



# Ontario Report

## Transport 2000 Ontario

### IS METROLINX ON THE RIGHT PATH?

*Editorial:* After a two month delay, Metrolinx's Regional Transportation Plan will be unveiled September 27th. There is no question as to what the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTAH) requires. It needs a regional rail network that is electrified with frequent all-day two-way service, a network mainly using existing railway rights-of-way. This is the kind of regional rapid transit that is found around the world in cities such as Madrid, Sydney, Berlin, and Zurich, to name a few outstanding examples. This regional transit system would be coordinated with, and linked to, local public transit at the regional network's many stations. The region's expanded and intensified public transit systems should also be linked across city boundaries enabling seamless mobility for all manner of more localized travel.

...continued on Page 2

### RAIL LINK TO PEARSON AIRPORT REVIVED

What will be done for the Weston community?

In July, SNC-Lavalin again started talks with the Province about its proposed express train service between Pearson Airport and Toronto's Union Station. Originally called Blue-22, the express train would take passengers between the airport and downtown Toronto in 22 minutes for \$20, with service every 20 minutes. There would be one other stop at the Bloor subway. Strong opposition to this service developed in Weston. Community groups were concerned because Blue-22 trains would travel at high speed through the heart of their community, crossing local roads at grade through a relatively dense mixed commercial and residential area. Weston is a stop on GO Transit's commuter rail service between Toronto and Georgetown on CN track.

The airport train service was initially proposed

...continued on PAGE 2

### FROM THE PRESIDENT NATALIE LITWIN



**TTC's Eglinton LRT.**  
In late July, Transport 2000 Ontario was surprised by a dust-up between Metrolinx and the

TTC over a transit project for Eglinton Ave. Eglinton, a major east-west artery that crosses the city from Scarborough to Mississauga, is part of Toronto's Transit City concept of Light Rapid Transit (LRT) along major arteries. These modern versions of the streetcar

can run as single vehicles or trains of 2-4 cars on their own rights-of-way. They can achieve subway speeds and have a capacity of up to 150 passengers in each car. LRT is considered an excellent, lower cost alternative to subway technology and is popular in Europe.

The argument between Metrolinx and the TTC revolves around the technology for the proposed Eglinton line – a very long route of 31 km. linking the Kennedy TTC station in the east with the Pearson Airport and the Mississauga Transitway in the west. Metrolinx Chair, Rob MacIsaac argues that this very long line needs faster and heavier rail to carry passenger the full

### In this Issue

- Meet David Leibold
- Toronto Low-floor Streetcars
- VIA Rail News
- Kitchener-Waterloo LRT
- Electric Car in the News
- Cell Phones and Driving
- High Speed Rail News & Views
- Membership Information

length of the route in a reasonable length of time. The TTC stands by its LRT plan.

Debate on public infrastructure is healthy and we are going to wade in. We have great respect for Rob and his crew, but on this issue we beg to differ. Eglinton's projected LRT has enough capacity

...continued on PAGE 2

**FROM THE PRESIDENT**

...continued from PAGE 1

for the demand that is lower than that of the Yonge or Bloor lines. Its rapid transit service will offer transportation that is midway between express and local service to riders who will travel on portions of the route. Almost nobody will travel the entire route so the length of time argument is moot.

Those who need to travel across the middle of the city require a regional, GO-type service and that, we believe, can be built at reasonable cost using existing freight rail lines. A CP Rail corridor that runs south of Eglinton between Milton and Oshawa is a good candidate for a regional line that has the potential to connect with lines to Pearson airport. Transport 2000 Ontario has been calling for some time for decision-makers to upgrade existing Toronto area freight lines, with CP's and CN's cooperation, to serve regional transit. It's worth serious study. Is anyone listening? ■

**IS METROLINX ON THE RIGHT TRACK?**

...continued from PAGE 1

Achieving these two goals deserves the highest priority. If Metrolinx can't deliver at this basic level, it will not succeed as a regional transportation agency. Transportation demand management is no substitute. Unless a region-wide rapid train service is offered in combination with improved local transit, people will not have an alternative for many trips now taken by car, and the region will not become transit-oriented. Achieving the goals outlined above will require major new

public financing, with funds redirected away from highways. That's the cost of catching up to the places we admire for their public transportation such as Barcelona or Tokyo.

More fundamentally, with the cost of gas skyrocketing, we need high quality regional rapid rail and complementary urban transit to keep mobility in the future affordable for all. That also helps curb global warming. And the transit-oriented city region will also act as a magnet for new private investment that will rebuild urban spaces in ways that augment density, community, jobs, and cultural life. There is much at stake in Metrolinx following a model of building regional mass transit that has already been successfully accomplished in many other of the world's urban regions. For most of the GTA/H that also means not using costly underground construction or the adoption of costly proprietary technologies. ■

**RAIL LINK TO PEARSON AIRPORT REVIVED**

...continued from PAGE 1

as a private-public partnership in 1999. The airport link became part of GO's environmental assessment (EA) required for improvements to the south end of the Toronto-Georgetown rail corridor. Local opposition increased when, at the public meetings held in Weston in 2005, planning documents revealed proposed overpasses or underpasses, and trenching the CN rail line (but not the CP freight rail line in the same corridor), all having in common huge cement structures grossly out of scale given the surround community. The Province responded by start-

ing the EA process over again as an Individual EA, an EA process that vanished at the end of 2006.

Two circumstances appear to have combined to bring the airport rail link back to life. The first is that the grade separation where the CN crosses the CP at West Toronto Junction is well underway. The second is that there is now an expedited EA process in place that applies to GO rail improvements.

Two concerns need to be addressed by the Province regarding the airport rail link. If express rail track is to be built on the Toronto-Woodbine portion of the corridor, then a low-impact design needs to be offered to Weston. One alternative is to raise both the CN and CP track through Weston so that road and foot traffic can pass under all tracks. These bridges should be built using the low-profile designs found elsewhere in Toronto (see accompanying photos). The goal would be no land take through Weston for this project.

The second concern that should be addressed regards the rail service itself to the airport. Before Blue-22 came along, GO Transit proposed train service to the airport. With GO Transit building a third track on the Toronto-Woodbine corridor, some critics of Blue-22 see this as an indirect subsidy to a private operator. The arrival of Metrolinx, with its mandate for developing regional transit, also changes the picture. In any regional rail system for the GTA/H, the Toronto-Georgetown rail line should quickly evolve into a regional rapid train service with frequent all-day two-way service. Residents on the west side of Toronto have long

hoped for additional GO train stops such as at Parkdale, Bloor, Mt.Dennis, and Woodbine. Clearly frequent GO trains on the Toronto-Georgetown route need to be complemented with a connection at Woodbine to the airport. Whatever service goes into Pearson airport, it should be connected with GO Transit at Woodbine at its regular fares, whether or not there is also a premium fare express service to and from downtown Toronto. ■



CPR low-profile bridge at Dovercourt Rd.

## MEET BOARD MEMBER DAVID LEIBOLD



David Leibold's involvement with Transport 2000 Ontario extends back to the late 1980s. He grew up in southwestern Ontario,

his family living in several towns, his parents now in Ingersoll. David recalls many trips by train on the north main line to Toronto to visit relatives, trips such as between Stratford and CN's West Toronto station in the Junction area of Toronto. David graduated from the Computer Science pro-

gram of the Math faculty at the University of Waterloo. During David's years at Waterloo, its computer science program was in the forefront of computer programming development; his years at Waterloo also bridged the shift from main frame computers to the micro-computers and servers of today. After completing university, David moved to North York but worked in York region. Using transit to get to work, David experienced first hand the difficulties in the Toronto area in trying to travel between areas served by different transit agencies. In 1998 David moved to Ottawa where he continued to work in the computer field including overseeing the development of computer software products.

One of David's hobbies is travel. David doesn't own a car and has relied on all forms of public transportation to visit every province in Canada, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories, and major parts of the U.S. Besides traveling on VIA and Amtrak, he has travelled with Greyhound and other bus companies, going to such far flung places such as Whitehorse and Yellowknife by bus, and by VIA to Churchill. A benefit of ground transportation, he notes, is not only scenery and the sense of geography that it brings, but also the social experience of meeting fascinating people as travel companions. Rail and bus travel are generally enjoyable experiences of their own, he acknowledges.

David's record of advocacy work over the years is outstanding. He has served on the Transport 2000 Ontario Board for many years. He edited our newsletter for many years succeeding John deWit, held the position of Vice-President, and was President from

1998 to 2004. He is currently the webmaster of Transport 2000 Canada. David does much volunteer work for the National Office in Ottawa, supports light rail transit for Ottawa, and is also involved with the group Canadians for Responsible and Safe Highways. David's dedication as a volunteer is gratefully acknowledged with thanks from all. ■

## TTC SEARCHES FOR THE 100% LOW-FLOOR STREETCAR

The Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) calls their light rail transit plan for Toronto its Transit City Plan. It's an excellent plan. It seeks dedicated streetcar rights-of-ways on a network of Toronto's arterial roads. Modern low-floor streetcars will provide both high capacity for carrying transit riders and a high quality ride. The public wins all around. This kind of fast streetcar service is acquiring a new name around the world - the rapid streetcar. It is right for Toronto because it is affordable and relatively quick to implement compared to subway building which has huge costs, takes years, and is only justified by rush hour needs to move 25,000 people or more per hour per direction.

Currently, the TTC is seeking to replace its life-expired streetcars that run in mixed traffic with 100% low-floor streetcars now common in major European cities. The TTC put out a tender some months ago. The manufacturer Siemens decided not to submit a bid, leaving the TTC with only two bids, one from Bombardier, the other from a small British company. In mid-July the TTC announced that no bids were compliant with its specifications. With tendering terminated, the

...continued on PAGE 4



## TTC LOW-FLOOR STREETCAR SEARCH

...continued from PAGE 3

TTC has begun a round of talks with major builders regarding its specifications. Among its difficult requirements are tight radius curves on legacy streetcar lines, its use of single-point rather than double-point switches (as used in Europe), and the required ability of one streetcar to push or pull a disabled car up an 8% grade.

Transport 2000 Ontario wonders if some of these specifications might be reconsidered? We support the low-floor design. Rebuilding switches so that they are double-point, while costly, could be done. Could the requirement to push a disabled car up an 8% grade be altered? Where this is a problem, could not some other solution be found such as a special purpose vehicle that might be used for just such situations? ■

## VIA RAIL NEWS

**VIA revenues up.** On August 1, VIA Rail Canada reported an increase of 6.7 per cent in total passenger revenues for the six-month period ending June 30, compared with the same period in 2007. The number of passengers traveling on VIA's network increased by 9.7 per cent in this year's first half. The biggest increase was registered in the Quebec City-Windsor Corridor, which carried 10.3 per cent more people than last year.

**North Main Line Improvements Planned.** Long overdue track and other improvements to VIA's route between Toronto, Guelph, Kitchener and London may begin soon. On August 2, the *Kitchener-Waterloo Record* reported that negotiations for significant

improvements were close to being concluded with the track owner, the Goderich-Exeter Railway. There would be upgrades to track, sidings, and signals to reduce trip times and prepared for more trains than the three trains per day now operated by VIA on the route. Paul Langan, Transport 2000 member, was quoted as saying that this is "great news" that "Our line is finally going to join the modern age with faster trains." Train advocates in Kitchener-Waterloo have been frustrated by the slow pace in modernizing this important rail line in one of Ontario's busiest travel corridors. ■

## KITCHENER-WATERLOO NEWS

### Public gets it right on LRT.

After five public meetings since June, it is clear that residents of the Kitchener-Waterloo-Cambridge region strongly favour light rail transit over busways. Some proponents of buses have tried to paint this public reaction as succumbing to the glitz for trains. But the public input suggests otherwise. LRT has a strong record across North America's urban regions of all sizes for providing fast, reliable, and comfortable transit that cannot be matched by buses, even express buses. While initially more costly to build, the long-term lower costs over bus systems pays for the difference.

Three other factors make LRT the better choice for Kitchener-Waterloo. First is the need to move away from dependence on fossil fuels to electricity for transportation. Second is the greater potential for stimulating development along a transit route. Finally, LRT has established its superiority in getting people out of cars and switching to transit. An LRT

trunk route serving major activity centres will strengthen the use of the local bus network as patrons are more likely to continue with trips on a bus if one segment is provided by LRT.

### Greyhound problems in downtown Kitchener.

Jeff Outhit of the *Kitchener-Waterloo Record*, in an August 16 article, suggests that Greyhound be accommodated at the transit terminal in downtown Kitchener. In a protest over the rent and commissions it has had to pay, Greyhound has established a new passenger and parcel terminal at Sportsworld Drive far south of the downtown, a location with infrequent local bus service. It still uses platforms at the transit terminal, but patrons must have exact change to purchase tickets from drivers, or disembark at Sportsworld to purchase tickets, slowing up service. Outhit suggests a deal helpful to Greyhound is worth the cost to provide the public convenience of an intermodal terminal which is also closer to the destinations of many of the users of the Greyhound, in particular university students.

**GO Rail instead of a ring road.** George Bechtel of Kitchener reports that residents of New Hamburg, 15km west of Kitchener, are fighting a proposed new ring road around their town that would affect some 50 farms in the area. Instead they would prefer to see GO Transit use Baden, 5km to the east, as the storage facility for GO train equipment and possibly a station. GO Transit is considering commuter train service to Kitchener with a storage yard at Breslau, about 5km east of Kitchener where a large park-and-ride facility could also be built. No firm plan for GO service to Kitchener has been announced. ■



## ELECTRIC CAR UPDATE

As electric car technology develops, readers need to keep in mind the difference between low-speed electric vehicles (LSV), usually of smaller and light weight design and modest driving range, and the quest to convert larger sized automobiles, that we now use everyday, into vehicles that would be run by electricity. LSVs generally do not meet all the safety requirements set for motor vehicles federally, and thus Transport Canada has tried to keep them out of mixed road traffic. However, Transport Canada adds that it is up to the provinces to decide where LSVs can operate. BC and Quebec allow LSVs on public roads up to 40kph, and BC allows municipalities to set the limit up to 50kph. Both Ontario and Manitoba are studying allowing LSVs on public roads.

One example of an LSV is the ZENN car offered by the ZENN Motor Company headquartered in Toronto. Its two-person two-door hatchback has many of the amenities of larger cars such as comfortable suspension, radio, air conditioning and sunroof options, a maximum speed of 40kph and a range of 50km using nickel metal hydride batteries. ZENN will adopt more powerful lithium batteries, and is experimenting with capacitor storage of electricity.

General Motors has announced its Volt plug-in electric sedan car for 2010 using lithium-ion batteries, and Toyota will likely introduce a newer version of its Prius hybrid car in 2010 also with plug-in lithium batteries. There is concern that between the use of lithium for cell phones and laptops, the world's limited

amounts of lithium might not sustain mass conversions to electric vehicles using lithium batteries. Transport 2000 stresses the need to work towards higher density land use, better public transit, and a network of fast and frequent train service to complement the road network we already have.

(Source: Electric Mobility Canada website; consult their electric car technology update study.) ■

---

## WHO KILLED THE ELECTRIC CAR? (Review)

With the worst air quality in the U.S., and aware that General Motors (GM) had an experimental electric car, in 1990 the California Air Resources Board (CARB) ruled that by 1998, 2% of cars sold in California had to be zero-emission cars, rising to 5% in 2001 and 10% in 2003. In response the auto industry actually began offering electric vehicles (EVs), but only on leases. GM lead the way with its EV1; electric cars were also offered by Ford, Honda, Toyota and Nissan. Then in 2003, the CARB changed its mind and dropped its zero-emission plan. The automakers began recalling their EVs; by March of 2005 every GM EV1 had been scrapped and shredded (except for one body shell donated to a museum). How the electric car vanished (for a second time; see following article) is the subject of *Who Killed the Electric Car?*, a documentary written and directed by Chris Paine and distributed by Sony Pictures (2006; available on DVD).

Though carmakers began building electric cars, about 1995 carmakers and big oil mounted a campaign to reverse the CARB fleet replacement plan and to scare the public away from EVs. Early on they were successful in getting the CARB to agree to limit fleet

turnover to the demand for EVs. Then consumer demand was diminished through negative marketing that highlighted the limitations of EVs. Finally, at the national level, the Bush government delivered a billion dollar program to develop a hydrogen fuel cell car that would be superior to EVs with range limited by their batteries. The Bush government even joined the automakers and oil companies in a law suit against the CARB. The fuel cell car just around the corner was a main factor for CARB abandoning electric cars.

Suspects in the demise of EVs in California include: consumers; batteries; oil companies; car companies; government; CARB; and the hydrogen fuel cell. Each is analysed in depth including going over arguments for and against. The verdicts? Take a look at the documentary. Batteries are exonerated though even consumers bear some of the blame.

Had California stuck to its zero-emissions fleet plan of 1990, it might have lead the way to a transport revolution in ground mobility. Of course the hydrogen fuel cell revolution never came about either. Now, ironically, carmakers are back at designing electric cars. At the end, the documentary mentions that one business that has sprung up in California after the first hybrid cars appeared was the conversion of hybrids for adventurous souls to all-electric plug-ins. One might conclude that the viability of mass produced electric cars was the proverbial genie out of the bottle once hybrids appeared, thanks to the Japanese persistence in getting hybrids to market so as to gain a competitive advantage over their U.S. competition. ■



## EDWIN BLACK'S INTERNAL COMBUSTION (Review)

Edwin Black is a forensic journalist noted for in-depth explorations of primary sources in order to shine light on murky episodes of corporate and government actions not in the public interest. His latest book, published by St. Martin's Press in 2006, deals with how America became addicted to oil for its transportation and discarded viable alternatives. Much of the book's attention is focussed on how the electric car was defeated in the early decades of the 20th century. For a brief period the electric car challenged gasoline-powered cars for private transport. Some important dates: lead-acid battery, 1859; electric lighting, 1882; electric streetcars, 1888; electric car in Philadelphia, 1894; oil discovered in Pennsylvania, 1859; first practical gasoline engine, 1885; first gas station, 1905; Ford's Model T car, 1908.

The turn of the 20th century was an era of robber baron capitalism marked by stock manipulations and frauds, the rise of cartels and monopolies, and the misuse of patent litigation to drive competitors without deep pockets out of business. Black describes how a bicycle manufacturing monopoly joined forces with a battery monopoly to form a cartel to build electric cars. The cartel soon also acquired a key but dubious patent on the internal combustion engine. Using this patent, the cartel focussed on restricting gas car building to a few firms that produced expensive vehicles for wealthy city dwellers. It failed to improve batteries, build a network of charging stations, and market the

electric car. The window of opportunity closed as Henry Ford began mass production of cheap gasoline autos, eventually defeating the bogus cartel patent in a long court battle. This is a very short version of the complex story that Black tells.

Two other chapters are of note. One discusses aborted railway electrification in the U.S. In another chapter, Black takes up the conspiracy to kill the electric streetcar in U.S. cities during the 1940s and 50s. The conspirators were GM, Firestone, Mack Truck, and several oil companies that operated through the holding company National City Lines (NCL). In 1947 they were convicted in an landmark case of conspiracy to monopolize the bus industry "by creating a network of transit companies that were" required to use the products of the defendants. Black's researchers conducted an extensive investigation of primary sources, likely more than any other scholar to date, in order to judge how transit was reshaped at mid-century. He found that GM was hard at work promoting transit conversions to buses starting in 1921.

Black concludes that GM was not responsible for killing mass transit in America, but that it certainly tried. At trial NCL produced a list of cities it was considering for transit acquisition and conversion to buses. The conviction may have slowed down NCL, but by the 1950s scrapping trolleys and buying new buses was considered progressive. Private mass transit lay in ruins as a consequence of multiple events including previous willful fleecing and manipulation of transit, letting physical plant run down, the ex-

plosion of car use and suburbanization. That electric transit was allowed to slip away was also the result of both negligent public policy and public attitudes that let it happen. Oil triumphed. ■

---

## PHONING AND DRIVING DON'T MIX

The Ontario government is planning, at long last, to introduce legislation restricting the use of cell phone use by drivers. In doing so, Ontario will join a small group of provinces with a ban: Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and Quebec. The existing bans are limited to hand-held cell phones which in our opinion is a timid and incomplete solution to a very dangerous activity. Heartbreaking stories abound, and the ones in which young children are killed when a parent is driving while chatting on a phone are good reason to take much stronger action.

Way back in 2001, Transport 2000 Ontario published a position paper with the title: *Phoning and Driving Don't Mix: A Case for Banning the Use of Wireless Devices in Moving Vehicles*. In our research for this report, we found one study that was particularly important and often quoted. Donald Redelmeier and Robert J. Tibsharani in the *New England Journal of Medicine* of February, 1997, found that the risk of collision quadrupled when a telephone call was made minutes before the impact. Equally significant was the fact that no safety advantage was found in the use of hands-free as opposed to hand-held devices. The Insurance Bureau of British Columbia agreed with the latter finding.



There can be no doubt that talking on a telephone while driving is a serious distraction. At times serious business and personal matters increase the distraction and place the driver, passengers and nearby vehicles in grave danger.

Transport 2000 Ontario recommended in its position paper and still recommends:

- That the Ontario Highway Traffic Act be amended to forbid the use of all wireless telephones, internet devices and fax machines by drivers in moving passenger cars, trucks and taxis, whether hand-held or hands-free;
- That, in the face of possible resistance from the provincial government, municipalities pass by-laws banning the use of the wireless devices listed above (in case, as we expect, only hands-on devices will be banned by the province); and
- That exceptions be made for police, fire, ambulance and other official vehicles that use dispatch radios.

On August 14, we sent an e-mail letter to the Minister of Transportation asking that the upcoming cell-phone legislation be strengthened to require all calls be made or received after the driver has pulled over and parked.

We will continue to be active on this issue. - Natalie Litwin ■

---

## HIGH SPEED RAIL.NEWS

**California.** High speed rail in California took another step forward when, on August 27, 2008, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger signed a Bill altering some language in a Proposition in support of a state bond issue to be

used to build high-speed rail between Sacramento and San Francisco, and Los Angeles and San Diego. The new language insures that all high speed rail corridors will have an equal chance to compete for a share of the US\$9.95 billion bond money. The changed proposition also insures US\$950 million for improvements to rail services that connect with high speed lines. Also included are new taxpayer protections and cost controls. The California Legislature must now determine the date on which the proposition is to go before voters, with many hoping that it will be on the up-coming November 4 ballot. ■

---

## VIEWPOINT ON HIGH SPEED RAIL FOR NORTH AMERICA

By Ken Westcar, Transport 2000 Ontario HSR Committee.

The British have an interesting term, "The man on the Clapham omnibus," describing a casual spectator of life. Travel gives one the ability to observe and to ask questions, including the frequently heard: "Are we there yet?" Indeed, a recent rail journey from Kiel, Germany, to London, England, convinced me that we, in North America, are most certainly not there yet.

The trip segment from Frankfurt to Paris in the front coach of the needle-nosed ICE train was a unique experience. It is difficult to describe the sensation of traveling smoothly and quietly at 320km/hr at ground level. Adding to this was the fact that a clear glass partition separated the driver from the passenger compartment and the access door was left open. It was therefore possible to actually share

the sights and sounds of driving the train. Apparently, Europeans have decided that it's important to showcase their technology and add value to the passenger experience.

As Europe rapidly expands its high speed train network giving people options to flying and driving, one wonders about where North America is headed? The infrastructure deficit in North America is reckoned to be almost \$2 trillion. Successive governments have ignored this, preferring instead to spend money on killing people, subsidizing dying industries, biofuels and other such tragic frivolities. Vote-buying tax cuts abound while construction equipment lays idle. High-paying jobs and expertise continue to disappear.

But on a high-speed train, you are reminded that travel is more than just sterile highways and financially precarious airlines. Perhaps this is why just about every country, except English-speaking ones, is making high-speed rail a travel option. Indeed, airlines are using high-speed rail to feed their long-haul airport hubs instead of short-haul planes. Contrast that with North America, where anyone mentioning a penchant for Amtrak or VIA Rail is considered, well, er, odd.

Yes, studies have been done here for high-speed rail, but they gather dust. Ask any politician why this mobility option never sees the light of day and the old chestnuts of population distribution/density and demand roll out of the fire. If they represent a riding dependent on the auto sector for jobs, or have strong highway or airport construction lobbies,

...continued on PAGE 8



**VIEWPOINT ON HIGH SPEED RAIL**

...continued from PAGE 7

this subject would be considered utterly taboo.

And yet voters in cities like Windsor and Kitchener-Waterloo, where the departure of the auto sector and flattening of the tech sector threatens long-term economic decline, might now have a different view. Perhaps they would understand that sustainable jobs and economic renewal are facilitated by modern railways and that city centre and urban decay are largely avoidable if they are served by something other than grid-locked, crumbling highways, infrequent, clapped-out trains and distant airports. Not convinced? Just look at Leeds or Sheffield in the United Kingdom. They were doomed as post-industrial cities but now thrive as commercial centres, largely because of good rail connections. Similar examples abound in many post-industrial economies.

My ICE train and the track it was running on were indicative of the future of mobility in the rest of the world. These are not big-boy toys, but tools to keep the countries in which they run highly competitive and resilient in a rapidly changing world. The Europeans and Asians have figured that out. Attractive and functional passenger spaces, through-ticketing, cooperation with airlines and reduced journey times, are driving ridership gains. While our elected representatives use the demand argument negatively, other countries struggle to cope with it.

The man on the Clapham omnibus has indeed come a long way. Casual observation has evolved into deeper thought. That we North Americans are "not there

yet" on our journey can no longer be dismissed as mere nuisance from a few concerned passengers. It is now quite clear that we are being left behind in the new world economic order. Sharecropping courses, anyone? ■  
(A longer version of this opinion article appeared in the *Woodstock Sentinel Review* on July 29, 2008)

**BOARD MEETINGS**

Transport 2000 Ontario Board Meetings are usually held evenings on the 3rd Wednesday of the month (no July or August meetings). We meet at 215 Spadina Avenue, Toronto. If you wish to attend, please contact Natalie Litwin by e-mail at [n.litwin@sympatico.ca](mailto:n.litwin@sympatico.ca) or call 416-498-0612 to confirm date, time and place which is subject to change. The September meeting is to be held exceptionally on the 10th. ■

Transport 2000 Ontario Report  
ISSN 1713-6539

Editor: Tony Turritti  
([turritti@hotmail.com](mailto:turritti@hotmail.com))

Contributions of news and items are welcome. We are looking for correspondents. Submissions, including articles and letters, are subject to acceptance and editing. Statements in this publication are those of the respective authors and are not official policy which is approved by the Board of Transport 2000 Ontario. Thanks to all who have helped out with the newsletter: David Leibold; Natalie Litwin; David Scott; Ken Westcar, George Bechtel, and Jim Goss.

**CONTACT AND MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION**

Transport 2000 Ontario: Working for environmentally, socially and economically sustainable transportation policies and actions.

E-mail: [ontario@transport2000.ca](mailto:ontario@transport2000.ca)  
Mailing address: Box 6418, Sta. A, Toronto, ON M5W 1X3  
Telephone: 416.504.3934 or toll free long-distance 1.866.542.1067  
Fax number: 416.410.9999. Or contact our President: 416.498.0612.

Join Transport 2000 to help us advocate for sustainable transportation. By joining Transport 2000 Ontario, you also become a member of Transport 2000 Canada. Members receive Ontario *Report*, as well as our national newsletter *TransportAction*.

To join, send your name, address, telephone number, e-mail address (if any), and membership fee to our box address above. Our annual membership fees are: introductory (1st year only) \$20; regular \$35; senior \$30; student \$25; low income \$20; family \$50; non-profit affiliate \$75; business \$170. Transport 2000 Canada is a registered charity and donations to it receive a tax-credit receipt.

Our website is [www.transport2000.ca/ontario](http://www.transport2000.ca/ontario). A membership form is available at this website.