



"LOS ANGELES-BOSTON: 20h on High Speed"

Fort, Luis
Fort, Carmen

Polytechnic University of Madrid¹
Eptisa, S.L.

Abstract

This paper describes a Spanish proposal of possible collaboration with the Federal Railway Administration of the USA Transport Department for the operating in a term of 15 years of the HSR way Los Angeles (CA)-Boston (MA), 3.626 mile (5.834 km) length, that vertebrate the USA High Speed Railway System "USHRSR", 17.000 mile (more of 27.000 km) length, launched in 2009 by the President Obama, and to date, only in execution some sections of the CHSRA (California High-Speed Railway Authority), 200 km hardly, in the Californian Central Valley, around Fresno. In the construction of these sections take part Spanish companies of high level in wined bids provided the Spain's privileged international consideration for the development and high technology of its high-speed railway network (AVE), the second in the world by length, after China.

This itinerary is integrated by the Structural Units: "Ia:- Pacific Coastal Corridor", "II: Intercoasts Way" and "Ib:- Atlantic Coastal Corridor", as collect in the Table "Taking off & Summary" about Characteristic figures: morphological, structural and budgetary, from predesigned HSR Lines by the authors of this paper in the "Farwest", "Canevar", "Nevut", "Utconmar", "Interplains", "Ohio-Potomac" and "Chesa-Hudsonan-Charles" Projects. The Construction Budget is 112.175 M\$, with an unit cost of 19,30 M\$/km.

Finally is summarized an operation study of this itinerary with fourteen stations and the two Terminals, from which would depart trains each forty minutes (18h/day) by direction, respectively, with twenty carriages (eleven sitting cars and nine sleeping cars) in a similar composition to the used in the Berlin-Moscow express railway since 2016 December 17. In a graph is summarized also the distances between stations, times of travel (with stops between) and foreseen ticket rates with loans at 6% for a total investment financing (infrastructure, superstructure, equipments, signaling and rolling stock).

Keywords: High-Speed Railway, USHSRS, Los Angeles-Boston Itinerary, ...

¹ Fort, Luis. Polytechnic University of Madrid. Email: lfort@ciccp.es
Fort, Carmen. Eptisa, S.L. E mail: cfort@eptisa.com

1. Introduction

The news in the press in December 2016: "Opening of the new Moscow-Berlin night train service", a few days before the announcement of the International High Speed Congress in Ciudad Real (October 2017), motivated the proposal of this Conference with The "abstract" sent at the end of January 2017.

The authors of this paper have pre-designed a large part of the US High Speed Network "USHSRS" in Preprojects registered at the Colegio de Ingenieros de Caminos of Madrid, and described in articles published in the "Vía Libre" and "Alta Velocidad" of the Fundación de los Ferrocarriles Españoles, "Ingeniería Civil" and "Fomento" of the Ministerio de Fomento and "Revista de Obras Públicas" "ROP" of the Colegio de Ingenieros de Caminos.

At the 1st International Congress of Civil Engineering, held at the Colegio de Ingenieros de Caminos in Madrid on March 2 and 3, 2016, under the motto "Routes joining the world", the authors presented a communication, based on the positioning of Spain as a world reference in the field of High Speed Rail, so that it could serve as the starting point for a possible coordinated collaboration between the governments of Spain and the United States. Figure 1 reproduces the planning presented for the development of the Plan, considering eight structural units. For the purposes of the present paper, we focus on units I, II and VI.

Unit I, "Coastal Corridors", consists of the Pacific Coast Corridor (I1) and the Atlantic Coast Corridor (I2). This unit is the one with the greatest profitability foreseeable in its exploitation, when communicating large urban conglomerates: (I1: Los Angeles-San Francisco Bay) and (I2: Washington D.C.-New York-Boston).

Unit II, "Intercoasts Way: San Francisco-Washington DC", communicates the two corridors of the first Unit and vertebra the network, allowing its execution a progressive advance of the communication between the different States of the country, taking into account the difference Time between the two coasts and the possibility of taking advantage of the night time for the trips, favors a progressive, comfortable, flexible and efficient exchange of relations between the most important centers of activity of the nation, in a similar way, although on a much larger scale, to the service of the night train Moscow-Berlin, inspiring of the Conference.



Unit VI, "Missouri-Illinois-Indiana-Ohio Connection (VI 1-3)". This connection: Saint Louis-Springfield-Chicago / Gary-Indianapolis-Cincinnati allows, alternatively, in a part of sub-unit II3 "Saint Louis-Louisville-Cincinnati Route, to realize it" via Chicago "or" via Louisville ", giving So high-speed access to the third urban agglomeration of the United States.

2. State of the art (Exposition)

The proposed commissioning of the Los Angeles (CA) -Boston (MA) itinerary requires at least the construction of 5,876 km (5834 + 42 km state of the branch to Carson (NV)), and an investment of 112,175 M \$, with itinerary integrated only by Structural Units I and II, connecting a population of 32.5 Mhab. in every sense.

If in this itinerary, the Saint Louis-Cincinnati route "via Louisville" is replaced by "Chicago route", the total length to be built is 6,170 km (5979 + 191 km state) of the branches to Carson (NV), Jefferson (MO) and Mount Vernon (TN)), with an investment of 116,917 M \$ and a connected population of 36,5 Mhab. in every sense.

This second option has the objective advantage that, with a 4% increase in investment, the population connected to a large distance is increased by 14%, with no appreciable difference in travel times. References to the Los Angeles-Boston route, are made considering it "via Chicago".

This itinerary, which is part of the United States High Speed Network "USHSRS", can be carried out, according to the Approach planned for its development in four five-year (20 years) stages, by the USHSRS Association, within fifteen years, taking the initial proposal of the authors (Ref. 11), to construct the more than 27,000 km of estimated total length of the network from ten major poles of action, dedicating six of them for the direction and coordination of the execution of this itinerary (San Francisco, Denver, Chicago, Pittsburgh, New York and Boston).

The other four large poles would occupy in this same period of construction of the "injection" to the vertebral route of the network, another 20 Mhab. In each direction: 2.5 Mhab. from the Seattle Pole (Salt Lake City Connection); 8.0 Mhab. from the Dallas Pole (Kansas City Connection); 3.0 Mhab from Atlanta's Pole (Connection Saint Louis) and 6.5 Mhab. from the Miami Pole (Washington DC Connection)

In the following five years, from the ten poles, the planned network could be completed, but with more than 50% of the urban working population already connected with traveling times of less than 20 hours, with an investment of less than 25%, overall.

2.1 LA-BO Itinerary Description

A detailed description of the route with the HSR lines that form it is found in the preliminary projects whose characteristic, morphometric, constructive and budgetary figures are summarized in the attached Tables

The following is a summary of the length of each line, the number of LT "Long Tunnels", the longest and total length of them, as well as the number of SB "Suspension Bridges" and their total length .



Line	L (km)	LT			SB	
		nb	ΣL(km)	Lmax (km)	nb	ΣL(km)
1: LA-SF	598	5	95,7	27,5	1	1,6
2: SF-Sac	167	1	14,0	14,0	8	12,8
3: Sac-Reno	162	4	56,5	16,0	1	1,6
4: Reno-SLC	680	2	70,0	35,0	7	11,2
5: SLC-Denver	660	18	204,5	22,0	3	4,8
6: Denver-KsC	896	0	0,0	---	4	6,4
7: KsC-SL	415	0	0,0	---	2	3,2
8: SL-Chicago/G	420	0	0,0	---	2	3,2
9: Chicago/G-Cin	450	1	6,0	6,0	1	1,6
10: Cin/H-Colum	60	0	0,0	---	2	3,2
11: Colum-Pittsb	253	0	0,0	---	2	3,2
12: Pittsb-Wash	371	2	17,0	10,0	3	4,8
13: Wash-NY	460	2	12,0	6,0	5	8,0
14: NY-BO	387	0	0,0	---	5	8,0
1-14: LA-BO	5.979	35	475,0	35,0	46	73,6

2.2 Summary of the previous exploitation study of the LA-BO itinerary

The Sustainable Approach to the California High Speed Network (CHSRS) (Ref.15) was premised on its functional integration into the United States federal grid, as anticipated by the USHSRS Network Phasing Plan) which includes, among others:

- Direct communication between the city of San Francisco and the capital of the State of California, Sacramento, crossing the Bay of San Francisco
- Direct communication of the “Central Valley” with downtown Los Angeles through “Tehachapi Mountains”
- The North HSR connection of the States of California and Nevada by the “Tahoe Line”

From a general point of view, the planning of the construction and operation of the network as a whole is based on the criterion of “prompt profitability” of the operation, linked to competitive rates with other means of transport (car, airplane) An operating income that allows the self-financing of the construction and operation of the same, providing its cashflow, from an initial funding contribution of approximately 20% of the total investment, an internal rate of return similar to Interest rate of the financial market for long-term operations (≈ 6%).

As a summary of the economic-financial analysis carried out for the LA-BO itinerary, some data are highlighted in the following sections.

a) Operating revenue

The average occupancy of the itinerary, of 5,979 km, is 8.83 Mp / y, which means an average operating revenue of 13,990 M \$ / y.

At the age of ten it could be in service from Los Angeles (CA) to Reno / Carson (NV) (927 km with demand of 18.6 Mp / y), on the other hand, from Denver (CO) to Columbus (OH) (via Chicago / Gary) (2,241 km with 5.4 Mp/y) and on the other hand, from Washington DC To Boston (MA) (847 km with 14.9 Mp / y). That is, 3,715 km, with an average operating revenue of 11,125 M \$ / y.

b) Rolling stock required for the operation

The following mobile material (for circulation and minimum reserve), both for service (TAV), and for assistance and rescue (VAL), is foreseen:

- Years 9 to 14: 50 TAV of 540 seats (348 seats and 192 beds / berths) and 26 VAL
- Years 15 to 50: 80 TAV of 540 seats (348 seats and 192 beds / berths) and 84 VAL

c) Operating costs

Annual operating costs are the sum of hourly costs (ch), linked to driving hours and kilometer costs, multiplied by a factor (F) of annual hours of service.

The unit costs, updated to 2017, of the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, are: cu h = 37 \$ / h and cekm = 2.57 \$ / km F = 365 * (15 or 21). n = number of trains

Operating costs will therefore be:

- ≈ 300 M\$/y (years 9 to 14)
- ≈ 765 M\$/y (years 15 to 50)

d) Construction Budgets

Los Angeles-San Francisco	15.312 M\$	Preliminary design Farwest
San Francisco-Sacramento	6.910 M\$	Preliminary design Farwest
Sacramento-Reno/Carson	6.806 M\$	Preliminary design Canevar
Reno-Salt Lake City	13.686 M\$	Preliminary design Nevut
Salt Lake City-Denver	19.905 M\$	Preliminary design Utconmar
Denver-Kansas City	8.825 M\$	Preliminary design Interplains
Kansas City-Jefferson/Saint Louis	4.345 M\$	Preliminary design Interplains
Saint Louis-Springfield-Chicago/Gary	6.183 M\$	Preliminary design Misilino
Chicago/Gary-Indianapolis-Cincinnati/H	5.088 M\$	Preliminary design Misilino
Cincinnati/Hamilton-Columbus	1.957 M\$	Prelimin. design Ohio/Potomac
Columbus-Pittsburgh	2.429 M\$	Prelimin. design Ohio/Potomac
Pittsburgh-Washington D.C.	5.587 M\$	Prelimin. design Ohio/Potomac
Washington/Dulles-New York	10.510 M\$	Prelimin. design Chesapeake
New York-Boston	9.374 M\$	Prelimin. design Chesapeake
Itinerary Los Angeles-Boston	116.917 M\$	(Chicago way)



USHRSR - LOS ANGELES-SAN FRANCISCO- INTERCOASTS WAY (TRAYECTO INTERCOASTAS SAN FRANCISCO-WASHINGTON (Via Chicago)) + WASHINGTON-NEW YORK-BOSTON						
Lineas	PACIFIC SIDE	CENTRAL SIDE	APPALACHIAN SIDE	PACIFIC COASTAL CORRIDOR	ATLANTIC COASTAL CORRIDOR	LOS ANGELES-BOSTON
<p>Longitud Total (San. milhas)</p> <p>Demontes / Areas de rubano (km) (N)</p> <p>Longitud Total de Trazados (km)</p> <p>Longitud Total de Viaductos (km)</p> <p>Estaciones Principales</p>	<p>FAIRWEST-CARNEVAR-NEVUT PROJECTS</p> <p>USHRSR INTERCOASTS I (San Francisco-Salt Lake City)</p> <p>1922.0 (614mils)</p> <p>296.6 (94.9m)</p> <p>194.0 (61.4m)</p> <p>63.0 (20.3m)</p> <p>VALLEJO-REDWOODS-COLUMBIAVILLE</p>	<p>UTCOMAR-INTERPLAINS I & II PROJECTS</p> <p>USHRSR INTERCOASTS II (Salt Lake City, Salt Lake)</p> <p>1871.2 (620mils)</p> <p>1662.0 (543.7m)</p> <p>276.0 (91.9m)</p> <p>70.0 (22.8m)</p> <p>Summe-Meter-DENVER-Grand-Serve-TOPICA-KANSAS CITY-MARSHFIELD-COLUMBIA-LITTON-CITY</p>	<p>OHIO-POTOMAC PROJECT & MISLINOH PROJECT</p> <p>USHRSR INTERCOASTS III (Salt Lake-Washington via Chicago)</p> <p>1720.0 (552mils)</p> <p>1601.0 (525.2m)</p> <p>95.0 (31.2m)</p> <p>46.4 (15.1m)</p> <p>SPRINGFIELD-COLUMBTON-JOLIET-CHICAGO-SART-WEST LA VARETTE-CHICAGO-INDIANAPOLIS-FORT LEBANON-LEESBURG-WASHINGTON Dunes Airport-CENTREVILLE</p>	<p>FAIRWEST PROJECT</p> <p>CHRSR- MISSIONS TRAIL, HSL (Los Angeles-San Francisco)</p> <p>887.0 (276mils)</p> <p>350.0 (112.8m)</p> <p>195.0 (63.3m)</p> <p>30.0 (9.7m)</p> <p>LOS ANGELES-SAN FRANCISCO-GRAND AVENUE-SAN JOSE-SAN FRANCISCO</p>	<p>CHESA HUDSON-SAN CHARLES PROJECT</p> <p>USHRSR LIBERTY & TRIMOUNTAIN HSLs (Washington-New York-Boston)</p> <p>847.0 (262mils)</p> <p>270.0 (86.3m)</p> <p>30.0 (9.7m)</p> <p>36.0 (11.3m)</p> <p>WASHINGTON D.C.-BALTIMORE-HUALAQUETON-NEW YORK-NEW HAVEN-PORTLAND-PORTER-BOSTON</p>	<p>LOS ANGELES-SAN FRANCISCO-SACRAMENTO</p> <p>REDWOOD-CARSON-SALT LAKE CITY-SEVIER-KANSAS CITY-KANSAS CITY-SPRINGFIELD-INDIANAPOLIS-FORT LEBANON-LEESBURG-WASHINGTON Dunes Airport-LEESBURG-WASHINGTON</p> <p>NEW YORK-PROVIDENCE-BOSTON</p>
<p>TRMPS-PAE's numero</p> <p>Velocidad media (km/h)</p> <p>Total Mejoramiento de Tierras (Mar)</p> <p>Túneles Largos (> 50 Km) (Lat. Km. Totales)</p> <p>Viaductos principales (> 400 m luz) (Lat. Km. Totales)</p> <p>Presupuesto (A+B+C+D+E+F) (M\$)</p> <p>Movimiento de Tierras (B) (M\$)</p> <p>Tonelas (B) (M\$)</p> <p>Estructuras (C) (M\$)</p> <p>A - Infraestructura (a-b-c) (M\$)</p> <p>B - Superestructuras (M\$)</p> <p>C - Equipamiento (M\$)</p> <p>D - Prácticas ambientales (M\$)</p> <p>E - Proyecto/Garantía de Calidad y Dirección de obra (M\$)</p> <p>F - Suplemento por Estaciones y PAE's (M\$)</p> <p>Costo Unitario (incluidas Estaciones) (M\$/km)</p>	<p>22</p> <p>508</p> <p>896,36</p> <p>15 (151,24)</p> <p>6</p> <p>27,82</p> <p>8115</p> <p>2066</p> <p>4088</p> <p>32544</p> <p>2554</p> <p>3994</p> <p>483</p> <p>611</p> <p>285</p> <p>25,28 (26,0)</p>	<p>31</p> <p>395</p> <p>390,23</p> <p>12 (184,88)</p> <p>14</p> <p>33,075</p> <p>2591</p> <p>2729</p> <p>9729</p> <p>18693</p> <p>5146</p> <p>8889</p> <p>903</p> <p>796</p> <p>688</p> <p>16,68 (17,48)</p>	<p>47</p> <p>536</p> <p>247,63</p> <p>5 (76,72)</p> <p>14</p> <p>31,344</p> <p>4811</p> <p>1953</p> <p>3403</p> <p>4677</p> <p>1342</p> <p>4627</p> <p>398</p> <p>511</p> <p>530</p> <p>12,13 (12,48)</p>	<p>17</p> <p>287</p> <p>120,36</p> <p>14 (181,45)</p> <p>9</p> <p>15,312</p> <p>1287</p> <p>3820</p> <p>1871</p> <p>5890</p> <p>1520</p> <p>1291</p> <p>177</p> <p>348</p> <p>358</p> <p>25,28 (25,8)</p>	<p>30</p> <p>522</p> <p>303,42</p> <p>8 (102,29)</p> <p>10</p> <p>19,838</p> <p>1024</p> <p>1100</p> <p>3488</p> <p>5388</p> <p>2943</p> <p>1054</p> <p>348</p> <p>518</p> <p>414</p> <p>22,88 (23,18)</p>	<p>142</p> <p>538</p> <p>195,28</p> <p>14</p> <p>30,834</p> <p>86</p> <p>16,817</p> <p>2225</p> <p>24373</p> <p>8378</p> <p>13333</p> <p>17775</p> <p>12,022</p> <p>1,887</p> <p>2,524</p> <p>2,022</p> <p>11,8 (18,9)</p> <p>1531 CALIFORNIA</p> <p>1242 UTAH</p> <p>1408 GOLDMAD</p> <p>4328 MARYLAND</p> <p>4301 ILLINOIS</p> <p>3302 INDIANA</p> <p>3300 NEW JERSEY</p> <p>2201 NEW YORK</p> <p>5208 CONNECTICUT</p> <p>1208 PENNSYLVANIA</p> <p>1205 WISCONSIN</p> <p>1204 MASSACHUSETTS</p>
<p>Inversión prevista de los Estados (M\$)</p>	<p>16200 CALIFORNIA</p> <p>12875 NEVADA</p> <p>8300 KANSAS</p> <p>4301 MISSOURI</p>	<p>8400 ILLINOIS</p> <p>3302 INDIANA</p> <p>3300 NEW JERSEY</p> <p>4300 OHIO</p> <p>2201 PENNSYLVANIA</p> <p>1208 MARYLAND</p> <p>1100 VIRGINIA</p>	<p>8400 ILLINOIS</p> <p>3302 INDIANA</p> <p>3300 NEW JERSEY</p> <p>4300 OHIO</p> <p>2201 PENNSYLVANIA</p> <p>1208 MARYLAND</p> <p>1100 VIRGINIA</p>	<p>1132 CALIFORNIA</p>	<p>288 VIRGINIA</p> <p>4301 PENNSYLVANIA</p> <p>1100 NEW YORK</p> <p>3300 NEW JERSEY</p> <p>2201 NEW YORK</p> <p>5208 CONNECTICUT</p> <p>1208 PENNSYLVANIA</p> <p>1100 MASSACHUSETTS</p>	<p>1531 CALIFORNIA</p> <p>1242 UTAH</p> <p>1408 GOLDMAD</p> <p>4328 MARYLAND</p> <p>4301 ILLINOIS</p> <p>3302 INDIANA</p> <p>3300 NEW JERSEY</p> <p>2201 NEW YORK</p> <p>5208 CONNECTICUT</p> <p>1208 PENNSYLVANIA</p> <p>1205 WISCONSIN</p> <p>1204 MASSACHUSETTS</p>

e) Estimation of the number of passengers/year (Demand)

The total demand initially envisaged in the LA-BO route, once put into service within 15 years, according to the attached list, is 128.70 Mp / y (passenger / year), and 143 Mp/y when the connections with the Poles of Seattle (in Salt Lake City), Dallas (in Kansas City), Atlanta (in Saint Louis) and Miami (in Washington DC) were put into service.

Section (HSL)	Population (Mhab)	Passenger/y(1) (Mp/y)	Travel time	Operation term (years)
LA-SF	8,111	22,25	2h 28'	8
SF-Sac	4,385	20,43	0h 36'	8
Sac-Ren	0,700	3,31	0h 34'	7
Ren-SLC	1,500	*2,87	2h 10'	15
SLC-Denv	2,500	**3,92	1h 57'	15
Denv-Ks.C	2,500	***1,62	2h 56'	9
Ks.C-SL	3,750	2,23	1h 19'	6
SL-Chic/G	7,330	8,02	1h 22'	10
Chic/G-Cin-Col	6,160	12,26	1h 43'	10
Col-Pittsb	3,100	10,76	0h 48'	15
Pittsb-Wash	5,400	9,94	1h 19'	15
Wash-NY	12,777	7,78	1h 24'	10
NY-Boston	14,401	23,31	1h 14'	10
LA-BO	72,614	8,83	19h 50'	15

(1): $z=(20,000-0,039682L) (0,34854 P)$

*: $Lv=(200/315)L$

** : $Lv=(200/338)L$

***: $Lv=(200/350)L$

Average daily occupation: $8.83 * 106/2/365 = 12096 p / d \rightarrow \approx 20$ daily compositions of 600 passengers, distributed in seated places, berths and beds, as specified in the attached tables by routes and directions: HST LABO And HST BOLA



LOS ANGELES - BOSTON HIGH - SPEED TRAINS ("HS LABO") TIME TABLE

CITIES	LOS ANGELES (CA)	SAN FRANCISCO (CA)	SACRAMENTO (CA)	SUNO (NY)	SALT LAKE CITY (UT)	SPRINGFIELD (MO)	KANSAS CITY (MO)	SANCTUARY (MO)	CHICAGO (IL)	INDIANAPOLIS (IN)	CINCINNATI (OH)	COLUMBUS (OH)	PITTSBURGH (PA)	WASHINGTON D.C.	PHILADELPHIA (PA)	NEW YORK (NY)	BOSTON (MA)
HS TRAINS																	
Morning Block	09:00	11:29	12:08	12:42	15:50	17:49	21:44	23:01	00:20	02:19	05:51	03:30	04:26	05:45	06:34	07:17	08:34
HSLABO M1																	
HSLABO M2	09:15	11:44	12:23	12:56	16:05	18:04	21:59	23:16	00:35	02:34	03:06	03:48	04:41	05:58	06:49	07:32	08:49
HSLABO M3	09:30	11:59	12:38	13:11	16:20	18:19	22:14	23:31	00:50	02:49	03:21	04:00	04:56	06:13	07:04	07:47	09:04
HSLABO M4	09:45	12:14	12:53	13:26	16:35	18:34	22:29	23:46	01:05	03:04	03:36	04:18	05:11	06:28	07:19	08:02	09:19
HSLABO M5	10:00	12:29	13:08	13:42	16:50	18:49	22:44	00:00	01:20	03:19	03:50	04:33	05:26	06:43	07:34	08:17	09:34
Midday Block																	
HSLABO N1	15:00	17:29	18:08	18:42	21:50	23:49	03:44	05:00	06:20	08:19	08:50	09:33	10:26	11:43	12:34	13:17	14:34
HSLABO N2	15:15	17:44	18:23	18:56	22:05	00:04	03:59	05:16	06:35	08:34	09:06	09:48	10:41	11:58	12:49	13:32	14:49
HSLABO N3	15:30	17:59	18:38	19:11	22:20	00:19	04:14	05:31	06:50	08:49	09:21	10:00	10:56	12:13	13:04	13:47	15:04
HSLABO N4	15:45	18:14	18:53	19:26	22:35	00:34	04:29	05:46	07:05	09:04	09:36	10:18	11:11	12:28	13:19	14:02	15:19
HSLABO N5	16:00	18:29	19:08	19:41	22:50	00:49	05:44	06:01	07:20	09:19	09:51	10:30	11:26	12:43	13:34	14:17	15:34
Afternoon Block																	
HSLABO A1	16:15	18:04	19:23	19:56	23:05	01:04	05:59	06:16	07:35	09:34	10:06	10:48	11:41	12:58	13:49	14:32	15:49
HSLABO A2	16:30	18:19	19:38	20:11	23:20	01:19	06:14	06:31	07:50	09:49	10:21	11:00	11:56	13:13	14:04	14:47	16:04
HSLABO A3	16:45	18:14	19:53	20:26	23:35	01:34	06:29	06:46	08:05	10:04	10:36	11:18	12:11	13:28	14:19	15:02	16:19
HSLABO A4	17:00	18:29	20:08	20:41	23:50	01:49	06:44	07:01	08:20	10:19	10:51	11:30	12:26	13:43	14:34	15:17	16:34
HSLABO A5	17:15	18:44	20:23	20:56	00:05	02:04	06:59	07:16	08:35	10:34	11:06	11:48	12:41	13:58	14:49	15:32	16:49
Evening Block																	
HSLABO E1	17:30	19:59	20:38	21:11	00:20	02:19	07:14	07:31	08:50	10:49	11:21	12:00	12:56	14:13	15:04	15:47	17:04
HSLABO E2	17:45	20:14	20:53	21:26	00:35	02:34	07:29	07:46	09:05	11:04	11:36	12:18	13:11	14:28	15:19	16:02	17:19
HSLABO E3	18:00	20:29	21:08	21:41	00:50	02:49	07:44	08:01	09:20	11:19	11:51	12:30	13:26	14:43	15:34	16:17	17:34
HSLABO E4	18:15	20:44	21:23	21:56	01:05	03:04	07:49	08:16	09:35	11:34	12:06	12:48	13:41	14:58	15:49	16:32	17:49
HSLABO E5	18:30	20:59	21:38	22:11	01:20	03:19	08:04	08:31	09:50	11:49	12:21	13:00	13:56	15:13	16:04	16:47	18:04
Other Data	3,972	0,965	0,491	0,242	0,193	0,663	0,627	0,316	2,721	0,854	0,259	0,851	0,305	0,673	1,368	3,551	0,698
Daily long distance passenger car (L.A.)	2,488	542	307	151	121	427	362	197	1,942	668	240	567	319	1,408	1,904	965	3,117
Demand Media	124	27	15	8	8	21	20	10	50 (97-47)	30	10	30	18	46 (75-24)	24 (65-41)	84 (113-29)	
Composition por tren	124	(SC + M)		(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)	(SC + M)
Composición proporcional	128	178	200	200	200	192	188	188	192	144	128	192	182	182	182	182	182
Plazas reservadas	108	134	134	134	134	174	174	174	188	200	200	214	214	228	228	240	240
Meas (M) cargado	219	254	254	254	254	288	288	288	305	324	324	343	343	362	362	362	400

BOSTON LOS ANGELES HIGH-SPEED TRAINS ("HSBOLA") TIME TABLE

CITIES	BOSTON (MA)	NEW YORK (NY)	PHILADELPHIA (PA)	WASHINGTON DC	PITTSBURGH (PA)	COLUMBIA (OH)	CINCINNATI (OH)	INDIANAPOLIS (IN)	CHICAGO (IL)	ST. LOUIS (MO)	KANSAS CITY (MO)	DAYTON (OH)	SALT LAKE CITY (UT)	PHOENIX (AZ)	SACRAMENTO (CA)	BAKERSFIELD (CA)	LOS ANGELES (CA)
HS TRAINS																	
Morning Block	06:00	07:12	07:55	08:46	10:03	10:56	11:35	11:53	12:09	13:31	13:51	16:45	17:51	29:02	21:36	22:12	00:48
HSBOLA M1	06:15	07:27	08:10	09:01	10:18	11:11	11:53	12:24	12:39	13:46	14:05	17:01	18:06	20:17	21:51	22:27	01:01
HSBOLA M2	06:30	07:42	08:25	09:16	10:33	11:26	12:08	12:43	12:58	14:01	14:21	17:16	18:21	20:32	22:06	22:42	01:16
HSBOLA M3	06:45	07:57	08:40	09:31	10:48	11:41	12:23	12:58	13:13	14:16	14:36	17:31	18:36	20:47	22:21	22:57	01:31
HSBOLA M4	07:00	08:12	08:55	09:46	11:03	11:56	12:38	13:13	13:28	14:31	14:51	17:46	18:51	21:02	22:36	23:12	01:46
HSBOLA M5	14:30	15:42	16:25	17:16	18:33	19:26	20:08	20:43	20:58	22:01	22:21	01:16	02:21	04:32	06:06	06:42	09:16
HSBOLA N1	14:45	15:57	16:40	17:31	18:48	19:41	20:23	20:58	21:13	22:16	22:36	01:31	02:36	04:47	06:21	06:57	09:31
HSBOLA N2	15:00	16:12	16:55	17:46	19:03	19:56	20:38	21:13	21:28	22:31	22:51	01:46	02:51	05:02	06:36	07:12	09:46
HSBOLA N3	15:15	16:27	17:10	18:01	19:18	20:11	20:53	21:28	21:43	22:46	23:06	02:01	03:06	05:17	06:51	07:27	10:01
HSBOLA N4	15:30	16:42	17:25	18:16	19:33	20:26	21:08	21:43	21:58	23:01	23:21	02:16	03:21	05:32	07:06	07:42	10:16
HSBOLA N5	15:45	16:57	17:40	18:31	19:48	20:41	21:23	21:58	22:13	23:16	23:36	02:31	03:36	05:47	07:21	07:57	10:31
HSBOLA A1	16:00	17:12	17:55	18:46	20:03	20:56	21:38	22:13	22:28	23:31	23:51	02:46	03:51	06:02	07:36	08:12	10:46
HSBOLA A2	16:15	17:27	18:10	19:01	20:18	21:11	21:53	22:28	22:43	23:46	00:05	03:01	04:06	06:17	07:51	08:27	11:01
HSBOLA A3	16:30	17:42	18:25	19:16	20:33	21:26	22:08	22:43	22:58	00:01	00:21	03:16	04:21	06:32	08:06	08:42	11:16
HSBOLA A4	16:45	17:57	18:40	19:31	20:48	21:41	22:23	22:58	23:13	00:16	00:36	03:31	04:36	06:47	08:21	08:57	11:31
HSBOLA A5	17:00	18:12	18:55	19:46	21:03	21:56	22:38	23:13	23:28	00:31	00:51	03:46	04:51	07:02	08:36	09:12	11:46
HSBOLA E1	17:15	18:27	19:10	20:01	21:18	22:11	22:53	23:28	23:43	00:46	01:06	04:01	05:06	07:17	08:51	09:27	12:01
HSBOLA E2	17:30	18:42	19:25	20:16	21:33	22:26	23:08	23:43	23:58	01:01	01:21	04:16	05:21	07:32	09:06	09:42	12:16
HSBOLA E3	17:45	18:57	19:40	20:31	21:48	22:41	23:23	23:58	24:13	01:16	01:36	04:31	05:36	07:47	09:21	09:57	12:31
HSBOLA E4	18:00	19:12	19:55	20:46	22:03	22:56	23:38	24:13	00:08	01:31	01:51	04:46	05:51	08:02	09:36	10:12	12:46
HSBOLA E5	18:15	19:27	20:10	21:01	22:18	23:11	23:53	24:28	24:43	01:46	02:06	05:01	06:06	08:17	09:51	10:27	13:01
Evening Block																	
Cities Population (2015 Census data)	668	8,551	1,568	673	335	851	299	854	271	310	627	683	193	242	491	845	3,072
Daily long distance passenger (by U.S.)	35	138	73	30	14	32	11	33	35	77	816	823	345	365	48	132	1,0474
Domestic mode	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)	(M)
Composition propuesta	16	110	200	162	192	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182	182
Longitud (mi)	68	141	241	341	441	541	641	741	841	941	1,041	1,141	1,241	1,341	1,441	1,541	1,641
Miles III (603660)	108	228	398	568	738	908	1,078	1,248	1,418	1,588	1,758	1,928	2,098	2,268	2,438	2,608	2,778

3. References

- 1-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2016) "España y la red de Alta Velocidad en Estados Unidos" Revista de Obras Públicas (ROP) nº3580 Octubre 2016 Madrid, España.
- 2-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2017) "Diseño sostenible en el desarrollo de la red de alta velocidad ferroviaria en Nueva España, EE.UU." Revista de Obras Públicas (ROP) nº3583. Enero 2017. Madrid, España.
- 3-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2016) "Los Proyectos de desarrollo de Líneas de Alta Velocidad en Estados Unidos (I): Del Pacífico a las Rocosas" Revista del Ministerio de Fomento, Febrero 2016, N°658, Madrid, España.
- 4-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2016) "Los Proyectos de desarrollo de Líneas de Alta Velocidad en Estados Unidos (II): El descenso de Las Rocosas" Revista del Ministerio de Fomento, Septiembre 2016, N°664, Madrid, España.
- 5-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2016) "Los Proyectos de desarrollo de Líneas de Alta Velocidad en Estados Unidos (III): Por las Grandes Llanuras al Golfo de México" Revista del Ministerio de Fomento, Octubre 2016, N°665, Madrid, España.
- 6-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2016) "Los Proyectos de desarrollo de Líneas de Alta Velocidad en Estados Unidos (IV): Por las Llanuras de la antigua Florida Española" Revista del Ministerio de Fomento, Diciembre 2016, N°667, Madrid, España.
- 7-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2017) "Los Proyectos de desarrollo de Líneas de Alta Velocidad en Estados Unidos (V): La Alta Velocidad llega a Nueva York" Revista del Ministerio de Fomento, Abril 2017, N°671, Madrid, España.
- 8-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2017) "Los Proyectos de desarrollo de Líneas de Alta Velocidad en Estados Unidos (VI): Desde el Mississippi a Los Grandes Lagos" Revista del Ministerio de Fomento, Prevista publicación Septiembre 2017, N°676, Madrid, España.
- 9-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2017) Anteproyecto "Misilino Project: Chicago Connection" Colegio de Ingenieros de Caminos, Canales y Puertos (Ref. 152452) Mayo 2017, Madrid, España.
- 10-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2015) "Alta velocidad ferroviaria en EE.UU. (USHRS): Señalización y Control de trenes: Sistema ARTMS" Fundación de los Ferrocarriles Españoles Revista Vía Libre Técnica/19 junio 2015. Madrid, España.
- 11-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2015) "Propuesta inicial para el desarrollo de la red de alta velocidad en EE.UU: USHSRS" Fundación de los Ferrocarriles Españoles Revista Vía Libre-Técnica/número 10 julio 2015. Madrid, España.
- 12-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2015). "Red de Alta Velocidad de EE.UU. (USHRS): Trayecto Intercostas San Francisco-Washington D.C. (Pacific Side)" Fundación de los Ferrocarriles Españoles Revista Vía Libre-Técnica/número 10-julio 2015. Madrid, España.
- 13-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2016). "Red de Alta Velocidad de EE.UU. (USHRS): Trayecto Intercostas San Francisco-Washington D.C. (Central Side)". Fundación de los Ferrocarriles Españoles 360. Revista de alta velocidad nº 4-diciembre 2016. Madrid, España.
- 14-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2017). "Red de Alta Velocidad de EE.UU. (USHRS): Trayecto Intercostas San Francisco-Washington D.C. (Appalachian Side)" Fundación de los Ferrocarriles Españoles 360. Revista de alta velocidad nº 5-junio 2017. Madrid, España.
- 15-Díaz del Río, M. & Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2014) "Alta Velocidad Ferroviaria en California (USA): Sexta Parte VI Planteamiento sostenible de la red" "High Speed Railway in California (USA): Sixth Part (VI): A sustainable approach to the network" Revista Ingeniería Civil nº173. En-FebMar 2014 CEDEX Ministerio de Fomento. Madrid, España.
- 16-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2016) "Alta Velocidad Ferroviaria en USA: Problema de Licuefacción de sedimentos en el acceso a la Terminal HSR de Salt Lake City por la Great Basin Line" Revista Ingeniería Civil nº184. Octubre-Noviembre-Diciembre 2016 CEDEX. Ministerio de Fomento. Madrid, España.
- 17-Fort, L. & Fort, C. (2017) "Alta Velocidad Ferroviaria en USA: Los Puentes colgantes de "Raritan Bay", "The Narrows" y "Long Island Sound" en New York" Revista Ingeniería Civil (Next publication) CEDEX Ministerio de Fomento. Madrid, España.