



# Ontario Report

## Transport 2000 Ontario

### METROLINX TRANSPORTATION PLAN WRAPPED UP

After two months of public outreach following release of its draft plan, on Nov. 28, the Metrolinx board approved its first official Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Held at the Toronto Convention Centre to accommodate a large crowd there for the occasion, the Board's first order of business was to hear from consultants about the substantial economic and social returns that would flow from the RTP's proposed \$50 billion investment over the next 25 years for the Greater Toronto Area and Hamilton (GTAH). The returns would flow from major congestion reduction and health, community and social benefits of a more efficient transit system. In short, the region can't afford doing nothing and continuing to choke on traffic congestion. With the stage thus set, the next order of business was to roll out the transportation plan itself, entitled "The Big Move: Transforming ...continued on PAGE 2

### SAULT/ALGOMA - TIME RIGHT FOR RAIL SERVICE REVIVAL

It's time for a better passenger train deal for the north. That was the message from a town hall meeting held in Sault Ste. Marie on Thursday, Nov. 27, at Shingwauk Hall at the City's newly independent Algoma University.

Over 90 interested residents from the Sault and surrounding areas crowded into the meeting room, decorated with reproductions of Group of Seven paintings of the Algoma region, to learn how to make rail passenger service a reality. Coalition for Algoma Passenger Trains (CAPT) Co-Chairs, Al Errington and Marie Price, and past CAPT Co-Chair, Linda Savoury-Gordon opened the meeting explaining that their recently incorporated not-for-profit group was formed to address deterioration in the currently operating Algoma Central Railway (ACR) and to revitalize connector lines, including returning passenger train ...continued on PAGE 4

### FROM THE PRESIDENT NATALIE LITWIN



**Roads to Congestion.** Way back in 1986, David Plane wrote an essay entitled "Urban Transportation: Policy

Alternatives," in which he presented a graphic description of his Black Hole Theory of Highway Investment. He created a spiral that illustrated the following circular series of events: Highway congestion ➔ Public pressure to

add capacity ➔ Capacity is added ➔ Travel is easier ➔ Urban sprawl is encouraged ➔ Average trip length increases ➔ Number of trips rises ➔ Further congestion ➔ Public pressure to add capacity ➔ And on and on it goes.

Our sprawling GTA has conclusively proven the truth of this simple theory and its related truism, "Build it and they will come."

In recent years, Ontario's Ministry of Transportation has, to its credit, recognized the need to contain sprawl by investing in transit. The transit portion of its budget has risen from 5% to 40%. Then MTO created Metrolinx with its powerful commitment to regional transit and transit sup-

### In this Issue

- Board Member Bruce Budd
- Ontario News Roundup
- Alternatives to Hwy 407 East Extension: Press Release Summary
- Part 1: High Speed Rail in Spain - The Trip Time Revolution
- Transport 2000 Ontario Contact Information

portive land use. Just when things were going swimmingly, the roadies stepped in.

In the implementation section of *The Big Move*, Metrolinx' title for its final regional transportation plan, was a paragraph entitled, *Strategic Improvements to the Highway and Regional Road Network*.

...continued on PAGE 2



### Season's Greetings from your Board

Left to right in photo: Peter Miasek, Gordon Woodmansey, Dan Hammond, David Scott, Natalie Litwin, Anthony Rubin, Tony Turrittin, and Doug Wilson; also greetings from Jim Appleby, Bruce Budd, Richard Crawford and David Leibold.

### FROM THE PRESIDENT

...continued from PAGE 1

It specified expansion of Highway 407 East into Ontario's Greenbelt, as well as additional lane kilometres to Highways 401, 404, 427, and 410. There are also plans for arterial road widenings and extensions to the municipal road system.

These additions fly in the face of the goals of the RTP and we suspect that the 400 series highway additions were imposed on Metrolinx from above.

In our response to *The Big Move*, we strongly expressed our concern that the demand and benefits analysis of expanded highways was not brought up-to-date as is required for rapid transit projects. Furthermore, this expenditure on roads removes billions of dollars that could be invested in public transit and causes the RTP to fail to achieve any GHG emissions reduction.

The expansion of the regional highway network is a serious barrier to the sustainability goals of the RTP. Transport 2000 Ontario will persevere in its opposition to this backward step.

(David Plane's essay may be found in the first and second editions of Susan Hanson, ed., *The Geography of Urban Transportation*, 1986, 1995, published by Guilford Press.) ■

### GTAH REGIONAL PLAN

...continued from PAGE 1

Transportation in the [GTAH]."

The final report projects a vision, goals and objectives for the future of the GTAH for the next 25 years. These include less driving and less congestion even with a 50% growth in population. There will be a much higher portion of trips by transit, more walking and cycling, greater satisfaction with the regional transportation system, 100% accessible transit, a single fare card, greener transportation and corresponding reductions in emissions and pollution. The RTP outlines ten strategies to achieve the plan's vision, goals and objectives that include priority actions and supporting policies. Briefly, the strategies include a regional rapid transportation network, expanded active transportation, improved efficiency of the road network, a transportation demand management program, a customer-first transportation system, integrated transit fare system, building communities that are pedestrian, cycling and transit supportive, universal accessibility, improved goods movement, and a commitment to continuous improvement.

Achievement of the above strategies is based on nine priority actions that give rise to the title of the report, the big moves, up from the eight outlined in the draft plan. The added big move is the revitalization of Union Station, a belated recognition of the importance of this focal point for much of the regional rapid transit network proposed by Metrolinx. The big moves are: (1) a fast, frequent and expanded regional rapid transit network; (2) high-order transit

connecting Pearson Airport from all directions; (3) an expanded Union Station; (4) a walking and cycling network; (5) an information system for travellers; (6) a region-wide integrated fare system; (7) mobility hubs; (8) a comprehensive strategy for goods movement; and (9) an investment strategy to provide stable and predictable funding.

Transport 2000 Ontario has long advocated a regional rapid transit system for the GTA based on existing rail corridors. Some of this will happen. The 15-year plan of the RTP envisages an express rail system on GO's Lakeshore route from Hamilton to Oshawa, and from Union Station to Brampton. Regional rail is envisaged from Union Station to Markham, to Richmond Hill, to Bradford, to Milton, and between Brampton and Georgetown. Express rail is defined as faster than regional rail (fewer stops), but both are marked for all-day, two-way service. Also envisaged are added peak hour services usually as extensions of existing GO routes. One lengthy new route is planned, this being peak hour service for the CP Rail route east-west north of Dupont Street in Toronto to Agincourt and eastward.



Transport 2000 has also advocated electrification of regional rail in the GTA. The RTP describes express rail as typically electric, and the Province previously announced electrification for GO's Lakeshore route. Regional rail is described by the RTP as either diesel or electric. The scant references to electrification in the RTP refer only to the Lakeshore line.

The RTP describes itself as a conceptual document. It describes a range of alternative transit technologies that mainly differ in terms of their carrying capacity and whether grade-separation is needed. How, then, will a route and transit technology be determined for any particular segment of Metrolinx's system? Such determinations will be made by a Benefits Case Analysis (BCA) done by consultants working jointly with Metrolinx and the relevant municipal government and transit agency. Environmental assessments will no longer compare technological choices and will largely stick to mitigations.

Originally a separate document, the Investment Strategy (IS) has been folded into the RTP. As critics have pointed out, there is really no investment strategy in the RTP. What the GTA will get is what has been already funded, the Quick Win projects, and the 15 projects which are part of the Province's Move2020, costed at \$17.5 billion with one-third of the monies to come from the feds in Ottawa. A plan for stable and predictable funding is put off in the RTP to 2013. Critics have noticed that what this does is delay consideration of dedicated revenue streams for Metrolinx capital and

operating costs that might come from a variety of sources utilized by governments elsewhere (such as in B.C. and Quebec), sources such as car registration fees, percentages of sales taxes, and the especially political hot potato of road tolls and congestion charges. Besides no real IS, there is also no real plan for goods movement to be found in the RTP (it's on their "to do" list).

The 15-year projects -- express rail: Hamilton-Oshawa, and Brampton-Union Station; regional rail: Pearson-Union Station, and the CPR crosstown route; subway extensions: Downsview-Vaughan, and Finch-Richmond Hill-Langstaff Gateway; other elements: Hamilton BRTs, BRT on Hwy 407 Halton-Durham, BRT connections north, west, and south of Pearson, most of Toronto's Transit City plan, Scarborough RT replacement and extension, Hurontario LRT, and more. The 25-year projects -- express rail Langstaff Gateway-Richmond-Hill-Union Station, and Cooksville-Union Station; also a downtown Toronto relief subway.

There are projects funded outside of the Metrolinx budget that are at various stages of progress. These include the Mississauga transitway, Union Station-Pearson rail link, the subway to York University and beyond, and Brampton's AcceleRide program. BCAs have been completed for York's VIVA program, and for the Shepard East LRT, so both of these are ready to go in 2009/2010. Other BCAs underway include: GO Lakeshore express rail, Yonge North subway extension, the Scarborough RT extension, Eglinton crosstown, and Finch LRT.

Other remaining top 15 projects should have BCAs begin shortly.

We can anticipate several controversial issues. The first is the Yonge Street corridor. Is a North Yonge subway line extension needed since a GO rail express route is planned for the same corridor north of Steeles? In the RTP the Eglinton crosstown is labelled higher order transit. Toronto wants this to be LRT and has the ridership modeling to support its choice of technology. Will the City prevail given that Metrolinx once pronounced it would favour a different technology? How will express rail to Brampton and Pearson be threaded through Weston to the satisfaction of the local community there? Will Union Station be up to receiving the additional rail patronage envisaged by the RTP compared to GO's original projections? How will CN and CP be successfully brought into the regional rapid transit plan given that they own much of the track to be used and use some of it for freight trains? It should be noted that there is no rail rapid transit planned for crossing the top of the GTA. Transit users in this broad corridor will have to make use of buses on Highways 401 and 407.

Finally, the highway extensions being planned by MTO for the region fly in the face of the Metrolinx plan by massively encouraging more sprawl. Their cost is excluded from Metrolinx's long term capital projections thus helping to close off public debate about where the region should concentrate its scarce capital resources. Metrolinx reminds us that public transit has been starved for capital and operating funds for decades. ■



## MEET BOARD MEMBER BRUCE BUDD



Long-time Transport 2000 member Bruce Budd has rejoined our Board. Bruce grew up in Toronto's east

end. He obtained a BA in Commerce and Finance at the University of Toronto. Bruce worked summers for TD Bank, including a summer for the bank in Quebec City. After graduating from university, he continued his studies in Paris, France, came back to Quebec City where he worked briefly for the Quebec government, then returned to Toronto. He was Director of Finance for OPSEU from 1980 to 1985. Beginning in 1986 he held various positions with the Ontario government dealing with employment standards and pay equity, retiring in 2007.

While stopping the Spadina Expressway was a major turning point that kept Toronto a transit-oriented city, it should be recalled that a network of expressways was planned for the Toronto area, including the Scarborough expressway through Toronto's east end. Bruce was chair of a coalition of 17 groups along this planned expressway that fought against it. Richard Soberman had been asked to assess the need for the expressway. With the Spadina expressway cancelled, the proposed expressway network fell apart and Soberman declared that there was no demand for the Scarborough expressway, recommending that it not proceed. Bruce also recalls in

the early 70s opposing building an airport on the Leslie Street Spit.

Transport 2000 Ontario was formed in 1979 with Don Bradbury as its president. Bruce was one of the founding members and became its president the following year, followed by being vice-president. Because Bruce was fluent in French, he often appeared in the French media on behalf of T2000.

In rejoining our Board, Bruce brings his considerable skill in strategic planning and innovative thinking regarding how Transport 2000 can make an impact on transportation policy. Given the recession, and government consideration of major infrastructure investments to stimulate the economy, Bruce believes inter-city rail should be an investment priority. In the Windsor-Quebec City corridor, track and signal improvements, and new cars and locomotives would permit more frequent and faster service that would expand VIA's market substantially, leading the way to eventual high speed rail. It's a possible major project for Transport 2000 in the New Year. ■

---

### SAULT/ALGOMA: TIME FOR BETTER PASSENGER TRAIN DEAL

...continued from PAGE 1  
service between the Sault and Sudbury. The ACR, owned by CN, runs north from the Sault passing through many small communities, including those of the First Nations, on the way to its terminus at Hearst. Harry Gow, past president and founder of Transport 2000, was the keynote speaker at the meeting.

Harry and the audience discussed how reinstating the pas-

senger rail link between the Sault and Sudbury would simultaneously address economic, environmental and personal health challenges. On the economic side, the service would stimulate tourism, as the only means of accessing the Sault currently are by plane, bus or car. Train access to the Sault would support tourist trips currently run on the ACR line to the scenic Agawa Canyon, remote resorts, canoe routes and snowmobile trails. There is also an opportunity to further showcase the magnificent landscape that inspired the Group of Seven to visit and paint this region. A connection to Sudbury could attract tourists from as far away as Toronto. Today's tourists are looking for ways to explore environments without the stress and risks of driving great distances.

The strategic location of the Sault on St. Mary's River between Lake Superior and Lake Huron, in addition to being on the American border, and having access to marine, rail, and highway transport, makes it an ideal location for a key transportation hub. This strategy is being pursued locally as part of the Multi-Modal Sault Ste. Marie. Further investment in the rail system would support both freight and passengers. Environmentally, passenger train service would also reduce greenhouse gas emissions (from car and plane travel) and also prepare the region for peak oil. Access to passenger rail service is very important in terms of accessing specialty medical services. Adding passenger rail, would give patients further options in reaching important medical appointments.



Harry Gow recounted how he had travelled on the now defunct Sault-Sudbury passenger train in 1959. At that time, it was possible to travel all over Ontario, Michigan, and Illinois by train. Freight now runs slowly on the Sault-Sudbury line called the Huron Central, and the track is in poor condition. Genesee Rail, the owner of Huron Central, has called for government investment in the line. Other provincial governments such as British Columbia, Saskatchewan, Illinois, Quebec, and Nova Scotia, Manitoba, Michigan, Wisconsin, New York, Ohio have all supported regional rail services. So, why not Ontario? The forum participants were frustrated to hear from Harry Gow that the Ontario Ministry of Transportation's focus is singularly on the expansion of the province's highway system. The forum wrapped up with Harry Gow encouraging audience members in their continued campaign to secure passenger rail service to Sault Ste. Marie.

To contact the Coalition for Algoma Passenger Trains (CAPT), please email at [info@captrains.ca](mailto:info@captrains.ca), contact Lori Middaugh at 705 949 2301 ext 4320 or visit the website at [www.captrains.ca](http://www.captrains.ca).

- Nairne Cameron ■

## ONTARIO NEWS ROUNDUP

Prepared by Jim Appleby

**Service deterioration to residents of Parry Sound.** As reported in the last newsletter, the schedule for VIA Rail's *Canadian* has changed. Service to and from Parry Sound occurs in the middle of the night and only three times a

week per direction. As a consequence, access to sheltered station waiting rooms is no longer offered. In October, the Ontario Northland (O-N) local bus service between Toronto and Sudbury was also changed. The three daily buses through Parry Sound were reduced to two, one afternoon and one after midnight. Eliminated was the morning service in both directions. Because the late night service mimicked the new *Canadian* schedule, and was as inconvenient, public outcry persuaded O-N, in November, to adjust the late night service to late evening. Still, there is no early morning service offered to and from Toronto or Sudbury. In August, completion of the final leg of the 'twinning' of highway 69 to Parry Sound was completed, the road becoming a 400 series highway south to Toronto, making personal car use more convenient! And, although Greyhound travels between Toronto and Sudbury on its transcontinental service, no passenger stops are allowed between these points because franchises restrict offering local bus service to the O-N exclusively on this route. There is no Ontario public transportation policy that would help the folks in Parry Sound other than more roads.

**Canadian Urban Transit Association (CUTA) annual meeting.** CUTA's annual meeting in Windsor in November made the news. The *Windsor Star* reported on Nov. 12 that CUTA asked for a national transit strategy that "would allow transit authorities across Canada to better plan for their growth and improve service to their riders." Michael Roschlau, President of CUTA, told the asso-

ciation's members that the current system of ad hoc funding from all levels of government and the large regional differences in the support of transit across Canada prevents transit from reaching its full potential.

### **Windsor gets a "D" grade.**

As the Canadian Urban Transit Association was winding up its successful annual meeting in Windsor, the Appleton Charitable Foundation in its GreenApple Canada Report ranked the city 20th out of 27 getting a grade of "D" as one of the least 'green' cities in Canada. The *Windsor Star* reported on Nov. 14: "While Windsor's international truck traffic was a contributing factor, the study's lead author pointed to the lack of mass transit and riders, little bicycle use and few hybrid taxis or buses as being much larger factors in the city's poor ranking."

**GO Transit may purchase more track.** GO Transit CEO Gary McNeil told the *Toronto Star* (Dec. 12) that the transit agency is considering purchasing more track from CN and CP in order to improve existing commuter rail services and add new service. GO owns three portions of track, from Pickering to Oshawa, from the Lakeshore East line to Stouffville and Lincolnville, and from Steeles Avenue through Aurora to Barrie South. The latter two routes, totaling 35km, were purchased from CN in 2000 for about \$14 million. The cost of acquiring routes such as the Lakeshore line will require negotiation because many of the improvements on this line, such as the program to add a third track, have been or are being paid for by GO. More express trains on the Lakeshore will start Jan. 5; half-hour train service throughout the day may start in 2010. ■



## ALTERNATIVES TO HWY 407 EAST EXTENSIONS

On Nov. 12, Transport 2000 Ontario joined with SHIFT, a coalition of 12 environmental groups, to hold a press conference at Queen's Park to question the eastward extension of Hwy 407 as proposed by the Ontario Ministry of Transportation (MTO). In Feb. 2007, the Ministry proposed four options. The first was a "do nothing" option that relied on already planned provincial, regional and local road widenings. Combination Option 1 included these road widenings plus transportation demand management measures, enhanced public transit, and increased intermodal rail shipments. Combination Option 2 consisted of less transit than Option 1 but added more regional road widenings. Option 3 included Option 1 plus up to 70km of 407 freeway extensions.

MTO concluded that Option 2 fell well short of Option 1. Option 1 was a significant improvement over "do nothing," but was declared to be deficient in that some screen lines were 1-7% over capacity in 2031. Option 3 was recommended despite screen line traffic volumes being only 73-78% of capacity in the eastern leg.

T2000 and SHIFT's position was that MTO's modeling was deficient because various assumptions were biased towards requiring more road capacity for cars. For instance, modeling was based on 2001 traffic survey data; now the public is more positive toward public transit. Gas prices were assumed to increase at the rate of inflation. Telecommuting was underestimated compared to numbers used by Metrolinx. Percent of ride sharing was lower than assumed by Metrolinx. Freight di-

version to intermodal shipping was assumed to be a modest 7%.

MTO's evaluation process is much narrower than the Benefit Case Analysis applied to Metrolinx transit projects which includes costs of accidents and health impairment from passive transport.

It is possible that updated modeling will show that Combination Option 1 is now viable. Or, an option with no freeway construction, but construction of new regional roads in the protected corridors might be viable. Or, scaled-down versions of Option 3, such as a shorter/alternate freeway extension, or construction of a 407 transitway only might be shown to be viable. For example, it is particularly difficult to understand why the eastern leg of the E-W corridor that runs in the Clarington Greenbelt is needed, given the low screen line traffic volumes. Time for MTO to seriously consider its highway bias for the sake of real balanced transportation options. ■

## High Speed Rail in Spain to Connect All Regions

**Introduction:** Below is the first article of a three-part series prepared by Avrum Regenstreif on the development of high speed rail (HSR), concentrating on Spain as a case study. This article focuses on "elapsed travel time," showing that HSR has achieved its success by being competitive with air travel in the 1980s for intercity distances up to 500km, but now for distances up to 1300km. Subsequent articles will address relative cost, comfort and convenience of HSR, followed by an examination of energy efficiency and related issues of environmental sustainability.



Talgo HSR train on Madrid-Barcelona route near Sagides (Soria). Photo by Carlos Pérez Arnau (2006).

## Part 1: High Speed Rail and the Trip Time Revolution

With high speed trains already a reality in Japan starting in 1964, by the late 1970's, transport planners were recommending that, for intercity travel in most major western European countries between cities less than 400-500 km (250-300 miles) apart, higher speed electrically powered passenger trains were a better choice than flying. Many advocated this approach for the Boston-Washington corridor in the US, and for the Quebec-Windsor corridor in Canada, but with limited success, given the lack of railway electrification (the exception being the US electrification between New Haven, CT and Washington, DC).

In Europe, by the 1960s, railways began to try to remain competitive with air travel by creating a network of fast first-class trains. The Trans-Europ-Express (TEE) network provided prestigious day trains with names such as SNCF's Mistral (Paris-Nice), DB's Blauer Enzian (Hamburg-Munich), or FS's Settebello (Rome-Milan). British Rail developed a network of InterCity 125 high speed trains in the 1970s. Some of these trains achieved speeds of 160-210 kph (100-125 mph). Real high speed rail (HSR) arrived with France open-



ing up its first dedicated high speed line between Paris and Lyon in 1981, but also in Italy in 1981, Germany 1988, Spain 1992, Belgium 1997, and in the UK in 2003 (the Chunnel opened in 1994). Commercial speed of the early TGV was 260 kph (160 mph), which allowed a two-hour travel time for the 425 km distance on the new TGV Paris-Lyon route (later raised to 300 kph).

In the three decades since 1981, several changes have occurred to move the limit of 500 km for HSR competitiveness upward to 1200-1300 km. The first of these was the very substantial technical improvements in European train and lightweight train set design, train cab communications, as well as right-of-way design and construction, with broad based introduction of these new techniques and systems within France, Germany, the Low Countries, and more recently Spain. The second event was the impact of 9/11/2001 which substantially increased total elapsed travel time by air by negatively transforming airline operations in response to security concerns. There is a third factor, and this is continued, intensified railway network electrification. Significantly, electrification means that this mode of transportation can quickly take advantage of new renewable sources of energy because electric railways do not require fossil fuels for most of their energy needs. Let's turn to Spain as our case study.

The most, ambitious, contemporary program for building HSR is Spain's plan to provide a three hour rail travel time to Madrid from all directions, meaning being able to traverse this highly moun-

tainous country end-to-end in six hours or less. Madrid and Seville (471 km) were linked by HSR in 1992 at up to 280 kph. This corridor was extended from Madrid to Barcelona (689 km) this year operating at over 300 kph.

At present, the 1160 km. AVE (*Alta Velocidad Española*) HSR system from Barcelona to Seville is Europe's longest and fastest high speed rail corridor, with an elapsed travel time centre to centre of 5¼ hours. By comparison, a domestic airbus trip of up to 1300 kms of flying requires 5¼ - 5¾ hours, total elapsed time, centre to centre. This is the case in North America, as in most large cities in Europe. As such it includes travel to and from airports, check-in, security clearance, boarding and taxiing time as well as disembarking on arrival, and baggage clearance. This represents an overall average travel speed of 200-247 kph, which is currently exceeded or equalled by AVE HSR train sets with maximum operating speeds of 302 kph.

With the prospect of completion of the next 145 km extension of the Seville-Barcelona corridor to Figueres (near the border with France) by 2010, total trip distance from either Seville or Malaga to Figueres will be just under 1300 kms, for a total elapsed time of less than 6½ hours. Here, HSR has an obvious advantage since many cities the size of Figueres do not have large airports.

On this major corridor, RENFE, the train operator and marketer, and ADIF, the railway infrastructure manager for the Spanish state railway system, have developed a fully operational, comfortable, affordable, HSR sys-

tem with better operating quality and standards of speed, safety, comfort and convenience than any medium haul airbus. We are using the more and more common term "airbus" to describe large commercial passenger aircraft carrying 400 passengers or more at air-speeds of 810-891 kph increasingly used on flights up to and beyond 1200 km.

Evidence of changing consumer preference for the 300 kph AVE HSR over airbus travel was dramatically demonstrated with the 2008 opening of AVE service between Barcelona and Madrid in 2½ hours, city centre to city centre. For many years, the modal split between air and rail travel between Spain's two largest cities has been consistently 80% air and 20% rail, even with the half-hour to an hour trip to or from the airport at both ends, downtown to downtown, one to two hour check-in, one hour flight between the cities, and up to a half-hour to offload baggage giving a total elapsed trip time from at best 2½ hours to at worst 4½ hours. On the older TALGO express train service, via Taragona, Lerida, Zaragoza, Catalayud and Guadalajara, trip time at its best was 6½ hours. With the completion of the AVE line in 2008, and with many trains per day running steadily at speeds up to 300 kph, the modal split ratio has now been reversed dramatically to 20% airbus, and 80% AVE. This repeats the experience of SNCF in France when it introduced an expanded TGV HSR service between Paris and Marseille in 2001.

On the seville-Barcelona corridor, RENFE has continued to  
...continued on PAGE 8



## SPAIN, HSR RAIL & THE TRIP TIME REVOLUTION

...continued from PAGE 7

maintain high quality service and affordability to the many urban areas situated along the this HSR route with as many trains serving the 6-7 smaller cities along the corridor, as those serving only the three or four major city rail stations of Seville, Cordoba, Madrid, and Barcelona. ADIF has also created a major corridor branch to Malaga from Cordoba which has the same high speed operating characteristics as the main HSR route itself. It is now possible to travel by AVE from Madrid to Malaga in close to the same elapsed time as by AVE from Madrid to Seville.

In addition, a new AVE HSR branch line has recently been opened from Madrid to Valladolid, beginning an important new connection from Madrid to the north and northwest regions of Spain. Finally, ADIF is currently taking proposals from major rail infrastructure contractors for a design-build project to complete a new high speed corridor from Madrid to Lisbon, Portugal, via Caceres. This line is approximately the same length as the Barcelona-Madrid link. This major international infrastructure project, linking the two capitals, will involve shared cost funding between the EU, Portugal and Spain. The HSR line will also offer a new, "environmentally sustainable gateway" to Western Europe by HSR, with potential to cross Portugal and Spain, over land, in a little over 6 hours total elapsed time, on an interoperable line compatible with the rest of Europe's high speed network. The link between Barcelona into France via Perpignan is expected to open in 2013.

Finally, Spain is making huge efforts to generate electricity using solar and wind power in addition to its extensive network of 400 small and medium size hydroelectric dams across the country. Electrified high speed rail in Spain will thus be able to achieve both a low carbon footprint and be sustainable as well.

*Dr. Regenstreif is a retired architect, urbanist, and consultant in energy management. He recently visited both Spain and France. ■*

## BOARD MEETINGS

T2000 Ontario's Board usually meets evenings on the 3rd Wednesday of the month (no July or August meetings). We meet at 215 Spadina Ave., 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. ■

## Transport 2000 Ontario Report

ISSN 1713-6539

Editor: Tony Turriffin  
([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: Natalie Litwin, Jim Appleby, David Scott, Nairne Cameron, Peter Miasek, and Avrum Regenstreif.

## 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 *Transport Action*.

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.