

Transport and Infrastructure Net Zero Consultation Roadmap

Take the survey

Department of Climate Change, Energy, Environment and Water

Response received at:

June 9, 2024 at 11:38 AM GMT+10

Response ID:

sbm2e90bde57c83feb4d8fd6

- 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
OceanHydro
- 4 Confirm that you have read and understand this declaration.
Yes
- 5 First name
Chris
- 6 Last name
Drake
- 7 Email
[REDACTED]

8 Phone

[REDACTED]

9 Who are you answering on behalf of?

Organisation

10 Organisation name

OceanHydro

11 What best describes you or your organisation?

Industry

12 What sector do you represent?

Energy

13 What state or territory do you live in?

Queensland

14 Postcode

4573

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.

#5 is not consistent with the purpose of the initiative. No evidence (genuine scientific input) has been provided to show the expected effect of the implementation of this program on the worlds climate.

#2 is badly worded and unfair: as written, it states that you're going to make "the private sector" pay, AND innovate, AND provide effort to reach your goals. We - all Australian

citizens, *are* the private sector: we run it, and what we don't run, we pay for directly and indirectly. The best outcomes are not going to be profitable, and are going to be risky (which means un-fanciable). Your wording thus excludes those.

#3 in a "net" context is not true. The "economic opportunity" robbed from Australia is going to be vastly greater than any opportunity delivered.

#4 is unrealistic and suggests a less-than-realistic appraisal of the policy impacts

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.

Partially - "Avoid" Looks OK. "Shift" _sounds_ good, but isn't realistic or possible.

"Improve" doesn't make sense - the cart is before the horse: electricity in Australia comes from Coal. Reducing "Transport" emissions by moving them into "Electricity" emissions should never be considered.

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.

Partially - Electricity comes from Coal, so the cart is before the horse on this idea as well.

Large numbers of people who do not use public transport have reasons for that:

"promoting" it or trying to "force" them is not going to have any meaningful impact.

See also my comments about #5 "evidence-based" - asking the general non-expert public "if they agree" is the exact opposite of "evidence-based" - "consulting" with "public" is a political tactic to hide the problem that the evidence, if any even exists, typically does not support the idea.

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

A complete re-think of this system - safety, discomfort, fear, inconvenience, cost, access ...

if public transport can be fixed at all, and entire re-invention of the concept is probably necessary (e.g. 1 to 4 person individual capsules which are more like a private elevator in a building that takes you (and maybe a couple of friends too, plus your stuff or luggage) from where you are to where you want to be quickly and for free - i.e. nothing whatsoever like a bus or train which you have to find a way to get to, pay for, wait for, ride uncomfortably on with sketchy other people sneezing on you, get off, then find you way to where you want to be, all while manhandling your stuff along the way...)

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? Replace all public transport (road and rail) with an attractive (in every sense of the word) alternative innovation.

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?

"rolling out the required infrastructure" is realistically the ONLY possible thing that could help do this, but in my significant first-hand experience in this exact field, if this even happens at all, it will be little-to-none, cost vast amounts of money, and take forever.

Investing government funds is the only way: Industry CANNOT help, because the law requires them to make profit for shareholders, and banks do not invest in high-risk projects (all Innovation is high-risk).

Government needs to make GRANT (no "matched funding" or other sly tricks) funds available to zero-emission projects to power this industry. Nothing else will help.

25 6.2. How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities for emissions reduction in the movement of goods? Realistically, this will never happen, because the costs over the distances involved are astronomical, and Government typically do not spend taxpayer money on innovative power projects.

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.

This is the most outrageous "no evidence" part of your strategy.

How much coal is burned to produce 1 charge of a Tesla?

To work that out, you'd need to know

1. the total coal input to our power stations, and
2. the total watts charged over the same period (to accurately understand the entirety of the losses in the generation, transformation, and transport phases of that power), and
3. the total power that lands in the battery per watt of power drawn from the grid
4. an accurately modeled chart of the coal-powered electricity output over time (day and night) paying particular attention to the number of times where generation has been at or near zero (i.e. when renewables have supplied 100%+ of the grid energy - for context: I think this has actually happened once in S.A.)
5. an accurate model of where, when, and how many electric vehicles are being charged.
6. in my (non-trivial) experience, most CO2 related studies are misleading, inaccurate, and improperly cited (such as using non-Australian data to make cases here, or mixing up lifecycle emissions with tailpipe - both of which you're doing). In almost every instance where I've "checked the numbers" on science reports, they're either wrong (sometimes blatantly so, even by factors of 100x or more), making unrealistic estimates, or otherwise using numbers to draw inappropriate results. We need real Australian numbers, not fake ones, and not sketchy international reports.

I've done my own back-of-the-envelope math on the above - here is the problem:-

Your average Tesla generates MORE CO2 (from coal) emissions per km than a typical new Diesel Landcruiser.

The main obvious difference is the the "Tailpipe emissions" from the Tesla is a coal chimney hidden in the bush a few hundred kilometers away.

Pay close attention to item #4 above. To spell this out more clearly - many less-educated people believe electric cars are solar powered, without understanding that the solar charging their car would have been powering something else, had they not plugged in their car. The act of charging directly requires the burning of more coal to provide that

charge.

Except for that isolated case in S.A.:-

EVERY SINGLE ELECTRIC VEHICLE IN AUSTRALIA IS COAL POWERED.

- 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?

"evidence based" - a genuinely accurate study and report of the emissions generated from electric vehicle charging needs to be done, so all electric cars and their owners can be suitably penalized for their emissions.

To be clear: EVERY car (electric and otherwise) produces CO2 per kilometer; so EVERY car (electric and otherwise) needs to be subject to the same emissions rules. Inventing a fake metric called "tailpipe emissions" so you can bury your head in the sand over coal power is the exact opposite of your "evidence based" agenda.

- 29 8.2 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce light vehicle emissions?

"Drive electric" is not the same as "reduce emissions" - it is in fact the opposite. People need to be made aware of the emissions of electric vehicles, so that investment in non-coal-powered charging can begin.

- 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

Besides the "Australian electricity comes from coal" elephant-in-the-room, this industry should be entirely left alone. We do not want to give them any excuse to increase the costs of everything for all Australians - the burden is simply not worth it.

Fix rail, make it inexpensive, and the heavy road issue will fix itself.

- 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: Battery electric
 - 3: Hydrogen fuel cell
- 33 10.1 Please add details to your response. Why did you rank them in that order?
- Hydrogen is not a thing (do some genuine research). "Battery" is another word for "Coal Powered".
- 34 11. What role should low carbon liquid fuels play in the heavy vehicle decarbonisation?
- None - leave the industry alone and fix rail and sea.
- 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?
- Fix rail and sea, leave road alone.
- 36 13. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for rail?
- No
- 37 13.1 Please add details to your response.
- It's low enough as it is, and alternative energy ideas are either unrealistic (battery) or unreal (hydrogen is not a thing)
- 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: Battery electric

3: Hydrogen fuel cell

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

Hydrogen is not a thing (do some genuine research). "Battery" is another word for "Coal Powered".

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

None - if we ever get non-coal electricity, electrified rail makes some sense (except for cost)

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?

None. It's low enough as it is, and considering costs, alternative energy makes no sense

42 16.1 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce rail emissions?

Effort and investment in other areas stands to provide vastly better outcomes

43 17. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for maritime?

No

44 17.1 Please add details to your response.

..."not included"... what's the point of any "Net zero" plan which willfully excludes contributors?

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?

Adopt the new slow-and-on-time shipping approach which is reduces emissions by 17% or more (see <https://newatlas.com/marine/blue-visby-cargo-emissions/>)

46 18.2 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce maritime emissions?

Cut them immediately; almost no costs involved.

47 19. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for aviation?

Partially, yes (interesting to see international included here, when it was excluded for shipping?)

48 19.1 Please add details to your response.

Hydrogen is not a thing, and given Australian distances, nor is battery. Airport operations (and in-air operations) show the larges promise.

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?

Fly slower and more directly (e.g. strait-in, strait out) should be considered for large reductions at almost no costs

51 21. Do you agree with the proposed net zero pathway for transport infrastructure?

No

- 52 21.1 Please add details to your response.
Vastly too unrealistic to expect any investment here to produce useful outcomes, and this sector doesn't really belong on its own. "Transport and Infrastructure" is not "Transport Infrastructure" - if you want to address Infrastructure, it needs its own strategy, so *all* Infrastructure is considered.
- 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?
Demand is the cause, so supporting innovation to shift demand makes some sense. Do Infrastructure separate from Transport
- 54 22.1 How would these actions address the identified challenges and opportunities to reduce transport infrastructure emissions?
less bad and more good
- 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?
Support (with funding and "red tape" dedicated assistance) zero emission innovation. Industry can never get loans or funding for "Innovation", because it's classed as "high risk".
- 56 24. How should the use of low carbon liquid fuels (LCLFs) be prioritised across different transport modes over time to achieve maximum abatement?
Nonsense question. Burning X fuel makes Y CO₂, regardless of when or where you do that. "maximum abatement" comes from "more LCLFs", not changing when or how you burn it.
- 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?

Support innovation - that means - provide funds for risky ventures with excellent outcome potential.

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?

Investments in renewable production are the only realistic examples. Unfortunately, no funds for "Innovation" is available (low-risk solar and wind have destroyed every alternative). Government funding needs to prioritize *outcomes*, not "return on investment".

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

Pay attention to our innovators, and back them with funding.

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

1. Cost to Australians: we do NOT want more expensive cars (neither new nor used), more expensive fuels, more expensive goods, or more expensive tickets etc.

2. Genuine EVIDENCE BASED metrics (real relevant evidence, not fake, not foreign, and actual evidence, not just using the words "evidence based" and then stating unsupported "facts").

3. CO2 per km for ALL VEHICLES (including electrics, without pretending they're "solar powered" when they're really coal powered).

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?

1. the total coal input to our power stations, and

2. the total watts charged over the same period

(to accurately understand the entirety of the losses in the generation, transformation, and transport phases of that power), and

3. the total power that lands in the battery per watt of power drawn from the grid

4. an accurately modeled chart of the coal-powered electricity output over time (day and

night) paying particular attention to the number of times where generation has been at or near zero (i.e. when renewables have supplied 100%+ of the grid energy - for context: I think this has actually happened once in S.A.)

5. an accurate model of where, when, and how many electric vehicles are being charged.

62 27. Do you have any feedback on the proposed review process?

Yes - it is fake. Asking the "general public" is not the right way to solicit feedback. You should have personally invited genuine experts and relevant industry to give sensible, relevant, and real feedback.

Asking "everyone" now means that you've got 99% uninformed opinion to wade through, and you're probably never going to notice the 1% of smart input you've gotten.

To be clear: I've had the opportunity to participate in other government feedback before, and I once had the luck of meeting the public servant who actually drafted the policy. I personally read all public submissions (took me 2 whole days) prior to my meeting, and asked his opinion about many themes I saw emerge. He had no idea what I was talking about, so I asked his opinion about my submission. It was this point where he admitted, when I asked how many submissions he read that he only "skimmed a few". His exact words.

I fully expect my submission never to be read by any "reviewer".

63 28. Do you have any further feedback on the Consultation Roadmap and proposed pathways?

It is scientifically horrific, and not genuine enough. Excluding entire chunks of the industry (shipping), including unrelated things (transport infrastructure), and the largest elephant in the room - utterly ignoring the emissions of electric vehicles entirely (coal power).

Also missing - what is the point? Where is the science that shows exactly what, and how much, realistic difference that any of these pathways will have on our climate? "worse" and "more severe" and other alarmist rhetoric that inspired this roadmap needs to be replaced with science and evidence. What's realistically going to happen when do do everything we probably actually can? What's the difference if we instead do nothing? What if we spend the money on preparing for the inevitable, instead of irrationally believing that we can pull off something impossible (and then we still need to prepare for the inevitable anyhow)?

The climate industry is awash with cancel-culture. Nobody wants to hear any opinion other than their own, but worse, nobody wants to face reality either. That's OK for we, the general public, but it's not OK for any Government. It's your job to responsibly look after us, no matter how ignorant and silly we are. Imposing swathes of new restrictions and price hikes on all of us for no measurably useful impact on our climate is not a responsible use of Government power.

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

Yes - evidence is missing. Huge number of claims are made which have no supporting evidence, and where's the CO2 per Km number for EVs ?

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

Either stop saying "evidence based", or start behaving that way. Right now, your roadmap and science are not in alignment.

66 Would you like to upload a document?

No

67 Have you removed any identifying information from your submission?

Not answered

68 Upload a submission

Not answered

69 Upload a submission

Not answered

70 Upload supporting file

Not answered

71 Upload supporting file

Not answered