

# Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Consultation Roadmap

## Take the survey

Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment and Water

---


Response received at:

June 14, 2024 at 5:44 PM GMT+10

Response ID:

sbm2eabcd4c0b6b086c356e9

---

- 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  
Geoffrey Houston
- 4 Confirm that you have read and understand this declaration.  
Yes
- 5 First name  
Geoffrey
- 6 Last name  
Houston
- 7 Email  


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?

Queensland

14 Postcode

4559

15 What area best describes where you live?

Regional area

16 1. Do you support the proposed guiding principles?

No

17 1.1 Please add details to your response.

There is no scientific evidence to justify the goal of Net Zero, nor is it attainable without destroying our standard of living.

18 2. Do you support the use of the avoid-shift-improve framework as a tool to identify opportunities for abatement?

No

19 2.1 Please add details to your response.

Abatement is not desirable or necessary.

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

No

21 3.1 Please add details to your response.

I believe that we, the people, are beginning to wake up to this damaging approach.

22 4. What should be included in a national policy framework for active and public transport and how should it be developed?

The government should support the development and implementation of safety standards and a free competitive market. All taxes and incentives that modify the free market should be removed.

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?

None.

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?

None

25 6.2. How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities for emissions reduction in the movement of goods?

They would not.

- 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.  
As I stated previously, Net Zero is unjustified scientifically and in practice, unattainable.
- 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?  
Do not introduce any standards to further reduce vehicle emissions.
- 29 8.2 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce light vehicle emissions?  
The identified challenges are a fiction. Ignore them.
- 30 9. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for heavy road vehicles?  
No
- 31 9.1 Please add details to your response  
Net Zero is scientifically unjustified and unattainable.
- 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: Low carbon liquid fuels  
2: Hydrogen fuel cell  
3: Battery electric

- 33 10.1 Please add details to your response. Why did you rank them in that order?  
Fuel options should be determined by economics and safety.
- 34 11. What role should low carbon liquid fuels play in the heavy vehicle decarbonisation?  
None.
- 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?  
None.
- 36 13. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for rail?  
No
- 37 13.1 Please add details to your response.  
Net Zero is unjustifiable scientifically, and unattainable in practice.
- 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: Low carbon liquid fuels  
2: Hydrogen fuel cell  
3: Battery electric
- 39 14.1 Please add details to your response. Why did you rank them in that order?  
It is the order causing least economic damage.
- 40 15. What role should low carbon liquid fuels play in rail decarbonisation?  
None. No change is necessary.

- 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?  
Stop interfering and allow free enterprise to make us a rich country.
- 42 16.1 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce rail emissions?  
They wont. But the challenges are imaginary.
- 43 17. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for maritime?  
No
- 44 17.1 Please add details to your response.  
Since Net Zero is scientifically unjustified and also unattainable, we are simply wasting resources on this project.
- 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?  
Get out of the way of free enterprise.
- 46 18.2 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce maritime emissions?  
They wont, nor should they.
- 47 19. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for aviation?  
No, for the reasons mentioned previously.
- 48 19.1 Please add details to your response.  
Net Zero is not justified by science and is unattainable.

- 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.  
What a waste of effort that was.
- 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?  
Get out of the way. Concentrate on safety and allow free enterprise to flourish with government sand in its wheels.
- 51 21. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for transport infrastructure?  
No
- 52 21.1 Please add details to your response.  
We do not need this.
- 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?  
None
- 54 22.1 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce transport infrastructure emissions?  
They wont.
- 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?

None.

- 56 24. How should the use of low carbon liquid fuels (LCLFs) be prioritised across different transport modes over time to achieve maximum abatement?

It should not.

- 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?

Attend to safety and make labor and finance efficient so that industry thrives.

- 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?

None known to me,

- 59 25.2 What opportunities can Government leverage to show leadership in Australia and internationally?

None known to me,

- 60 26. What measures and metrics should be used to evaluate the final Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Roadmap and Action Plan?

Success will be the abandonment of the Net Zero goal, exit from the Paris accord and a thriving free enterprise Australia with a clean environment uncluttered by solar and wind factories.

- 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?

Refer to the CO2 Coalition to get an accurate picture of how CO2 and climate are connected.

- 62 27. Do you have any feedback on the proposed review process?  
Its all a waste of time.
- 63 28. Do you have any further feedback on the Consultation Roadmap  
and proposed pathways?  
Ditto
- 64 28.1 Is there anything missing? Are the sections appropriately  
integrated? Is the Roadmap appropriately ambitious?  
Science and common sense are completely absent.
- 65 29. Is there any further information or documentation that you wish to  
be considered with your submission?  
Please read my attachment.
- 66 Would you like to upload a document?  
Yes
- 67 Have you removed any identifying information from your submission?  
Yes
- 68 Upload a submission  
The Case Against Net Zero.docx
- 69 Upload a submission  
Not answered
- 70 Upload supporting file  
Not answered
- 71 Upload supporting file  
Not answered

## The case against NetZero.

The intention of this submission is to express and justify the view that any Solar/Wind Farm and BESS and the entire NetZero renewables revolution of our electricity grid should be scrapped.

It is contended that the commitment to NetZero, and to coal exiting the system, is not justified. There is no need for the coal exit and NetZero is a folly which will destroy our economy and leave us weak at a dangerous time in history.

### 1. CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition.

To establish the claim that NetZero is unjustified, the work of a distinguished organisation: The CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition<sup>1</sup> will be referenced. Here is how the coalition describes itself:

*“The CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition was established in 2015 as a non-partisan educational foundation operating under Section 501(c)(3) of the IRS code for the purpose of educating thought leaders, policy makers, and the public about the important contribution made by carbon dioxide to our lives and the economy. The Coalition seeks to engage in an informed and dispassionate discussion of climate change, humans’ role in the climate system, the limitations of climate models, and the consequences of mandated reductions in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.”*

The board of this Coalition comprises 3 PhD Physicists, including Clauser, the 2022 Nobel prize winner. The board has PhD’s in Nuclear Engineering, Chemistry, Oil Markets, and World Politics. Also on the board are Moore (founder of Greenpeace), and the founder of a semiconductor company. These people are extremely well qualified to understand the scientific issues as well as the politics. They receive no benefit from their efforts on the Coalition, unlike most of those who promote subsidised implementation of renewables. The next two sections refer to their work.

### 2. CO<sub>2</sub> Sensitivity.

A key issue is to understand what temperature rise to expect as a result of a doubling of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. This is referred to as Climate Sensitivity. IPCC still maintains it is between 1.5 and 4.5 deg C. According to foremost climate scientist Richard Lindzen from the CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition Publications, Lindzen<sup>2</sup> methodically shows how it is at or most probably below 1.5 deg C. This increase is harmless and probably beneficial. This is really all the information needed to show we are wasting resources in restricting use of fossil fuels in any way.

With such a low CO<sub>2</sub> Sensitivity there is no indication that using all available fossil fuels will cause dangerous global warming. The result of switching from coal fired power to renewables, assuming it results in lower CO<sub>2</sub>, is an imperceptible change to temperature and huge damage to our environment, waste of farmland and a reduced standard of living.

### 3. How Did we get NetZero so Wrong?

In order to understand how the world's decision makers have been led to agree on NetZero, it is instructive to refer to another publication of the CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition, namely Ref 3: Challenging "NetZero" with Science.

The authors show how studies leading to exaggeration of the effects of CO<sub>2</sub> on climate have resulted from use of fabricated data, as well as ignoring contrary data. It shows how climate models are not capable of making the predictions they claim. The NetZero proponents also ignore the benefits of CO<sub>2</sub> and ignore costs associated with renewables.

The whole paper is worthy of scrutiny as it explains from a scientific perspective, how we arrived at this dangerous and unjustified decision point.

### 4. Summary.

In section 1 an unbiased and well qualified source of climate science was introduced, the CO<sub>2</sub> Coalition. In sections 2 and 3 it was explained how we got NetZero wrong and how curtailing use of fossil fuel is entirely unjustified.

### 5. Conclusion

There is an urgent need for brave, honest leadership to call time on this waste of our resources and manpower. It is leading to a dark future with decreasing quality of life and insecurity. The warning signals are there for those who observe objectively. Huge farmer strikes in Europe have resulted in minor official capitulation<sup>4</sup>. Offshore wind farm sales in USA have almost halted<sup>5</sup>. Dozens of land-based renewables projects in USA, enabled by Biden's policies, are stalled due to grid connection issues and costs<sup>6</sup>. The increase in EV sales has stalled in California and Great Britain<sup>7</sup>.

The longer Australia waits to cease the NetZero transition and revert to a modern electrical grid with redundancy and safeguards to cope with inevitable interruptions, the more expensive it will be. Don't leave our children to deal with this damage. Cancel this and every other renewable project designed to reach the worthless NetZero target.

Ref 1

<https://co2coalition.org/>

Ref 2

<https://co2coalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/08/On-Climate-Sensitivity.pdf>

Ref 3

<https://co2coalition.org/publications/challenging-net-zero-with-science/>

Ref 4

<https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/tractors-roll-into-downtown-prague-czech-farmers-join-protests-2024-02-19/>

Ref 5

<https://www.eenews.net/articles/offshore-wind-faces-more-financial-turbulence-in-2024/>

Ref 6

<https://www.nytimes.com/2023/02/23/climate/renewable-energy-us-electrical-grid.html>

Ref 7

<https://www.wsj.com/business/autos/electric-vehicle-demand-charts-7d3089c7>