

# Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Consultation Roadmap

## Take the survey

Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment and Water

---


Response received at:

July 27, 2024 at 3:14 PM GMT+10

Response ID:

sbm2f88b5847965fc3ad91f6

---

- 1 Confirm that you have read and understand this privacy notice.  
Yes
- 2 Please indicate how and if you want your submission published.  
Public
- 3 Published name  
Brisbane CBD BUG
- 4 Confirm that you have read and understand this declaration.  
Yes
- 5 First name  
Paul
- 6 Last name  
French
- 7 Email  


8 Phone



9 Who are you answering on behalf of?

Organisation

10 Organisation name

Brisbane Central Business District Bicycle User Group

11 What best describes you or your organisation?

Not for profit

12 What sector do you represent?

Active transport

13 What state or territory do you live in?

Queensland

14 Postcode

4001

15 What area best describes where you live?

City

16 1. Do you support the proposed guiding principles?

Not answered

17 1.1 Please add details to your response.

Not answered

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.

Not answered

20 3. Do you agree the development of a national policy framework for active and public transport will support emissions reduction?

Not answered

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?

Not answered

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?

The Brisbane CBD BUG was already aware of, and welcomes, the Australian Government establishing the \$100 million Active Transport Fund via the 2024-25 Budget. However, this funding is spread over four years, and is for both walking and cycling infrastructure across the entire country. As a comparison, even the Brisbane City Council's very modest 2024-25 budgeted spending for cycling infrastructure is equivalent to this. Therefore, the Australian Government's Active Transport Fund is little more than a token effort compared to the budgeting required to make up for the decades of neglect towards active travel by governments at all levels across Australia. Hence, significantly more Australian Government funding is required to develop appropriate (safe and direct) infrastructure for cycling and other active travel modes.

In relation to transport funding we call for the cessation of new Federal Government funding for road upgrades in the urban environment - and the redirection all such program budgets

towards the  
delivery of improved active and public transport infrastructure.

- 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?

Not answered

- 27 7.1 Please add details to your response.

Not answered

- 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?

A key issue is that critical mineral constraints appear to not have been addressed e.g.:  
electric

motor vehicles will require between two and three times the amount of copper and twice the

manganese compared to a current internal combustion engine vehicle. The critical minerals required

for the charging network are not considered either). A search of the Consultation Roadmap for the

word “copper” returned zero results.

There is little acknowledgement of the opportunity for encouraging electric bicycles – instead of electric cars. Australian state and territory governments are subsidising electric cars and ignoring the potential for electric bicycles (and PMDs) to enable the population’s personal mobility at far less cost than cars while also reducing emissions and traffic congestion. The Consultation Roadmap acknowledges that “bigger and heavier cars such as SUVs” are the fastest growing segment of the vehicle market, yet no actions are proposed to discourage this worrying trend. These larger vehicles have negative consequences for road and parking infrastructure and also increase the impact of collisions on vulnerable road users. Accordingly, we call for changes to the taxation and vehicular regulatory systems to disincentivise purchases of such vehicles.

**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

Not answered

**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.

Not answered

- 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.  
Not answered
- 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.  
Not answered
- 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.

Not answered

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?

Not answered

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.

Not answered

- 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?

In relation to transport funding we call for the cessation of new Federal Government funding for road

upgrades in the urban environment - and the redirection all such program budgets towards the

delivery of improved active and public transport infrastructure.

- 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

Brisbane\_CBD\_BUG\_sub\_Transport\_Infrastructure\_Net\_Zero\_Consultation\_Roadmap\_final\_13ab8732\_Redacted.pdf

69 Upload a submission

Not answered

70 Upload supporting file

Not answered

71 Upload supporting file

Not answered



---

**Brisbane Central Business District Bicycle User Group**

**CBD BUG**

**GPO Box 2104**

**Brisbane Qld 4001**

[brisbanecbdbug@gmail.com](mailto:brisbanecbdbug@gmail.com)

[www.facebook.com/cbdbug/](http://www.facebook.com/cbdbug/)

---

Mr Jim Betts  
Secretary  
Department of Infrastructure, Transport,  
Regional Development, Communications and the Arts  
GPO Box 594  
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Mr Betts

**Brisbane CBD BUG submission on  
*Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Consultation Roadmap***

This submission provides the views of the Brisbane Central Business District Bicycle User Group (CBD BUG) on the *Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Consultation Roadmap* (the “*Consultation Roadmap*”).

As a matter of policy, the comments in this submission are limited to issues impacting bicycle riders and other active travel users.

This submission can be made public and published.

*Brisbane CBD BUG information*

The Brisbane CBD BUG is a grass roots volunteer organisation of more than 800 members, representing the interests of people riding bicycles to, from and within the Brisbane city centre. We are active in seeking policy decisions at all levels of government supporting people who want to cycle, and focus on calling for improved infrastructure, end-of-trip facilities, integration of cycling needs with other transport modes and a regulatory environment supporting people riding bikes. CBD BUG members meet monthly to exchange information and ideas, discuss issues of relevance and determine the direction of policies to benefit CBD cyclists.

*Background*

After decades of prioritising private motor vehicle travel, much of Australia’s urban environment is overtly hostile towards people walking and people riding bikes and micro-mobility devices.

Key features of the current policy environment that foster car driving and deter people from using active travel modes include:

- most of the width of road corridors is dedicated to motorists and car parking, while people riding bicycles/personal mobility devices (PMDs) and people walking are left to share sub-standard footpaths
- state and territory governments are directly subsidising electric vehicle purchases while also providing indirect subsidies for drivers through spending far more on roads each year than the revenue derived from motorists via road tolls and registration fees, plus the national tax system subsidises driving cars for private travel, and
- the host of anti-cyclist road rules – such as the ban on riding bicycles on the footpath applied in several states and the unsafe 50km/h default urban area speed limit.

This car-centric transport planning has locked the majority of the population into incurring the high financial costs of owning and operating motor vehicles, the costs to individual health from sedentary lifestyles, along with the personal cost of time lost due to driving and sitting in traffic congestion. Other community-wide costs are the social impact from people losing a sense of community from being isolated from others while driving a car (unlike cycling and walking during which people can engage with others directly), and the environmental damage due to vehicle emissions.

### Comments on Consultation Roadmap

Overall, the CBD BUG very much welcomes the *Consultation Roadmap* for recognising the need to reform Australia's transport and transport infrastructure sectors - and that this will require a substantial increase in the use of active and public transport.

We strongly support the views articulated in section 2.1 of the *Consultation Roadmap* regarding the potential for active transport to significantly reduce road transport emissions while also easing congestion and household transport costs, increasing physical activity levels and reducing harmful pollution, heat and noise.

However, our comments refer primarily to Road – light vehicles (Chapter 3.1), and Transport infrastructure (Chapter 4.1)

A key issue is that critical mineral constraints appear to not have been addressed e.g.: electric motor vehicles will require between two and three times the amount of copper and twice the manganese compared to a current internal combustion engine vehicle. The critical minerals required for the charging network are not considered either). A search of the *Consultation Roadmap* for the word “copper” returned zero results.

There is little acknowledgement of the opportunity for encouraging electric bicycles – instead of electric cars. Australian state and territory governments are subsidising electric cars and ignoring the potential for electric bicycles (and PMDs) to enable the population's personal mobility at far less cost than cars while also reducing emissions and traffic congestion.

The *Consultation Roadmap* acknowledges that “bigger and heavier cars such as SUVs” are the fastest growing segment of the vehicle market, yet no actions are proposed to discourage this worrying trend. These larger vehicles have negative consequences for road and parking infrastructure and also increase the impact of collisions on vulnerable road users. Accordingly, we call for changes to the taxation and vehicular regulatory systems to disincentivise purchases of such vehicles.

The extent of the opportunity to encourage a mode shift to active transport is missing. Given running costs for electric cars will be less than internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles, extensive and urgent action is required to discourage their use for urban trips over short distances.

Citing Brisbane City as an example, half of all motor vehicle trips are 5km or less, a distance easily covered with a person riding and electric bicycle or scooter.

The Brisbane CBD BUG was already aware of, and welcomes, the Australian Government establishing the \$100 million Active Transport Fund via the 2024-25 Budget.

However, this funding is spread over four years, and is for both walking and cycling infrastructure across the entire country. As a comparison, even the Brisbane City Council's very modest 2024-25 budgeted spending for cycling infrastructure is equivalent to this.

Therefore, the Australian Government's Active Transport Fund is little more than a token effort compared to the budgeting required to make up for the decades of neglect towards active travel by governments at all levels across Australia. Hence, significantly more Australian Government funding is required to develop appropriate (safe and direct) infrastructure for cycling and other active travel modes.

In relation to transport funding we call for the cessation of new Federal Government funding for road upgrades in the urban environment - and the redirection all such program budgets towards the delivery of improved active and public transport infrastructure.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on the *Consultation Roadmap*.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

Co-convenor  
Brisbane CBD BUG  
27 July 2024