

Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Consultation Roadmap

Take the survey

Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment and Water

Response received at:

July 11, 2024 at 3:00 PM GMT+10

Response ID:

sbm2f3642c08b8e474316c66

- 1 Confirm that you have read and understand this privacy notice.
Yes
- 2 Please indicate how and if you want your submission published.
Public and anonymous
- 3 Published name
Not answered
- 4 Confirm that you have read and understand this declaration.
Yes
- 5 First name
[REDACTED]
- 6 Last name
[REDACTED]
- 7 Email
[REDACTED]

- 8 Phone
[REDACTED]
- 9 Who are you answering on behalf of?
Individual or individuals
- 10 Organisation name
Not answered
- 11 What best describes you or your organisation?
Not answered
- 12 What sector do you represent?
Not answered
- 13 What state or territory do you live in?
[REDACTED]
- 14 Postcode
[REDACTED]
- 15 What area best describes where you live?
[REDACTED]
- 16 1. Do you support the proposed guiding principles?
Yes
- 17 1.1 Please add details to your response.
Please see my attached statement.
- 18 2. Do you support the use of the avoid-shift-improve framework as a tool to identify opportunities for abatement?
Not answered

- 19 2.1 Please add details to your response.
I have not become informed about this framework.
- 20 3. Do you agree the development of a national policy framework for active and public transport will support emissions reduction?
Yes
- 21 3.1 Please add details to your response.
Not answered
- 22 4. What should be included in a national policy framework for active and public transport and how should it be developed?
Please see my attached statement.
- 23 5. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to ensure the movement of people contributes to transport emissions reduction?
Not answered
- 24 6.1 What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to ensure that the movement of goods contributes to transport emissions reduction?
Not answered
- 25 6.2. How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities for emissions reduction in the movement of goods?
Not answered
- 26 7. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for light road vehicles?
No

- 27 7.1 Please add details to your response.
I feel we need to reduce vehicle size, urgently, and change roadways. We need to be very cautious re the impacts of lithium mining and of non-green hydrogen. Please see my attached statement.
- 28 8. The Australian Government is currently developing an Australian New Vehicle Efficiency Standard and has already begun to implement actions in the National Electric Vehicle Strategy.8.1 What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce light vehicle emissions?
Not answered
- 29 8.2 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce light vehicle emissions?
Not answered
- 30 9. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for heavy road vehicles?
Not answered
- 31 9.1 Please add details to your response
I have not become informed about this.
- 32 10. The proposed pathway for heavy road vehicles relies on a mix of battery electric, hydrogen fuel-cell and low carbon liquid fuels.Rank from 1 to 3, the order in which these should be prioritised for emissions reduction.
1: Battery electric
2: Low carbon liquid fuels
3: Hydrogen fuel cell
- 33 10.1 Please add details to your response. Why did you rank them in that

order?

Not answered

34 11. What role should low carbon liquid fuels play in the heavy vehicle decarbonisation?

Not answered

35 12. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce heavy vehicle emissions?

Not answered

36 13. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for rail?

Not answered

37 13.1 Please add details to your response.

I have not become informed about this pathway.

38 14. The proposed pathway for rail relies on a mix of battery electric, hydrogen fuel-cell and low carbon liquid fuels. Rank from 1 to 3, the order in which these should be prioritised for emissions reduction.

1: Battery electric

2: Low carbon liquid fuels

3: Hydrogen fuel cell

39 14.1 Please add details to your response. Why did you rank them in that order?

Not answered

40 15. What role should low carbon liquid fuels play in rail decarbonisation?

Not answered

- 41 16. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce rail emissions?
Not answered
- 42 16.1 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce rail emissions?
Not answered
- 43 17. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for maritime?
Not answered
- 44 17.1 Please add details to your response.
I have not become informed about this pathway.
- 45 18. The Australian Government is engaging in consultation as part of the development of the Maritime Emissions Reduction National Action Plan and those consultations will also inform the final Roadmap and Action Plan. 18.1 What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce maritime emissions?
Not answered
- 46 18.2 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce maritime emissions?
Not answered
- 47 19. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for aviation?
I have not become informed about this pathway.
- 48 19.1 Please add details to your response.
Not answered

- 49 20. The Australian Government has already engaged in consultation on aviation decarbonisation through the development of the Aviation White Paper and those consultations will also inform final Roadmap and Action Plan.
Not answered
- 50 20.1 What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce aviation emissions?
Not answered
- 51 21. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for transport infrastructure?
Not answered
- 52 21.1 Please add details to your response.
Please see my attached statement.
- 53 22. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to reduce transport infrastructure emissions and ensure that transport infrastructure is ready for and enables low-emission transport modes?
Not answered
- 54 22.1 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce transport infrastructure emissions?
Not answered
- 55 23. What additional actions by governments, communities, industry and other stakeholders need to be taken now and in the future to ensure the energy mix is ready to support transport emissions reduction?
Not answered

- 56 24. How should the use of low carbon liquid fuels (LCLFs) be prioritised across different transport modes over time to achieve maximum abatement?
Not answered
- 57 25. What are the best ways for the Australian Government to work collaboratively with industry, business, governments and communities to implement the proposed pathways?
Not answered
- 58 25.1 What are good domestic or international examples of partnership and collaboration on transport and transport infrastructure emissions reduction that could inform the final Roadmap and Action Plan?
Not answered
- 59 25.2 What opportunities can Government leverage to show leadership in Australia and internationally?
Not answered
- 60 26. What measures and metrics should be used to evaluate the final Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Roadmap and Action Plan?
Not answered
- 61 26.1 What other data and evidence could governments use and how could this offer further insights on the pace, scale and location of transport emissions reduction pathways?
Not answered
- 62 27. Do you have any feedback on the proposed review process?
Not answered
- 63 28. Do you have any further feedback on the Consultation Roadmap and proposed pathways?

Not answered

64 28.1 Is there anything missing? Are the sections appropriately integrated? Is the Roadmap appropriately ambitious?

Not answered

65 29. Is there any further information or documentation that you wish to be considered with your submission?

Not answered

66 Would you like to upload a document?

Yes

67 Have you removed any identifying information from your submission?

Yes

68 Upload a submission

Submission to infrastructure transport emissions roadmap.pdf

69 Upload a submission

Not answered

70 Upload supporting file

Not answered

71 Upload supporting file

Not answered

Big birds, small cars and curly gardens

Re publication: It is fine to publish the content of my submission, but I would prefer if my name, location, and contact details were kept private thanks.

Submission to infrastructure, transport emissions roadmap

I have always felt very strongly about the issue of transport emissions in Australia and finding solutions to this problem. I am going to focus on the use of private vehicles, public transport and roadways.

Because transport is one of the largest and growing source of greenhouse gas emissions in Australia, it is extremely important that we address this issue as a country, and don't just ignore it. Unfortunately it is easy for Australian governments to put this issue on the back burner, largely because they want to be re-elected and so not to go against a majority perspective, while Australians en masse have a huge and growing population-wide desire to drive enormous, polluting, 'fuel-guzzling' and other resource-consuming vehicles, and to change these for new ones every several years, and also to have wider better roads built everywhere to accommodate them. This definitely represents great amenity for human beings (none of it benefits wildlife or natural habitats however), or at least it appears to benefit humans, at least in the short term (none of this actually helps us at all of course with respect to climate change and its impacts). Clearly our appetite for huge cars is one aspect of the problem, one which 'produces' much greater emissions and other types of resource wastage (e.g. a larger amount of rubber for tyres, and plastics, etc, with all the attendant disposal issues).

In my opinion, mainly because I am aware of the further endangerment of Western Australian black cockatoos, in part by the mining of lithium for electric car batteries, which destroys the habitat of the cockatoos and other endangered species, we need to tread very carefully in automatically assuming that mass electrification of vehicles is the only solution. We need URGENTLY to look much harder for lithium sources that are not located in important natural habitat areas, and not proceed willy nilly with the further expansion of mines that threaten endangered species, especially our iconic wildlife such as the black cockatoos. We need to actively prevent such thoughtless expansion. Lithium is prevalent in a number of types of less sensitive Australian environments, and cockatoos deserve to keep their homes. Also the main 'Australian' lithium mines (called such on Wikipedia last I looked) (e.g. Talison Lithium) are actually entirely owned by Chinese and US companies – it's debatable whether their profits benefit the Australian economy a great deal when the money is taken offshore, and they employ relatively few local people. And are we thinking we are going to supply lithium to the vast Chinese and US markets for electric car batteries at the expense of our endangered cockatoos? In the meantime, there is one straightforward partial solution that has been staring us in the face for many years. Australians could substantially reduce emissions simply by driving smaller vehicles, perhaps about 2 or 2.2 litre engines maximum for most purposes, and I strongly feel that there could be a much more urgent stance and stronger position taken by governments to prohibit larger vehicles as a general population trend. Most vehicles on the road contain only one person, the driver. Most of the time they don't need to be used for carrying several passengers, or heavy big loads, so they don't need big engines. I've driven 1.9 litre engine cars and smaller for decades, while raising a family. They are just as fast, reliable, long lasting and hard-working as 'standard' 2.6 litre

and larger vehicles and use a lot less petrol. Some have quite good leg-room, head-height and visibility. People who genuinely need to drive larger vehicles, say if they themselves and family members are all particularly tall (although they could choose a car with a higher ceiling), or they have families with more than two or three children, or if their work requires them to carry substantial loads, or they drive mini-bus loads of people around, could be issued with a permit to do so, as part of the registration and licensing process, enabling a type of ‘policing’ of ‘oversized’ vehicles to be introduced over time. This would force us Aussies to drive smaller cars (in keeping with population-dense countries such as Japan and Europe). We NEED to reduce our vehicle size, especially as our own population keeps growing. We’re not going to do it without being made to do so, much the same as speed-reducing policies. Given climate change, it is NOT safe for us to continue driving huge vehicles en masse. We are not yet set up for people to be able to charge electric vehicles in public places as much as they would need to with mass electrification. This strategy of demanding smaller vehicles across the board would go a considerable way towards dramatically reducing our overall vehicle emissions footprint to begin with, especially in tandem with other measures being introduced in the longer term.

I note that in the timeline provided for the transport emissions roadmap, there is a plan to introduce electric vehicles, backed by the use of hydrogen fuel cells. Like lithium, hydrogen fuel is a loaded gun, and I believe we need to proceed with great caution here. There is one kind of hydrogen fuel that is recognised as ‘green’ hydrogen, which is admirable, and is not apparently polluting. There is another kind, the most commonly used kind, which is masqueraded as being ‘green’ but is not. Companies make out that they are doing us a favour by promoting it, and that they are undertaking an environmentally conscious activity, whereas in fact it is more polluting than using fossil fuels, due to the extreme amount of resources consumed and emissions created in its production. Such companies are actively ‘greenwashing’, and not being honest. It is not OK for us to simply introduce this hydrogen fuel without questioning the source and manufacturing methods used, and emissions created in the process of producing the hydrogen. It should in my view actually be prohibited unless it is genuinely ‘green’ hydrogen only, or else we would just be shooting ourselves in the foot and creating more of a problem than we already have.

Furthermore, many people live and work close to main roads and are frequently exposed to toxic transport fumes, causing long-term sicknesses such as respiratory disease, heart conditions and cancer. These conditions are costly for the government in providing public health care. I have seen a map of the prevalence of deaths in Melbourne, constructed by a research statistician. It looked like a map of the main roads. While we reduce emissions for the purpose of addressing greenhouse gases, we also need to work towards lessening this effect of toxicity, in much the same way as we try to reduce the number of people who are smoking. One way to do this would be to slow much of the city traffic down by narrowing the roads and including more planted shrubs and trees in made gardens along roadsides. This might annoy some people who think of roadways only as a thoroughfare and a convenient way to get to work. However, roadways could become more local-community friendly by this method, increasing their ability (using plants) to reduce the impact of greenhouse gases produced by vehicles use. Also an article in the Guardian from 8th July 2024 (screenshot extract below) (<https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/article/2024/jul/08/half-of-australians-in-the-five-largest-cities-live-too-far-from-public-transport-to-ditch-cars>), if I understand it correctly, shows that, for instance in Melbourne (where driving distances can be quite considerable due to urban sprawl), while 52.5% of people have reasonable access to frequent public transport, only 18% of people are using it. Often times when I take the bus at peak times of the day it is quite full with passengers, but often at other times there is only one or a few passengers. It can feel quite silly when you’re the only passenger or one of only two or three on a big bus, with heaps of cars all around you on the roads, all with only one driver in them. Sometimes there are no passengers on buses. The bus services are still being provided at off-peak times (which I do appreciate very much, but many such

services could use smaller size buses for off-peak times, to reduce resource consumption and emissions). If cars were slowed down somewhat by the installation of more side-of-road curly gardens, at least on secondary and smaller roads (maybe also improving available parking in some places), a lot more people might feel that it would be worth their while to use public transport more often. Incorporating this and similar strategies, the speed limits could be reduced in many parts of our cities from 80 to 70, from 70 to 60, and from 60 to 50, making our roads much safer. This would also encourage wildlife in urban centres, and would lead to the wildlife being safer too, reducing road deaths of birds for instance, which generally die if struck by vehicles travelling even at speeds like 60kph. Public transport use could also perhaps be encouraged more if employment hours could change a little at the start and end of the working day to accommodate the extra time taken in public transport journeys, and to somehow reward those who do use public transport for their daily commute (perhaps specifically by gaining an extra half hour at each end of their workday, while still being paid the same rate). This might be just as effective, work productivity wise, as a 4-day week has been shown to be.

Access to public transport across Australia's largest cities

	Adelaide	Brisbane	Melbourne	Perth	Sydney
People with all-day frequent services available near their home	47.6% have access	33.7% have access	52.5% have access	40.5% have access	67.2% have access
Population ²	1.2 million	2.3 million	4.6 million	2.0 million	4.7 million
Population density	1,457 people per km ²	1,129 people per km ²	1,592 people per km ²	1,188 people per km ²	2,141 people per km ²
Land area	854 km ²	2,027 km ²	2,881 km ²	1,720 km ²	2,194 km ²
Transport options used to travel to work	Public: 10% Active: 5% Private: 80% Other: 5%	Public: 14% Active: 5% Private: 75% Other: 6%	Public: 18% Active: 6% Private: 71% Other: 6%	Public: 12% Active: 5% Private: 78% Other: 5%	Public: 27% Active: 6% Private: 62% Other: 5%
Service gap between wealthy and lower income suburbs	Access is 19% lower in lower income suburbs	Access is 27% lower in lower income suburbs	Access is 27% lower in lower income suburbs	Access is 18% lower in lower income suburbs	Access is about the same in lower income suburbs

Guardian Graphic | Source: Climate Council of Australia Ltd 2024. ² Population and density statistics have been estimated off the basis of aggregated mesh block counts aligned to these boundaries. Population data is sourced from the 2021 Census, based on reported place of usual residence. ³ Journey to work mode share is based on 2016 Census results. As 2021 Census results were impacted by COVID lockdowns, 2016 data is the most recent consistent national data available. 'Other' includes people who worked at home on Census Day