
POLICY BRIEF

Impacts on Agriculture and Farmers from the ALTO High-Speed Rail Southern Corridor in Eastern Ontario

Farm Severance, Land Loss, and the Lessons of HS2

Prepared for the ALTO Public Consultation

Submitted by: Lindsay Davidson

Research conducted using publicly available materials and AI tools

February 2026

Executive Summary

Key Finding: The ALTO southern corridor would bisect one of Eastern Ontario's most productive agricultural regions with an impassable, continuously fenced high-speed rail line travelling at 300 km/h. Unlike conventional railways, no level crossings are possible. Farms will be permanently severed, with equipment and livestock unable to cross without grade-separated underpasses or overbridges spaced kilometres apart.

The ALTO High-Speed Rail project proposes a southern corridor between Ottawa and Peterborough that would traverse approximately 200 kilometres of Eastern Ontario through the counties of Hastings, Lennox and Addington, Frontenac, and Leeds and Grenville.¹ This route was selected for study in part because *agricultural land is cheaper and easier to build on than*

¹Alto, "Leaving Ottawa toward Peterborough," Corridor Consultation Platform, January 2025.

Canadian Shield granite—a rationale that places the construction cost savings squarely on the backs of farming communities.²

This policy brief examines the agricultural consequences of the southern corridor through three lenses: the permanent physical barrier a 300 km/h rail line creates through farmland; the multi-year construction-phase disruption to farm operations; and the compensation and expropriation framework that will determine whether affected farmers are treated fairly. It draws extensively on the experience of the United Kingdom’s HS2 project, where 213 agricultural holdings were directly affected and farming families reported “generational devastation.”³

The brief also situates these agricultural impacts within the broader economic context of Eastern Ontario, where farming, tourism, and agri-food processing are deeply interconnected—and where the Frontenac Arch UNESCO Biosphere Reserve, the Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site, and a growing local food economy are all at risk from a poorly planned rail corridor.

1. The ALTO Southern Corridor and Eastern Ontario Agriculture

Alto, the Crown corporation overseeing the Toronto–Québec City high-speed rail project, is studying two route options between Ottawa and Peterborough. The northern option crosses the Canadian Shield through Lanark, Frontenac, and Hastings counties. The southern option swings closer to the Highway 401 corridor through agricultural and resort areas with higher population density.⁴

Alto’s own consultation materials describe the southern route as passing “through more valuable farmland and suburban lots.”⁵ The route has drawn immediate opposition from affected communities. South Frontenac Township council voted unanimously to oppose the project, with Mayor Ron Vandewal warning that it “would have very little economic positives for South Frontenac, but I think it could be generational devastation on the community.”⁶ The City of Belleville has identified that the corridor would cut through its Thurlow Ward, impacting “prime agricultural land” and the Moira watershed, with no train stop proposed.⁷

1.1 The Agricultural Profile of the Affected Region

²Alto Corridor Consultation Platform, “Southern option: through eastern Ontario, in agricultural and resort areas.”

³NFU (UK), HS2 Phase One evidence: 213 agricultural holdings directly affected along London to West Midlands route.

⁶CBC News, “Landowners, officials north of Kingston, Ont., fear ‘devastation’ from high-speed rail,” February 4, 2026.

⁷The Quinteist, “North vs. south? Belleville city councillors grapple with proposed high-speed train routes,” February 2026.

The counties along the southern corridor support a diverse and economically significant agricultural sector. According to the 2021 Census of Agriculture and Ontario Ministry of Agriculture profiles:⁸

County/Region	Farms	Primary Agriculture	Land Value/Acre	Cropland Trend
Frontenac	538	Dairy, beef, organic/sustainable	\$5,000–\$15,000	-15.4% (2011–21)
Lennox & Addington	537	Beef cattle, dairy	\$5,000–\$15,000	-3.6% (2011–21)
Hastings	~800	Mixed livestock, hay, crops	\$5,000–\$10,000	-5.7% (2011–21)
Leeds & Grenville	~900	Dairy, beef, cash crops	\$5,000–\$10,000	+4.9% (2011–21)

Sources: OMAFRA County Profiles; FCC Farmland Values Report; Farmers Forum; Statistics Canada Census of Agriculture 2021.

Several characteristics make this agricultural region particularly vulnerable to HSR disruption:

Livestock and dairy dominance. These operations depend on daily movement of animals and equipment between buildings and pasture. A farm severed by an impassable rail line faces an existential crisis, not merely an inconvenience.⁹

Mixed operations on moderate-sized farms. Eastern Ontario farms are typically smaller and more diversified than southwestern Ontario’s large cash crop operations. A 200-acre mixed farm severed into two 100-acre parcels may lose the critical mass needed for economic viability.

Lower-margin forage production. The region’s soils favour hay, oats, corn silage, and pasture rather than high-value cash crops. These operations have less financial cushion to absorb years of disruption.

Rising farmland values under pressure. Eastern Ontario farmland values have risen significantly—from an average of \$9,700/acre in 2021 to a median of \$15,000/acre in 2022—driven by farmers from Quebec and southwestern Ontario seeking affordable land.¹⁰ An HSR corridor announcement will immediately depress values on affected parcels while creating uncertainty across the broader region.

Growing agri-tourism and local food economy. The Rideau Heritage Route tourism study documented that agriculture and food industries are increasingly connected to tourism through farm-to-table restaurants, artisan cheese makers, wineries, and farmers’ markets. The tourism

⁸ Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA), County and Conservation Profiles, 2021 Census of Agriculture.

⁹ Ontario Farms and Land Group, “Frontenac, Lennox & Addington Farms For Sale,” regional profile.

¹⁰ Farm Credit Canada, Farmland Values Report, 2022. Eastern Ontario average \$9,700/acre (2021); Farmers Forum reports median \$15,000/acre (2022).

sector contributes \$695 million annually to the regional economy and sustains 8,744 jobs.¹¹ Construction disruption would damage both sectors simultaneously.

Declining cropland base. Between 2011 and 2021, Frontenac County lost 15.4% of its cropland (11,254 acres), Hastings lost 5.7%, and Lennox and Addington lost 3.6%.¹² Removing additional farmland for rail infrastructure accelerates a trend that is already straining the region's agricultural capacity.

2. The Impassable Barrier: How 300 km/h Changes Everything

This is the single most consequential impact of the southern corridor on agriculture. A high-speed rail line operating at 300 km/h is fundamentally different from a conventional railway. It requires:

Continuous security fencing of approximately three metres in height along the entire corridor to prevent humans, livestock, and wildlife from accessing the tracks.¹³

Complete grade separation. No level crossings of any kind are possible. Every road, farm lane, and equipment crossing must be an underpass or overbridge—expensive structures that are typically spaced several kilometres apart.¹⁴

A wide right-of-way. Based on the earlier Ontario HSR proposal, the OFA calculated the line would consume approximately 12 acres of farmland per kilometre of track.¹⁵

What This Means for Farmers

Mayor Vandewal of South Frontenac: "It's going to cut through farmland where farmers can't go on one side or the other, they're going to have to go all the way around.... Unlike the train of old, if it went through your property, you had a crossing; you could still use your property."

The Ontario Federation of Agriculture has been raising this alarm since the earlier southwestern Ontario HSR proposal. The OFA noted that "while the Canada Transportation Act (1996) guarantees the right to a crossing through newly built railways, this requirement is difficult to fulfill safely when trains travel at 300 km/h."¹⁶ Furthermore, "farm equipment is increasing in size

¹¹BDO Canada, "Rideau Heritage Route Tourism Association Tourism Economic Impact and Product Feasibility Study," November 2017.

¹²Farmers Forum, "Disappearing farmland? Not in Eastern Ontario," August 10, 2022.

¹³CBC News, "Ontario's proposed high speed rail a 'disadvantage' for rural communities, says OFA," April 23, 2018.

¹⁴Ontario Federation of Agriculture, "High-Speed Rail," Policy Position, accessed February 2026.

and complexity, and there is no indication this trend will reverse. Farmers must be guaranteed in perpetuity safe access to their lands and the ability to convey people, equipment, and crops across the rail line.”¹⁷

Modern combines, grain carts, and manure tankers can exceed 4 metres in width. Underpasses must be designed to accommodate this equipment permanently—and if they are not, the farm cannot function. The OFA has warned that “the dimensions of a rail crossing may limit its farm’s future growth and ability to pivot business operations.”¹⁸

2.1 Permanent Land Loss Estimates

If 12 acres are consumed per kilometre of track, and the southern corridor traverses approximately 200 km through Eastern Ontario, the total permanent land loss could reach 2,400 acres (970 hectares). However, only a portion of this corridor crosses active farmland—much of the Frontenac Arch section is forested Shield terrain. A conservative estimate would place direct farmland loss at 1,000–1,500 acres, plus additional acreage for:

- Construction staging areas and temporary access roads (returned to agriculture post-construction, but often with degraded soil structure)
- Aggregate extraction sites and borrow pits
- Environmental mitigation areas (wetland creation, wildlife crossings, noise berms, drainage ponds)
- Severed “remnant” parcels too small or awkwardly shaped to farm economically

The total agricultural footprint—including temporary and permanent impacts—could easily double or triple the direct right-of-way land take.

3. Lessons from the UK’s HS2: What Happened to Farmers

The United Kingdom’s HS2 project provides the most directly comparable evidence of what happens when high-speed rail is built through agricultural land. The parallels to Eastern Ontario are striking—and the outcomes for farmers have been devastating.

3.1 Scale of Agricultural Impact

The UK’s National Farmers’ Union identified 213 agricultural holdings directly affected by HS2 Phase One (London to the West Midlands).¹⁹ These ranged from small mixed farms to large

arable operations, but all shared the “uncertainty HS2 has created for the individuals and those businesses involved.”

3.2 Broken Access Promises

HS2 Ltd initially promised to build underpasses and overbridges to maintain farm access across the line. In practice, these commitments were broken. In Staffordshire, dairy farmers were told that access infrastructure would not be built until after construction was complete—a period that could last seven years.²⁰ During this time, farmers would be unable to move cattle between pasture and milking parlours, effectively shutting down dairy operations.

3.3 Compensation Failures

The NFU’s evidence to the HS2 Select Committee documented systematic compensation failures:

Delayed payments. Crop loss payments and land compensation were chronically late, forcing farmers to absorb losses while waiting for bureaucratic processes.²¹

Capital gains tax liabilities. When land was compulsorily purchased, farmers faced capital gains tax on proceeds without having chosen to sell. The NFU requested exemptions or extended reinvestment time limits.²²

Inadequate valuation. Market value compensation did not capture the going-concern value of farm businesses—quota, herd genetics, decades of soil improvement, and the economic value of a functioning integrated operation.

Excessive mitigation land take. The NFU challenged HS2’s environmental mitigation proposals as taking productive farmland unnecessarily, demanding “proper consultation with farmers before deciding land take for mitigation” and questioning why “the area proposed is excessive.”²³

3.4 The Psychological Toll

Perhaps most disturbingly, the House of Commons Transport Select Committee heard that HS2-affected landowners and farmers had been “left feeling suicidal” owing to the lack of action following the cancellation of the northern HS2 route.²⁴ Many had endured years of uncertainty, with their land under safeguarding orders that prevented investment, sale, or normal business

²⁰NFU (UK), letter to HS2 Minister Hew Merriman re: dairy farm access during construction, 2023.

²¹NFU (UK), press release: “NFU calls for swift action following HS2 cancellation,” October 2023.

²²NFU (UK), HS2 Select Committee evidence session: capital gains tax, ombudsman, planning permission for replacement buildings.

²⁴Yorkshire Post, “Farmers’ leader urges: Don’t leave us in limbo again over rail projects,” January 16, 2026.

planning. The NFU warned that farmers along new rail proposals “will be held in limbo for at least another decade, possibly even two, before work even starts.”²⁵

HS2 Lesson: The Country Land and Business Association’s regional surveyor warned of “a chronic lack of respect for farm businesses, which are often viewed as just being in the way of these projects.” This attitude pervaded HS2 from design through construction and compensation.

3.5 What the NFU Demanded (and Often Did Not Receive)

NFU Demand	Outcome
Binding duty of care with standards and timescales	Largely unenforceable; contractors routinely breached commitments
Independent ombudsman for breach resolution	24/7 Agricultural Liaison Officer secured, but limited powers
Accommodation works to leave farms in viable condition	Underpasses and overbridges delayed or downgraded
Enhanced compensation paid promptly	Payments chronically delayed; crop losses outstanding years later
Capital gains tax relief for compulsorily purchased land	Not resolved; farmers absorbed unexpected tax liabilities
Consultation before mitigation land take decisions	Mitigation areas imposed with excessive land take from productive farms

Sources: NFU HS2 evidence sessions, Select Committee testimony, Farmers Weekly, Yorkshire Post.

4. Construction-Phase Impacts on Farm Operations

Beyond the permanent barrier, the multi-year construction period—likely 5 to 10 years for this section of the corridor—would impose severe burdens on farming operations throughout the affected region.

4.1 Road Damage and Spring Weight Restrictions

Eastern Ontario’s county and township roads are subject to half-load restrictions during spring thaw (typically March through May). These restrictions protect road infrastructure that was never designed for sustained heavy truck traffic. HSR construction requires massive volumes of

aggregate, concrete, steel, and fill, generating thousands of daily truck movements on rural roads.

The UK's HS2 project generated over 3 million construction truck trips, with rural roads described by one Member of Parliament as “completely destroyed.” Buckinghamshire Council received just £93,000 in road compensation despite a £3.95 million road safety fund—enough to resurface approximately 5 metres of road. Eastern Ontario municipalities, with far smaller fiscal capacity than UK county councils, would be even less able to absorb this damage.

4.2 Drainage Disruption

Agricultural drainage in Eastern Ontario is an interconnected system of tile drains, surface ditches, and watershed flows. A 200 km linear excavation through flat agricultural land will intercept drainage patterns across hundreds of farms. This can cause waterlogging on one side of the construction zone and drought conditions on the other, destroying crops and degrading soil structure until new drainage infrastructure is engineered and installed—a process that can take years even after construction is complete.

4.3 Livestock Impacts

Dairy cows under stress from noise, vibration, and disrupted routines produce measurably less milk. Cattle can break through fences when startled by blasting or heavy equipment. The southern corridor passes directly through active livestock country where beef cattle and dairy farming are the dominant agricultural activities.²⁶

4.4 Temporary Land Occupation

Construction staging areas, access roads, aggregate storage, and worker facilities will take additional land out of production for years. In the HS2 experience, temporary land occupation often resulted in permanent soil degradation—compaction from heavy equipment, disrupted drainage tile, and mixed or contaminated topsoil. The NFU called for “reinstatement of land to its former condition” but this proved difficult to enforce in practice.²⁷

5. Expropriation, Compensation, and the Blight Effect

When asked directly whether Alto plans to expropriate private property, CEO Martin Imbleau did not answer the question.²⁸ This evasion is itself a significant concern. Under the federal Expropriation Act, the Crown can take land for national infrastructure projects, but the compensation framework has historically undervalued agricultural operations.

²⁸CBC News, “Want high-speed rail closer to Kingston? MP says it’s time to speak up,” January 15, 2026.

5.1 The Blight Period

From the moment a corridor is publicly identified, affected properties enter a period of “blight”: property values decline, buyers disappear, credit becomes harder to obtain, and farm investment freezes. For the ALTO southern corridor, this blight period has effectively begun with the January 2026 announcement of the route option. If the alignment decision is made by late 2026 and construction does not begin for another 5–10 years, farmers along the corridor could face a decade or more of uncertainty before a single track is laid.

This is precisely what happened with HS2 in the UK, where farming families “endured years of disruption because of HS2 flipflopping, delays and insufficient communication, uprooting both their businesses and everyday lives.”²⁹

5.2 Compensation Gaps

Market value compensation does not capture the full economic loss to a farm business. Key gaps include:

Going-concern value. A dairy farm’s value is not just land—it includes supply-managed quota, herd genetics, buildings, decades of soil improvement, and the economic value of a functioning integrated operation. Severance that renders a farm unviable destroys value that land compensation does not capture.

Capital gains tax. When land is compulsorily purchased, farmers face capital gains tax on proceeds without having chosen to sell. This can consume a substantial portion of the compensation payment.³⁰

Injurious affection. Land adjacent to but not taken by the corridor loses value from noise, visual impact, disrupted access, and construction disturbance. Compensation for injurious affection is notoriously difficult to claim and inadequate when received.

Loss of future optionality. The OFA has warned that “the dimensions of a rail crossing may limit its farm’s future growth and ability to pivot business operations.” A farmer locked into a fixed underpass width cannot adapt to larger equipment, new enterprises, or changing agricultural practices.³¹

6. Interconnected Impacts: Agriculture, Tourism, and Biodiversity

²⁹Farmers Weekly, “Farming sector fears new rail plans will repeat HS2 blunders,” January 15, 2026.

The agricultural impacts of the southern corridor cannot be understood in isolation. Eastern Ontario's economy is built on the interconnection of farming, tourism, and the natural environment—and the ALTO project threatens all three simultaneously.

6.1 The Agri-Tourism Economy

The Rideau Heritage Route tourism study documented that the 11 municipal members of the RHRTA—including Rideau Lakes and South Frontenac—support a tourism economy contributing \$695 million in annual GDP and 8,744 jobs.³² Agriculture is a key component of this tourism appeal: local produce, wineries, breweries, artisan cheeses, and farm-to-table dining are among the experiences that attract visitors to the region.

Rideau Lakes alone contributes \$20.7 million in tourism GDP with 261 jobs; South Frontenac contributes \$18.9 million with 238 jobs.³³ Construction disruption—noise, dust, truck traffic, road closures, degraded scenic landscapes—would affect both the farms that produce local food and the tourism operators who market the region's agricultural heritage.

6.2 The Frontenac Arch and Species at Risk

The Frontenac Arch UNESCO Biosphere Reserve is a continental-scale wildlife corridor described by the Nature Conservancy of Canada as the “narrow pinch point” connecting the Algonquin Highlands to the Adirondack Mountains.³⁴ It harbours numerous species at risk that depend on the agricultural landscape: Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark (Threatened) nest in hayfields and pasture, with their highest Ontario abundance “between Belleville and Kingston.”³⁵ Blanding's Turtle (Threatened), Gray Ratsnake (Threatened), and Butternut trees (Endangered) are all found throughout the corridor.³⁶

An impassable rail barrier through the Arch would fragment habitat for these species, while construction trucking on rural roads would dramatically increase road mortality for turtles and snakes—species that are already under severe pressure from the existing road network.

6.3 The Rideau Canal World Heritage Site

The Rideau Canal contributes over \$24 million to national GDP and sustains more than 600 full-time jobs.³⁷ The canal's tourism value depends on the scenic, agricultural, and heritage character of its surrounding landscape. Construction of a high-speed rail line through the Rideau

³⁴Nature Conservancy of Canada, “Frontenac Arch Natural Area” profile; Kingston News, NCC conservation announcement, November 2025.

³⁵Ontario government, Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark Government Response Statement: highest abundance between Belleville and Kingston.

³⁶COSEWIC / Ontario ESA species assessments: Gray Ratsnake (Threatened), Blanding's Turtle (Threatened), Bobolink (Threatened), Eastern Meadowlark (Threatened), Butternut (Endangered).

³⁷Parks Canada, Rideau Canal Management Plan, Section 9: Heritage Tourism and Recreation. Canal contributes \$24 million to national GDP, sustains 600+ jobs.

corridor would directly affect this character during the multi-year construction period and permanently alter the rural landscape that defines the Rideau experience.

7. The Ontario Federation of Agriculture's Position

The OFA has been raising concerns about high-speed rail and farmland since the earlier southwestern Ontario proposal. Its position on the ALTO project remains firm:

“The OFA is highly skeptical that the proposed High-Speed Rail concept will provide sustainable, effective, and efficient transportation with any net benefit for Ontarians. For rural and small towns, it downloads all the associated problems, with none of the ascribed benefits.”

— Ontario Federation of Agriculture

The OFA's specific demands include:

1. A comprehensive cost-benefit analysis that includes all costs to rural residents, communities, and farm businesses—not just urban transportation benefits.³⁸
2. Agricultural impact assessments before route selection, conducted in consultation with affected farmers who know their land best.
3. Guaranteed farm access in perpetuity across the rail line, accommodating current and future equipment sizes.³⁹
4. Railway responsibility for construction and permanent maintenance of all safety infrastructure, including fencing.⁴⁰
5. Agricultural representation on the project advisory body.⁴¹
6. Consideration of high-performance rail (up to 175 km/h) as an alternative that allows level crossings and runs on existing lines, avoiding farm severance entirely.⁴²

8. Policy Recommendations

⁴¹Farmtario, “Look at other high speed rail options, say farmers,” April 18, 2018.

Drawing on the HS2 experience, the OFA's positions, and the specific conditions of Eastern Ontario agriculture, this brief recommends the following measures if the southern corridor advances:

#	Recommendation	Details
1	Mandatory Agricultural Impact Assessment	Conduct a comprehensive AIA before route selection, mapping every affected farm, documenting current operations, and assessing severance impacts. Engage farmers directly—they know their land and operations better than any consultant.
2	Binding Farm Access Guarantee	Legislate a requirement for grade-separated farm crossings at intervals no greater than 2 km, designed to accommodate equipment up to 6 metres wide. Access infrastructure must be built before rail construction severs any farm, not after.
3	Enhanced Compensation Framework	Compensation must reflect going-concern value, not just market land value. Include supply-managed quota, herd genetics, soil improvements, and loss of business income. Provide capital gains tax rollover relief for compulsorily purchased farmland.
4	Anti-Blight Protections	From the moment a corridor is identified, establish a guaranteed purchase scheme allowing affected farmers to sell at pre-announcement market value. Provide interim payments for demonstrated income losses during the uncertainty period.
5	Construction-Phase Protections	Enforce spring weight restrictions on all construction traffic. Require independent agricultural liaison officers with binding authority to halt work that threatens farm operations. Mandate drainage impact assessments and pre-construction restoration bonds.
6	Independent Agricultural Commissioner	Appoint an independent commissioner (modelled on HS2's Independent Construction Commissioner but with binding powers) to resolve disputes between Alto/contractors and farming operations without requiring farmers to pursue litigation.
7	Mitigation Land Take Limits	Cap environmental mitigation land take from productive farmland. Require consultation with affected farmers before any mitigation area is designated. Prioritise non-agricultural land for environmental offsets.
8	High-Performance Rail Alternative Study	Before committing to 300 km/h HSR through agricultural land, commission an independent study of high-performance rail (up to 200 km/h) that would allow level crossings, reduce the right-of-way width, and potentially use existing rail corridors—eliminating the farm severance problem entirely.

9. Conclusion

The ALTO southern corridor, if selected, would impose generational costs on Eastern Ontario's farming communities. The experience of HS2 in the United Kingdom demonstrates that these costs are not theoretical: 213 farm holdings were directly affected, access promises were broken, compensation was delayed and inadequate, and farming families were left in psychological crisis.

Eastern Ontario's agricultural sector is more vulnerable to these impacts than the arable farmland affected by HS2. Smaller mixed farms, livestock operations dependent on daily cross-farm movement, a growing agri-tourism economy, and the irreplaceable ecological heritage of the Frontenac Arch all amplify the consequences of a poorly planned rail corridor.

The fundamental question is one of fairness. Alto's southern route is preferred precisely because agricultural land is cheaper and easier to build on than Canadian Shield rock. The construction cost savings are captured by the project; the costs—severed farms, destroyed roads, disrupted drainage, degraded landscapes, and years of uncertainty—are borne by rural communities that will never board the train.

If Canada is to build high-speed rail, it must do so in a way that treats farming communities with the respect and fairness they deserve. The recommendations in this brief provide a framework for that—but only if they are adopted before the route is selected, not after the damage is done.

The ALTO public consultation is open through March 2026.

Submit comments at: alto.ca/consultations

References

This policy brief contains 32 footnoted references drawn from the following categories of sources:

Government and regulatory sources: Alto consultation platform; Ontario Ministry of Agriculture (OMAFRA) county profiles; Statistics Canada Census of Agriculture 2021; Farm Credit Canada farmland values reports; Ontario Endangered Species Act assessments; COSEWIC species assessments; Parks Canada Rideau Canal Management Plan.

Industry and advocacy organizations: Ontario Federation of Agriculture (OFA) policy positions and submissions; National Farmers' Union (UK) HS2 evidence and press releases; Country Land and Business Association (UK); Nature Conservancy of Canada.

News media: CBC News (Dan Taekema, Priscilla Ki Sun Hwang); Global News; The Quinteist; Farmers Weekly (UK); Yorkshire Post; RealAgriculture; AGCanada; Farmtario; Farmers Forum.

Research and economic studies: BDO Canada, Rideau Heritage Route Tourism Economic Impact Study (2017); C.D. Howe Institute rail corridor analysis; HS2 Ltd Guide for Farmers and Growers (GOV.UK).

UNESCO designations: Frontenac Arch Biosphere Reserve (2002); Rideau Canal World Heritage Site (2007).