Viability of water transport for passenger movement in Kochi

Sneha George, Naina Gupta

INTRODUCTION TO STUDY AREA



Kerala is one of the very few states blessed with a **wide range of water bodies** and Kochi is one among the few cities of Kerala that has access to these water bodies and there is a proposal for **an integrated water transport system** in Kochi. So the city should take advantage of the available water bodies and use them for sustainable transportation.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The reasons for the **decline of water transportation** are many. The **commissioning of bridges**, most notably the Goshree bridges that opened in the 2000s has led to people choosing roadbased transportation modes over water transportation. There seems to be a preference among the citizens for door to door connectivity in this area where rains are a constant possibility. **The levels of service delivery in the ferry system have failed to keep up with the expectations of the general public**.

GAPS IDENTIFIED

Even though water transport is highly praised by the public of kerala and even though it has **2-3 times lower travel time** compared to roads, people prefer using other modes of transport. Why is that? Very few studies have been done on water transport.



KOCHI

To critically analyse the usage of water transportation as a service for Urban Passenger transport in the city of Kochi

STUDY METHODOLOGY



sment		•
and t		
	 	 •
r transport operator survey		
Overall trip characteristics		
	 	 •••••
avel time ratio		
ffer area increase		
		•••••
		-

LITERATURE REVIEW

	Basic odch in mode cho hypothesis	Major Dice modelling for constraints	n Major r education trips: a Accenstus y of Indi drawbacks	an metropolitan city (Ashu Shivkuma	r
ANN model Mode share an	Inspired by Human Neural System nd choice beha	Performance depends on architecture, training, and activation viounction	Difficult to interpret the result in terms High of natural alangleage		
logit modelling i can better res rhativalodel inpu develop a fuzz education trips,	able transportations s used to analyse semble humber htsliptilinguistic exp cy(Typgid Dased which make u	nede choice, l helenvioury chy oressions, This stu- mode choice in the significant	Household income Trip length accepting dy gims to model for share of	nience	
GEV model	Across various inc Multivariate extreme value distribution	ome groups in Independent, but not identically distributed error terms	utility of any alternative should not exceed an upper bound		
Planning and evo	aluation of passer	ger ferry service	in Hores Kong (CEDER, 2006)	Fuzzy logic model	
Fuzzy set Designed a plan procedure on ha and pier resource	Based on underlying ning upptionacht co w tormake the bo esibility	Input values ombined with an estructures estructure of the exis	ability and difficulty in Origin evaluation bestingtign ting water hipare for travel function (tuning time	Mamdani Approach	
The process inclu	uded steps starting	g with	(funing) inplime		
Calculate avg. (dtfly:pévizs, Co model Ferry travel tim evaluation.	Origin Destination alcutate WT , Calcu complement e to determine each other	(OD) for peinle of the peinle	off peak , framework. Manosafety different NF Stability models caple t size be compared with models		
Demand is proje modal split and r eigneissioo chebde	cted for the horiz opinion survey Normal distribution	ofingederMNL is us isoconducted and non- independently distributed	sedific find midtopptraination of results. Computation al problem& initiation Mainline mode Mainline mode	uired in each vessel best PT competitor	

The paper has done fuzzy logic mode choice model to calculate the income impact on mode choice. Similarly the effect of different parameters on modal shift can be analyzed using fuzzy logic

Advantages • Initiative Destinction • Well-suited to human input Fare for fravel • More interpretable rule base Waiting time • Have widespread acceptance Trip time Comfort of travel

- Better chairs
- More safety
- Stability
- Fleet size
- First mile mode
- Mainline mode
- Last mile mode
- Walking time to station
- Minimum frequency required in each vessel
- Minimum travel time for best PT competitor

SELECTION OF STATIONS FOR THE STUDY



Route	Route_length(km)	
1	1.80	
	1.53	
3	3.05	
4	0.90	
5	3.81	
6	13.84	

	Jetty name	Daily total boarding alighting	
1	Ernakulam	8170	
2	Fort kochi	6550	
3	Wellington island	2450	
4	Mattancherry	1850	
5	Vypeen	1600	
6	High court jetty	515	
7	Pizhala	330	·!
8	Vytila	300	
9	Kakkanad	300	
10	Chittoor	283	
11	Mulavakadu panchayat	257	
12	Thandonithuruth	225	
13	Varapuzha	190	
14	Mulavakadu north	110	
15	Eroor	100	
16	Kadamakudy	80	
17	Poonari mangalam	75	

Detailed Project Report, Kochi water metro 2015

STATION ANALYSIS





PEAK HOUR - EKM FK ROUTE







- Ticket counter in dilapidated condition, fungus growth on walls
- Not enough lighting at the station making it difficult for passengers night movement and security
- Overall infrastructure of the building is really poor with no maintenance at all

CATCHMENT AREA





EXISTING LAND USE OF BUFFER ZONE AT EKM STATION

PROPOSED LAND USE OF BUFFER ZONE AT EKM STATION



- City Centre/Sub Centre
- Community Centre
- Industrial (M2)
- Open Space
- Public & Semipublic
- Residential
- Transportation
- Water Bodies
- Wetland

20 18 16 14 12 DEMAND VS SUPPLY 10 demand 8 supply 6 4 2 0 ernakulam fort kochi vytila fort kochi embarkation evening peak morning peak

5 spupsnoy 4.5 3.5 2 3 2.5 2 1.5 0.5 0 01-12-2022 06-12-2022 11-12-2022 16-12-2022 21-12-2022 26-12-2022 31-12-202 EKM-Vypin Ridership — EKM-FK Supply — EKM-Vypin Supply EKM-FK Ridership

PEAK HOUR DEMAND SUPPLY GAP





MODE CHOICE MODELLING

STEP 1: MODEL INPUT AND

OUTPUT PARAMETERS

STEP 3: FUZZY RULE BASE FORMATION

Age			
<18	[0 0 18]		
18-30	[16 23 32]		
30-45	[29 37 47]		
>45	[39 65 65]		
Inco	me		
<10	[0 0 12000]		
10-20	[7500 14000 22000]		
20-30	[18000 26000 35000]		
30-50	[31000 41000 53000]		
>50	[47000 70000 70000]		
Trip le	ngth		
Very Low	[0 0 1.5]		
Low	[0.5 2 4]		
Medium	[3.5 8]		
High	[6 8 10]		
Very High	[9 15 15]		
Travel cost			
Very Low	[0 0 15]		
Medium	[12 20 30]		
High	[45 60 80]		
Very high	[60 150 150]		
Comfort			
Low	[0 0 3]		
Medium	[2 4 6]		
High	[5.5 10 10]		

Waiting Time			
Very Low	[0 0 4]		
Low	[2.5 4.56.5]		
Medium	[5.5 7.5 9.5]		
High	[8.5 10.5 12.5]		
Very High	[11.5 25 25]		
Travel Time Ratio			
Low	[0 0 0.6]		
Medium	[0.5 0.75 1]		
High	[0.9 3 3]		
Output-Mode			
Walk	[0 0 1.5]		
3 wheeler	[1 1.5 2]		
2 wheeler	[1.5 2.5 3.5]		
Ferry	[2.5 3.5 4.5]		
Metro	[3.5 4.5 5.5]		
Bus	[4.5 5.5 6.5]		
Car	[5.5 7.5 7.5]		

37 rules defined

ULE BASE ON STEP 4: DEFUZZIFICATION PROCESS OR VALIDATION OF RESULT

- 1. If (Age is 1) and (income is <10) and (Trip length is Very low) and (Travel cost is Very low) and (Comfort is Low) and (Waiting time is Very low) then (Mode is Walk) (1)
- 2. If (Age is <18) and (income is <10) and (Trip length is Medium) and (Travel cost is Low) and (Comfort is Low) and (Waiting time is Low) and (Travel time ratio is Low) then (Mode is Bus) (1)
- 3. If (Age is <18) and (income is <10) and (Trip length in High) and (Travel cost is High) and (Comfort is Medium) and (Waiting time is High) then (Mode is Metro) (1)
- 4. If (Age is 30-45) and (Income is 30-50) and (Trip length is Medium)d (Travel cost is Very high) and (Comfort is High) and (Waiting time is Very low) and (Travel time ratio is Medium) then (Mode is Car) (1)
- 5. If (Age is 18-30) and (income is 30-50) and (Trip length is Low) and (Travel cost is Very high) and (Comfort is High) and (Waiting time is Very low) and (Travel time ratio is Medium) then (Mode is Car) (1)
- 6. If (Income is 10-20) and (Trip length is Medium) and (Travel cost is Very low) and (Comfort is Low) and (Waiting time is Medium) and (Travel time ratio is High) then (Mode is Ferry) (1)

DATASET VALIDATION



				1	
PARAMETER	EXISTING CONDITION	SCENARIO 1	SCENARIO 2	SCENARIO 3	SCENARIO 4
WAITING TIME	20	20	15	15	12
COMFORT	LOW	MEDIUM	MEDIUM	HIGH	HIGH
FARE	6	8	10	12	15



TESTING DATA SET VALIDATION





PREDICTED MODAL SHARE



CONCLUSION

- Public usage of water transport is highly dependent on the multimodal connectivity
- As there is a great amount of travel time saved using the water transport instead of by road all different mode users are interested to shift but • accessibility to the station is found to be the major problem in second with the infrastructure
- Major shift as observed are the 2 wheeler passengers followed by the auto and bus users.
- High likelihood of increased ridership if the infrastructure is enhanced and waiting times are minimized •
- In existing public transport services itself interconnectivity showed increase in the modal share of the service stressing on the fact that this is one • of the most important factors leading to increased PT ridership. This interconnectivity when designed further has the potential to further boost ridership and make water transport a preferred mode of travel.

THANK YOU

