and within budget. |
| Page 144 | The concept model describes the product and how it will be delivered. This model is important in creating a clear vision for the project. |
| Page 145 | The summary model describes how the project will be implemented. The model should be clear and concise. |
| Page 119 | In summary, the focus of the project is on delivering a successful product. The project should be well-structured and well-planned. |
| Page 118 | The focus of the project is on delivering a successful product. The project should be well-structured and well-planned. |
| Page 78 | The focus of the project is on delivering a successful product. The project should be well-structured and well-planned. |
Good Afternoon,

I wonder if you could give me an update on the current situation with respect to the Barrhead South report as we had hoped for a response by the end of October.

Many thanks,

From:  
Sent: 24 October 2017 12:28  
To:  
Cc:  
Subject: RE: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG

We are currently reviewing the updated Barrhead South report and will look to get a response to you by the end of this month. As I am sure you will appreciate we need to consider the detail of any appraisals suggesting the promotion of strategic interventions, such as the new station at Barrhead South, due to potential impacts across the network and it is important that we do so in a robust and consistent manner.

Kind Regards,

Senior Transport Planner  
Tel  
Mob

Transport Scotland, the national transport agency
Cômhdhail Alba, buidheann nàiseanta na cômhdhail

Buchanan House, 58 Port Dundas Road, Glasgow, G4 0HF

From:  
Sent: 24 October 2017 11:36  
To:  
Subject: FW: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG

I wonder if you have had the opportunity to consider my email of 16 Oct (below)?
I hope you can assist. I am Team Leader for East Renfrewshire’s City Deal projects. The Programme Management Office (PMO) has requested all Council’s to provide realistic spend profiles for all the City Deal projects. This is particularly important as we approach the first Gateway review.

My colleague has been dealing with the Barrhead South STAG but he is on leave this week. He updated me before he left to advise that he was still awaiting approval of the STAG to allow us to commission GRIP. As you will understand, ERC has predicted a significant spend on the basis that we enter GRIP during the current financial year.

Could you update me on the position with the STAG and particularly provide me a potential date for approval of the STAG? If you believe there are outstanding issues, can you provide me with these in order that we do everything we can to assist the process?

I would very much appreciate an update to allow me to be confident on our financial profiles.

Regards,

[Name]

Development Team Leader
Environment Department
Tel: [Tel]
Mobile: [Mobile]

East Renfrewshire: Your Council, Your Future
http://www.eastrenfrewshire.gov.uk

Please consider the environment - do you need to print this email?

Information security classification
No marking No special handling practices
PROTECT Protective action required
PROTECT+ Additional protective action required DPA sensitive
From: [Redacted]
Sent: 13 December 2017 11:42
To: [Redacted]
Cc: [Redacted]
Subject: LATIS request form: Barrhead South
Attachments: latis_requestform_barrhead_south.doc

Please find attached a LATIS request form.

Regards

[Signature]

[Full Name]
Associate Director, Strategic Planning & Advisory, Transportation

AECOM
1 Tanfield
Edinburgh EH3 6DA, United Kingdom

twitter.com/aecom

Built to deliver a better world

LinkedIn  Twitter  Facebook  Instagram

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit http://www.symanteccloud.com
Contact Details
Name: [REDACTED]  
Position: Associate Director  
Organisation: AECOM  
Address: 1 Tanfield, Edinburgh, EH3 5DA  
Telephone: [REDACTED]  
E-mail: [REDACTED]  
Your role: Modelling manager

Project Description and Model Use
Q1 Please provide details of the ultimate client for this request for use of the LATIS service.  
East Renfrewshire Council

Q2 Please provide a project title and a description of the scope, aims and objectives of the project.  
Project Title: Barrhead South Transportation Accessibility Appraisal

Scope: to summarise the surface transport problems and possible solutions for the Barrhead South area of East Renfrewshire, including existing communities in Auchenback and West Arthurlie, newly created communities in Springfield and the expected development and growth of the Dams to Darnley Country Park.

Aims and Objectives: The appraisal seeks to reflect the wider impacts of transport solutions upon Barrhead as a whole, including areas identified for economic and social regeneration in the north of the town. The use of the Scottish Transport Appraisal Guidance (STAG) approach to this appraisal supports the determination of transport solutions for identified and/or perceived transport problems, using an evidence base.

As an objective-led rather than solution-led approach, STAG thus avoids pre-conceived solutions being brought forward without first considering other options which may also meet the identified problem or opportunities. The Transport Planning Objectives developed as part of this STAG Appraisal study therefore aim to capture the essence of the evidence-based problems to be addressed and any opportunities being developed.

The Part 1 Appraisal took forward the following options for further analysis:

- Do minimum PLUS Investment in softer measures and Pedestrian / Cycling links;
- Do minimum PLUS Investment in softer measures and Pedestrian / Cycling links PLUS road enhancements including a link from Barrhead South to the M77;
- Do minimum PLUS Investment in softer measures and Pedestrian / Cycling links PLUS provision of a new rail station at Barrhead South with or without a park and ride and with or without a bus terminus

Q3 Please provide a description of how you plan to make use of the LATIS service (e.g. the modelling suite, data sources).
Initial demand forecasting has been undertaken using spreadsheet analysis, including catchment analysis and trip rates for the rail station option. It was always intended that this would be superseded once the SRTM became available. We understand that the Glasgow City Region Deal cumulative impact assessment is now at the draft report stage, and that the option of a station to the south of Barrhead on the Neilston line was included. We would like to make use of the SRTM to forecast the use of the Do Something infrastructure options (road and rail, and potentially bus, depending on model detail). The model would be used to generate all values required by a standard STAG, including TEE, accidents, impacts on public transport loads and road traffic flows etc.

This would require at least two forecast years, ideally with one in 2021/22 and then 2036/37. The land use pattern underpinning this would need to be discussed, but we would require two scenarios: with and without the development of Barrhead South itself, with a defined build-out. ...........................................

Timescales requested by the Client are for updated results by the end of February 2018. ..........................

.................................................................................................................................

Q4  Do you require any training in the use of analytical tools from the LATIS Service (eg TM5/TELMoS or its data)?  

No

Q4a  If ‘Yes’, please detail the type and extent of the training.

.................................................................................................................................

Q5  For the purpose of your request, do you require any changes to the ‘Do Minimum’? (Please see Information on the current ‘Do Minimum’)

Yes

Q5a  If ‘Yes’, please provide details.

Possibly. As discussed above, the Do Min land use scenario will require a specified build out for Barrhead South. .................................................................

Q6  If you require base or forecast year data, please indicate the desired years that you require.

2021 and 2036 ......................................................................................................................

.................................................................................................................................

**Specific Deliverables**

Q7  Please provide a list of deliverables in the table below, providing a description of the task and a desired and latest acceptable completion date for each deliverable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Desired Completion Date</th>
<th>Latest Acceptable Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D01</td>
<td>Provision of full release version of SRTM</td>
<td>5 January 2018</td>
<td>12 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D02</td>
<td>Coding from Cumulative Impact Assessment for relevant schemes</td>
<td>12 January 2018</td>
<td>12 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D03</td>
<td>Forecast years with desired build outs</td>
<td>19 January 2018</td>
<td>19 January 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D04</td>
<td>Any and all relevant analytical tools developed for Cumulative Impact Study eg annualisation factors, spreadsheets for quantifying accidents, TUBA setup etc</td>
<td>12 January 2018</td>
<td>12 January 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q8 How would you have undertaken this aspect of your project had the LATIS service not been available?

In the absence of a regional model, the uni-modal assessments would have had to be refined as far as was practicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of application:</th>
<th>13 December 2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Internal use only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Receipt:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please sign below to confirm that you have read and understood the **LATIS Terms of Use** and the **Guide for Users**. Following completion, please return to LATIS@transportscotland.gsi.gov.uk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I have read and understood the LATIS Terms of Use.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I agree to fill in a LATIS User Satisfaction Survey upon completion of the use of the model.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature: [Signature]  
Print name: [Print name]
From: [Redacted]  
Sent: 09 January 2018 15:31  
To: [Redacted]  
Cc: [Redacted]  
Subject: Barrhead South 171213 - AECOM - ERC - SRTM - Application Form - Approval in principle

Thank you for the application to use the SRTM for the appraisal is the possibility of a new railway station at Barrhead South with possible additions of P&R and a bus terminus.

In principle, the application is approved bearing in mind that this scheme was not a specific objective of the model development. As such, it is your responsibility to ensure the model is fit for your purpose.

Please note that the release version of the SRTM is not yet available. I currently anticipate this to be ready in mid-February [this is not guaranteed]. As the current version is nested with an out-of-date version of TMIS and TELMoS, we would advise waiting for this version of the model to be ready for use.

Happy to discuss further.

Regards

Transport Scotland

From: [Redacted]  
Sent: 13 December 2017 11:42  
To: LATIS Mailbox  
Cc: [Redacted]  
Subject: LATIS request form: Barrhead South

Please find attached a LATIS request form.

Regards

[Redacted]

AECOM  
1 Tanfield  
Edinburgh EH3 5DA, United Kingdom  
T +44-131-3018600  
eaecom.com

Built to deliver a better world  
LinkedIn Twitter Facebook Instagram
We have now had the chance to consider the updated appraisal report and are keen to meet to discuss before we complete our formal written response.

The issues highlighted with the evidence base, objectives and rationale for intervention which we raised in our March response remain largely unanswered. However, we are aware of the potential to undertake further work on the issues and options now that information is available through the Strathclyde Regional Model. We also wish to understand how this appraisal work would fit with potential more detailed work on the rail options.

A meeting in early 2018 between ERC, TS and Network Rail would seem the most appropriate way to take this discussion forward and I would be grateful if you would provide available dates in due course.

Kind Regards,

Senior Transport Planner

Transport Scotland, the national transport agency
Còmhthail Alba, buidheann nàiseanta na còmhthail

Buchanan House, 58 Port Dundas Road, Glasgow, G4 0HF
Thanks

Senior Transport Planner
Strathclyde Partnership for Transport, 131 St Vincent Street, Glasgow, G2 5JF

See attached exchanges which kicked off just before the festive break...

I'll include you in further emails which will look to set a date for the meeting over the next few weeks.

Kind Regards,

Senior Transport Planner

Transport Scotland, the national transport agency
Comhdhail Alba, buidhearin náiseanta na comhdhail

Buchanan House, 58 Port Dundas Road, Glasgow, G4 0HF

Thanks

I agree with your proposed response.
I'll need to get in touch with the Council for update as it's about a year now since they produced their last version of a STAG report and all has gone quiet since then.

have they been back to you recently?

Senior Transport Planner
Strathclyde Partnership for Transport, 131 St Vincent Street, Glasgow, G2 5JF

From: [Name]
Sent: 05 January 2013 11:06 AM
To: [Name]
Cc: [Name]
Subject: Barrhead South 171213 - AECOM - ERC - SRTM - Application Form - Review

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

All,

Sorry, I hadn't realised that I'd not sent this round. As it involved some quite detailed questions I had sent it onto SYSTRA for advice first. I've appended their response.

Overview
East Renfrewshire Council are doing an appraisal of access issues for Barrhead.

The important option (in relation to SRTM use) coming out of the appraisal is the possibility of a new railway station at Barrhead South with possible additions of P&R and a bus terminus.

The most suitable off-the-shelf model available for appraising this option is the SRTM.

Issues
Most of the issues relate to timescale. ERC want results by end of February which in turn means data coming out of SRTM by mid-January. Not a hope.

The current SRTM Do Minimums which we do currently cover all the years needed and were developed before the major corrections made to the hospital land-use which has had a significant effect at the new Queen Elizabeth University Hospital. Whilst the hospital isn't that close to the area, it would be much better to await new Do Minimums.

Recommendation
Approval in principle but with a strong recommendation that they wait for the new SRTM Do Minimum models to be available.

I've copied in [Name] to this as I've been told that [Name] is meeting with ERC sometime in January to discuss this project, I don't know if you know that you're meeting ERC (It's not in your diary), but please let me know if there's anything else we should know about in relation to this application.

Cheers

Transport Scotland

From: [Name]
Sent: 13 December 2017 11:42
To: LATIS Mailbox
Subject: LATIS request form: Barrhead South

Please find attached a LATIS request form.

Regards

Associate Director, Strategic Planning & Advisory, Transportation

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return. Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-a'innichtie a-mhàin. Chan cill e ceadaichd a chleachdadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a' toirt a-steach córaichean, foilseachadh neo sgoileadh, gun cheud. Ma 's e is gun d'fhuair sibh seo gun fhiosd', bu choir cur às dhan phost-d agus leathblreach sam bith air an t-siostam agaibh agus fios a leigil chun reach a sgaol am post-d gun dàil. Dh'fhaodadh gum bi teachaideachd sam bith bho Riaghaltas na h-Alba air a charadh neo air a spreodadh airson deanbhadh gu bheil an siostam ag obair gu h-îseachadh neo airson adhbharr laghail eile. Dh'fhaodadh nach cill beagdhan ans a' phost-d seo co-ionann ri beagdhan Riaghaltas na h-Alba.

Please consider the environment - do you need to print this email?
STRATHCLYDE PARTNERSHIP for TRANSPORT www.spt.co.uk
This communication and any attachments may include privileged, confidential and/or copyright information. It is intended for the "addressee" only. The contents should not be disclosed to anyone other than the addressee. If you are not the intended addressee, please note that any dissemination, distribution or copying of the email and any attachments is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the addressee and have received the email by mistake, please return it to the sender and then delete the email and destroy any copies of it. This email and any files transmitted with it, do not necessarily contain the views of Strathclyde Partnership for Transport.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit http://www.symanteccloud.com

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by Mimecast Ltd

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
From:          
Sent: 02 February 2018 15:20
To:            
Cc:            
Subject: FW: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG
Importance:    High

All –

Happy to confirm that Aecom has advised that [redacted] will attend the meeting on Monday 19th February, 2pm in our Speirsbridge offices.

I look forward to seeing you all then,

Regards,

---

From:          
Sent: 31 January 2018 14:52
To:            
Cc:            
Subject: RE: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG

All –

Could you hold 19th Feb 2pm – 4pm for the moment. I am just awaiting confirmation of a substitute attendee from Aecom.

I should be able to confirm finally tomorrow.

Regards,

---

From:          
Sent: 31 January 2018 12:01
To:            
Cc:            
Subject: RE: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG

From the dates below, 19th PM (after 1300 Spiersbridge or Glasgow) and 20th AM (0930 to 1100 in Glasgow) would appear to fit best with myself and [redacted]
Kind Regards,

Senior Transport Planner
Tel: [redacted] Mob: [redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 30 January 2018 09:26
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG

Good morning,

I understand that the suggested meeting has not yet taken place and, as we are keen to progress this project, I hope that we can get a date in the diary for all concerned to meet in the near future.

I have some suggested dates that suit [redacted] and myself and hopefully some of these dates may suit all involved.

- 13th/14th Feb – AM and PM
- 19th Feb – PM
- 20th Feb – AM
- 22nd Feb – AM and PM

We are happy to host the meeting here in Speirsbridge if that suits everyone.

Can you all advise if these dates suit and hopefully we can get a date confirmed.

Regards,

---

From: [redacted]
Sent: 19 December 2017 09:46
To: [redacted]
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Barrhead South Accessibility STAG

We have now had the chance to consider the updated appraisal report and are keen to meet to discuss before we complete our formal written response.

The issues highlighted with the evidence base, objectives and rationale for intervention which we raised in our March response remain largely unanswered. However, we are aware of the potential to undertake further work on the issues and options now that information is available through the Strathclyde Regional Model. We also wish to understand how this appraisal work would fit with potential more detailed work on the rail options.
A meeting in early 2018 between ERC, TS and Network Rail would seem the most appropriate way to take this discussion forward and I would be grateful if you would provide available dates in due course.

Kind Regards,

[Name]

Senior Transport Planner
Tel: [Number] Mob: [Number]

TRANSPORT SCOTLAND
CONNDAIL ALBA

Transport Scotland, the national transport agency
Còmhdaill Alba, bùidheann nàiseanta na còmhdaill

Buchanan House, 58 Port Dundas Road, Glasgow, G4 0HF

**************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************************

This e-mail (and any files or other attachments transmitted with it) is intended solely for the attention of the addressee(s). Unauthorised use, disclosure, storage, copying or distribution of any part of this e-mail is not permitted. If you are not the intended recipient please destroy the email, remove any copies from your system and inform the sender immediately by return.

Communications with the Scottish Government may be monitored or recorded in order to secure the effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes. The views or opinions contained within this e-mail may not necessarily reflect those of the Scottish Government.

Tha am post-d seo (agus faidhle neo ceanglan còmhla ris) dhan neach neo luchd-a’innichd a-mhàin. Chan eil e ceadaichte a chleachadh ann an dòigh sam bith, a’ toirt a-steach còrachd, foilseachadh neo sgoilteachd, gun cheadh. Ma ‘s e is gun d’fhuaire sibh seo gun fhiosd’, bu choir cur as dhan phost-d agus lethbhreach sam bith air an t-siostam asaibh agus fios a leigeil chun neach a sgoil am post-d gun dàil. Dh’fhaoadadh gum bi teachdaireachd sam bith bho Rìoghaltas na h-Àlb a’ chlàrachd neo a grudadh airson dearbhadh gu bhile an siostam ag obair gu h-bheachdach neo airson adhbar laghail eile. Dh’fhaoadadh nach eil beuchdann ansa a’ phost-d seo co-ionann ri beuchdann Rìoghaltas na h-Àlb.
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