

| | | |
|---|---|--|
|  | <p>Tirol-Adria-Projekt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ⇒ hydropower ⇒ Waterway Danube-Tyrol-Adriatic Sea ⇒ Maglev München-Verona ⇒ Solarpowerbridge | <p>Tirol-Adria KG des Albert Mairhofer & Co.</p> <p>I-39030 Gsies /Valle di Casies BZ Preindl 45 St.N. 02350140212 Mobil +39 349 3813236 Tel/Fax 0474978421 www.tirol-adria.com info@tirol-adria.com</p> |
|---|---|--|

Subject: Waterway Danube-Tyrol-Adriatic Sea

Date:December 2008

Dear ladies and gentlemen,

Poland, the Czech Republic and Slovakia run – with the benevolence of the Baltic States, countries and cities besides the new waterway – the new waterway project Danube-Oder-Elbe-Canal. On my behalf as the ideator of the waterway Danube-Tyrol-Adriatic Sea I feel myself hereby confirmed, since the waterway’s continuation from the Danube till the Adriatic Sea will allow an end-to-end inland waterway transport from the North and Baltic sea down to the Mediterranean Sea.

This aforementioned *Tirol-Adria*-Project (Tyrol-Adriatic Sea-Project) was filed at the EU-commission in Brussels (head office Energy and Traffic) and at governments of Berlin, Vienna, Rome, Munich, Innsbruck, Bozen and Trento and consists of the following proposals:

A: Tyrol-Adriatic Sea hydropower stations based on the deviation Inn-Etsch; Capacity of 3.500 MW, pumping capacity 2.000 MW.

B: Danube-Tyrol-Adriatic Sea-Waterway, the waterway Passau-Venice has a distance of 700 kilometres and is at the Po Valley already navigable.

Plus the following project conceptions, which add themselves up due to the building of the canal tunnel:

C: Maglev Train Munich-Verona (330 kilometres).

D: High-Voltage-DC-feed conduit on the maglev’s line Munich-Verona through the Alps-canal-tunnel. This line could also function as part of the solar power-bridge Africa-Europe (distance: 1.000 kilometres), as the hydropower stations on the Alps’ southside can be embedded as regulating power stations.

The detailed project can be found on www.tirol-adria.com in German and Italian and soon in English

Waterways and inland navigation:

The project „Brenner-Basis-Tunnel“ made me think of a **canal-tunnel between the Inn and the Etsch** instead of a railway tunnel to establish a link between the Danube and the Adriatic Sea, the so called **Danube-Tyrol-Adriatic Sea-Marine Passage** via Inn, Etsch, Lake Garda, Mincio and Po. This waterway would be an alternative to the farther easterly link Danube-

Save-Adriatic Sea, which was released within the Baltic Sea-Adriatic Sea-Corridor as “Other Projects” in the EU’s *Official Journal* (1994/C 220, 65).

To use rivers for inland navigation, you have to assemble a certain water depth. To lift the water level of the Etsch, Mincio and Po you have to:

1. lead over water of the Inn’s watershed via the Tyrol-Adriatic Sea-hydropower stations and Meran into the Etsch and
2. build up barrages for simultaneous production of energy or dam up these rivers with floodneutral rubber dams.

In view of the goods traffics’ huge environmental pollution on land an increased use of the waterways has to be an **European necessity**.

Please consider this: Italy with 500 kilometres of waterways and 7.750 kilometres coast (Germany similar, but contrary) handles 0.1% of it’s goods with barges and 0.6% on coastal waters, 13% on railroads and the huge remainder on the streets. Compared to Germany, there we have 25% and to the Netherlands, where we even have 40% of cargo transportation on inland waters. Northamerica has – with a slightly longer network of waterways – a ternary transport emergence.

The construction of new railway lines is involved with a heavy interference on our environment, whilst rivers constructed as waterways pervade cities and towns as shipping traffic hardly pollutes our environment. A ship consumes compared to a truck only one third of fuel, has just one-fifth of the CO2-emissions and passes by with a cargo worth 88 trucks nearly soundless. In fact, we could economize on the route through the Alps nearly 1.000.000 litres of fuel and avoid 2.700 tonnes of CO2-emissions – daily.

Developments at the corridor of the Baltic Sea and the Adriatic Sea:

Precisely a hundred years ago one was thinking of a waterway between the Baltic Sea and the Adriatic Sea and started constructing the canals, but both World War I and II resulting in the splitting of Europe made the realization then impossible.

Due to the fall of the iron curtain political relationships changed, which smoothed the way to co-operation. Countries all across from the Baltic Sea to the Adriatic Sea now work together to implement the former Eastern Bloc’s integration into the EU-market. To achieve this, we have to at first develop essential traffic conditions.

On the occasion of the conference on March 2008 in Venice this new concept of a Danube-Adriatic Sea waterway will come up by a representative of the Region of Veneto.

Consequently we can proceed with the first steps made a hundred years ago and realize the missing links Danube-Oder-Elbe-Canal and Danube-Tyrol-Adriatic Sea-Passage.

Brenner-Basis-Tunnel:

The constant increasing of traffic volume on main traffic routes and therewith closely connected increasing enviornmental burden coerces politicians for action. Considered as this tight spot’s solution is the construction of a second railway line between Munich and Verona with the so called “Brenner-Basis-Tunnel”. Not considered in this project remain the above described movements at the Baltic Sea-Adriatic Sea-corridor and therefore **the then debated waterways’ link of Middle Europe with the ones of Upper Italy and the Mediterranean Sea would remain dead** – although a shift of the commercial transport on land to the more eco-friendly barge would (despite longer routes) hence result in traffic calming.

That’s why I appeal to both the concerned countries’ and states’ political representatives as well as to the European Union to actualise a canal tunnel through the

alpine main ridge instead of the planned Brenner-Basis-Tunnel. With a subsequent ship lift you can establish a link between the rivers Inn and Etsch (Hall / Tyrol and Gargazon / Southtyrol with a longitude of 78 kilometres) and realise the

WATERWAY DANUBE-TYROL-ADRIATIC SEA,

which will bring the development of this, our Europe, a bigger profit instead of a second railway line at the same location.

The canal Rhein-Main-Danube as well as the waterway Danube itself will serve their purposes only when the continuation southwards, to the Adriatic Sea, will be established.

This aforementioned Alps-Canal-Tunnel – being composed of one tunnel each in both directions with a bore of 13 metres with the shape of a horseshoe – needs no additional technical facilities like a tunnel for bullet trains (with three tunnel sections in total and countless connecting- and safety-galleries) and it is therefore viable in a far shorter time than the Brenner-Basis-Tunnel. Furthermore a multiple-shift usage would be more than only feasible, like the installation of the Maglev train in the canal's vaults and the laying of voltage- and data cables are also possible afterwards.

A collective epousal is strongly essential – now. I therefore ask you to support this my initiative.

With kindest regards,

Albert Mairhofer

info@tirol-adria.com www.tirol-adria.com



EU-waterway network with a longitude of 35.000 kilometres
Yet missing links: Danube-Tyrol-Adriatic Sea as well as Danube-Oder-Elbe
http://ec.europa.eu/transport/iw/doc/2002_brochure_iw_en.pdf