

MetaCDM multimodality

Roger Gardner/Lynnette Dray

MetaCDM workshop 2

12th November 2013

Multimodality - Literature Review

- Only mixed success for use in past major disruption
 - Other modes are often disrupted too (e.g. by snow)
 - Problems with lack of spare short-notice capacity in other modes
 - Not a solution for all passengers/flights – e.g. transfer passengers may need visas to exit the airport
- Passengers often switch modes by themselves when faced with major disruption
 - Depends on having the knowledge and equipment to do this
 - Information about whether costs can be reimbursed is often unclear

Multimodality – Interviews (1)

- Other modes already involved in airport contingency planning
 - Rail providers involved, passengers can be redirected to metro/buses but poorer connection with highways
 - However airports do initiate ‘dot matrix’ road sign warnings and taxi-share schemes
 - Airlines organise coach service for diversion response and passenger accommodation
 - Protocol established at one location to use contingency high-speed rail in crisis situations on domestic routes
- Ground transport providers tend to lack immediate updates on crisis information

Multimodality – Interviews (2)

- Also covered in training/exercises by
 - Ground transport operators
 - Government (e.g. national exercises also involving highways)
 - Some cross-agency table-top exercises but too little inter-agency engagement on full exercises
- Some local authorities can initiate diversion routes and/or city-level control responses in the event of airport access problems
- Problems with unifying/linking systems across organisational boundaries, information and data compatibility