



## Economy 1nc

Passenger rail doesn't cause economic boom, costs outweigh Staley 9(Sam, director of urban growth and land use policy for Reason Foundation, "Why High-Speed Rail Fails as a Jobs Program," August 18 ,<http://reason.com/archives/2009/08/18/why-high-speed-rail-fails-as-a>) Of course, rail proponents argue that spending money now on high-speed rail is a long-term investment that will pay off in higher economic productivity over the long-haul. But these job creation and income estimates they use are based on spending for freight rail, not passenger rail. **Freight rail in America is a crucial part of our transportation infrastructure, accounting for 43 percent of the shipment of goods and services from one city to the other.** Thus, investments in freight rail have a direct impact on the bottom line for American businesses, increasing the speed and reliability of goods shipment and improving productivity. Passenger rail in the U.S. is a different story. **Passenger rail currently carries a very small portion of city-to-city travel**—the market targeted by high-speed rail—and it's likely to remain modest well into the future. In 2008, Amtrak carried 28.7 million passengers. By comparison, there were 687 million airline passengers in 2008, in part because air service provides frequent high-speed travel to geographically distant cities. Then there's our well-developed highway network that makes automobiles very competitive with rail for distances under 200 miles. In most cases, once travel and wait times to train stations are factored in, travelers will spend as much time in route on the train as they will in a car. Consider a trip from Los Angeles to San Francisco, or Chicago to St. Louis, for a typical high-speed train traveler. You'll likely have to drive to the train station and pay to park. Once arriving in downtown St. Louis or San Francisco, you will likely have to take a taxi or rent a car to get to your hotel or meeting place (which is likely to be outside the central business district). The reliable, diverse, and nimble transit system that many advocates envision surrounding high-speed rail stations simply doesn't exist in most cities today, limiting the appeal of trains. To compensate for these disadvantages, taxpayers will have to steeply subsidize train ticket prices for the business travelers and tourists that are most likely to use them. Ultimately, highspeed rail's impacts on American travel patterns and employment productivity are going to be negligible, and the actual job creation potential for high speed rail is much more modest than proponents admit

## Economy 2nc –

No econ gain No short-term stimulus effect –HSR will take decades to complete Stegemeier 10– Retired Chairman and CEO of Unocal (Richard, "Richard Stegemeier: High-speed rail economics bleak," Feb 15, <http://www.oregister.com/articles/speed-234453-high-rail.html>) High-speed rail is a wonderful concept because it uses electricity and could reduce our dependence on fossil fuels sometime in the distant future. But it's also far more expensive than commercial airlines and will require a new source of electricity from solar, wind or nuclear power. The president assures us there will be no pork in the \$3.8 trillion federal budget for 2011. That may be true if we ignore the proposed \$2.3 billion high-speed-rail grant for California. An undetermined amount of that money would be spent as a down payment on a

\$42.6 billion proposal to connect Anaheim with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's San Francisco and Los Angeles with Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid's Las Vegas. That's an "oink-oink" if I ever heard one. I can understand the Las Vegas high-speed link to accommodate the thousands of Californians who want to flee to Nevada to escape California's high taxes. High-speed rail as part of a short-term economic stimulus package is nonsense if it takes a decade or two to build. The environmental impact statement itself will take years. **Acquiring 680 miles of right-of-way will be contested in thousands of eminent domain lawsuits and will take at least a decade to complete. If high-speed rail serves intermediate cities then it will increase travel time, create noise and interrupt traffic flow at thousands of intersections. If it bypasses smaller cities to gain the advantage of speed, then it serves only the end terminals and disadvantages everyone in-between**

#### EDITORIALS

## A lost cause: The high-speed rail race

Washington [Post](#)

Wednesday, February 16, 2011; 8:23 PM

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S [fiscal 2012 budget](#) includes \$8 billion for high-speed rail next year and \$53 billion over six years. In the president's view, the United States needs to spend big on high-speed rail so that we can catch up with Europe, Japan - and you-know-who. "China is building faster trains and newer airports," the president warned in his [State of the Union address](#). But of all the reasons to build high-speed rail in the United States, keeping up with the international Joneses may be one of the worst. In fact, experience abroad has repeatedly raised questions about the cost-effectiveness of high-speed rail.

China would seem to be an especially dubious role model, given the problems its high-speed rail system has been going through of late. [Beijing just fired its railway minister](#) amid corruption allegations; this is the sort of thing that can happen when a government suddenly starts throwing \$100 billion at a gargantuan public works project, as China did with rail in 2008. Sleek as they may be, China's new fast trains are [too expensive for ordinary workers](#) to ride, so they are not achieving their ostensible goal of moving passengers from the roads to the rails. Last year, the Chinese Academy of Sciences asked the government to reconsider its high-speed rail plans because of the system's huge debts.

Of course, if the Chinese do finish their system, it is likely to require operating subsidies for many years - possibly forever. A recent [World Bank report](#) on high-speed rail systems around the world noted that ridership forecasts rarely materialize and warned that "governments contemplating the benefits of a new high-speed railway, whether procured by public or private or combined public-private project structures, should also contemplate the near-certainty of copious and continuing budget support for the debt."

That's certainly what happened in Japan, where only a single bullet-train line, between Japan and Osaka, breaks even; it's what happened in France, where only the Paris-Lyon line is in the black. Taiwan tried a privately financed system, but it ended up losing so much money that the government had to bail it out in 2009.

When it comes to high-speed rail, Europe, Japan and Taiwan have two natural advantages over every region of the United States, with the possible exception of the Northeast Corridor - high gas taxes and high population density. If high-speed rail turned into a money pit under relatively favorable circumstances, imagine the subsidies it would require here. Every dollar spent to subsidize high-speed rail is a dollar that cannot be spent modernizing highways, expanding the freight rail system or creating private-sector jobs. The Obama administration insists we dare not lag the rest of the world in high-speed rail. Actually, this is a race everyone loses.

## Energy 1nc

Dependence and warming benefits long timeframe Stegemeier 10(Richard, the Anaheim resident is a retired chairman and CEO of Unocal and a longtime member of the National Academy of Engineering, "Richard Stegemeier: High-speed rail economics bleak," Feb 15, <http://www.oeregister.com/articles/speed-234453-high-rail.html>) High-speed rail is a wonderful concept because it uses electricity and could reduce our dependence on fossil fuels sometime in the distant future. But it's also far more expensive than commercial airlines and will require a new source of electricity from solar, wind or nuclear power. The president assures us there will be no pork in the \$3.8 trillion federal budget for 2011. That may be true if we ignore the proposed \$2.3 billion high-speed-rail grant for California. An undetermined amount of that money would be spent as a down payment on a \$42.6 billion proposal to connect Anaheim with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's San Francisco and Los Angeles with Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid's Las Vegas. ( as of 2016, the estimate is exceeding \$78 BILLION) That's an "oink-oink" if I ever heard one. I can understand the Las Vegas high-speed link to accommodate the thousands of Californians who want to flee to Nevada to escape California's high taxes. High-speed rail as part of a short-term economic stimulus package is nonsense if it takes a decade or two to build. The environmental impact statement itself will take years. Acquiring 680 miles of right-of-way will be contested in thousands of eminent domain lawsuits and will take at least a decade to complete. If high-speed rail serves intermediate cities then it will increase travel time, create noise and interrupt traffic flow at thousands of intersections. If it bypasses smaller cities to gain the advantage of speed, then it serves only the end terminals and disadvantages everyone in-between. CO2 reductions overstated – inconsequential effect on warming Cox and Vranich '8 (Wendell Cox Principal of Demographia (St. Louis. Mo.), a public policy firm; and Joseph Vranich Consultnt @ National Journal. The California High Speed Rail Proposal: A Due Diligence Report <http://reason.org/files/1b544eba6f1d5f9e8012a8c36676ea7e.pdf>) Claims about HSR's environmental benefits have been greatly overstated. California HSR will do little to reduce CO2 emissions (greenhouse gas emissions). Based upon California Air Resources Board projections, HSR would ultimately remove CO2 emissions equal to only 1.5% of the current state objective. This is a small fraction of the CHSRA's exaggerated claims of "almost 50%" of the state objective. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has indicated that for between \$20 and \$50 per ton of reduced greenhouse gases emissions, deep reversal of CO2 concentrations can be achieved between 2030 and 2050. A McKinsey report indicates that substantial CO2 emission reductions can be achieved in the United States for less than \$50 per ton. Yet the cost per ton of CO2 emission removal by HSR is far higher—between 39 and 201 times the international IPCC ceiling of \$50. The reality is that HSR's impact on CO2 would be inconsequential while being exorbitantly costly. Hence, HSR's CO2 emission reduction strategy cannot be legitimately included as an element of a rational strategy for reducing GHG emissions. In view of the untenable traffic impact projections and other factors, CHSRA's claims are considered specious. There is a need for an objective, independent assessment of HSR's CO2 impacts, including both operations and

construction. Until such an analysis is completed, CHSRA should cease making any statements about CO2 or other air quality impacts. Increases in fuel efficiency solves their internal links – their evidence doesn't assume future gains.

## Solvency 1nc

HSR empirically doesn't get enough ridership Utt 10 (Ronald, Research Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation, "America's Coming High-Speed Rail Financial Disaster," March 19, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/03/america-s-coming-high-speed-rail-financial-disaster>) To put the European commitment to passenger rail in perspective, rail ridership (high speed, conventional intercity, and metropolitan commuter rail) in these six countries accounted for just 7.9 percent of all surface transportation modes on a per passenger, per billion kilometer basis. This suggests that these countries received a poor return on their money given that **more than 90 percent of passengers in these countries chose other travel modes-- mostly auto--despite the subsidies.** In Europe as a whole (EU- 27), rail accounted for only 6.1 percent of passenger travel in 2007, including travel by air and sea. Buses accounted for 8.3 percent of the market, and air travel accounted for 8.8 percent. Despite Europe's huge investment in passenger rail, its market share declined from 6.6 percent in 1995 to 6.1 percent in 2007. Over that same period, commercial air increased its share from 6.3 percent to 8.8 percent. By providing faster service and competitive prices, it took passengers away from rail, buses, and autos. This last point is of some importance because one goal of the HSR scheme is to shift travel from largely unsubsidized commercial aviation to heavily subsidized trains. Yet the same scheme in Europe seems to have failed over the past dozen years, despite massive government subsidies. Nonetheless, as problematic as the general European experience with passenger rail has been, some individual countries have experienced even worse results. Failure to terminate existing policies undermines HSR MK: Gilbert,; Perl, 2010 (Richard Anthony. Transport Revolutions : Moving People and Freight Without Oil. New York, NY, USA: New Society Publishers,. p 239. <http://site.ebrary.com/lib/umich/Doc?id=10397417&ppg=239> Copyright © 2010. New Society Publishers. All rights reserved.) Existing aviation and road development policies and programs that are not compatible with a shift away from oil-powered transport will have to be terminated, as will policies and programs that support associated land uses. The skill and effort needed to remove existing policies and dismantle established programs is far from trivial. Lack of a focus on policy termination has undermined many efforts by leaders — across the spectrum of political orientation — to change the direction of US policy. These efforts include, for example, the Carter administration's agenda of government leadership in energy conservation of the late 1970s and the Reagan administration's goal of replacing Social Security pensions with private alternatives in the 1980s. Failures to terminate existing policies have undermined the key priorities of more than these two presidents. One analyst noted that the political dynamics of terminating established public policies differ fundamentally from those involved in creating new policies because "...distinctive coalitions generally form on both sides... [and] termination contests are usually more bitter and harder to win than most policy adoption contests."<sup>25</sup> Eminent domain and environmental lawsuits gut solvency – fiat doesn't solve Longman 11(Phillip, senior fellow at Washington Monthly and New America foundation, "The Case for Not-Quite-So-High-Speed Rail," Aug, [http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/julyaugust\\_2011/features/the\\_case\\_for\\_notquite\\_sohighsp030492.php?page=2](http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/julyaugust_2011/features/the_case_for_notquite_sohighsp030492.php?page=2)) But as great as it would be to have passenger service as fast and elegant as the TGV in the United States, there are many reasons not to put our first dollars into such an ambitious

project. First off, building a truly high-speed rail system in today's America would be so expensive, disruptive, contentious, and politically risky that it just might not be possible. It would require, for example, securing brand-new rights-of-way, because trains traveling at more than around 125 mph can't share tracks with slower freight or passenger trains. This in turn would require using eminent domain to secure millions of acres of real estate, and these days, in the U.S., that would involve endless litigation, environmental review, and the innumerable other processes that always stand to derail any large-scale infrastructure project. Plans to build a highspeed rail in California between San Diego and the Bay Area are now foundering for precisely this reason. Big showcase high-speed projects in Texas and Florida flopped in the 1990s for the same reason, plus another: the shifting currents of polarized American politics.

## General

**What is high speed rail?**

**Where is high speed rail service currently operational along the East Coast?**

**What is the Washington, D.C. to Richmond Southeast High Speed Rail project?**

**What prompted this project?**

**What are the benefits of this project to Virginia?**

**Who will use the high speed rail service?**

Rail improvements designed as part of DC2RVA will benefit passenger and freight rail. The track infrastructure will be designed for use by passenger and freight service along this shared-use corridor.

**Why would people use high speed rail instead of existing methods of transportation?**

**Are there any other high speed rail efforts in Virginia?**

**What process will the project follow?**

**Who is actually doing the preliminary engineering and environmental study work?**

DRPT is the project sponsor and leads the EIS process as well as overall project management. FRA serves as the lead federal agency on the project

**Where will the funds to build this project come from?**

Future funding is beyond anyone's ability to predict. Even in the absence of a known funding source, it is important to complete the federal planning process in order to qualify for future federal funds, if and when they are available. This Tier II EIS is a key element to the federal planning process, and a requirement for federal funding. DRPT has a successful track record of partnering with Amtrak, CSX, FRA, VRE, and others to get projects funded and built using a mix of funding sources. It may be necessary to build the project in an incremental fashion as

funding becomes available. **If the trains don't stop in my community, what benefit will there be for me?**

New passenger rail service will provide another transportation option to the traveling public to avoid traffic congestion on I-95 between Washington, DC and Richmond, VA. The construction and operation of the project would likely have a positive economic impact on cities, towns and counties along the corridor. The improved rail infrastructure would make the Commonwealth more competitive, thereby retaining existing businesses and attracting new business ventures to the region. Estimates of construction employment, as well as permanent employment, attracted to the corridor by the advent of higher speed rail service will be prepared as part of the project. Because the lines would carry both passengers and freight, new and/or improved freight access and improved reliability could bring goods to market faster.

