

Submission on Clean cars, Mot discussion paper

Vince Dravitzki

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Email [REDACTED]

Overall I support the approach whereby you are setting up a requirement for vehicle fuel efficiency, that will be enforceable, and in addition there will be an accompanying fee-bate scheme. I believe that these measures will work to reduce GHG emissions, but their overall impact will be small. Early research that I have done on similar measures introduced in the late 1970's early 1980's support this. (*The response of travel behaviours and transportation patterns to fuel-price increases and legislative constraints* Tiffany Lester, Vince Dravitzki)

Those measures were largely supported by the public even though they were far more onerous.

However, these current measures are in my opinion far too timid, especially in view of the urgency for emissions reduction. You have the 1970s as examples of far bolder policies, but from a period where the ministry led public opinion, not followed it.

There are more effective ways to reduce vehicle emissions such as far greater support for public transport, especially with regards to how it is managed, paid for, and operated. It is time to drop the remaining vestiges of the 1980's neo-liberal approach to PT.

My is also that it is time that you dropped this illusion of mode neutrality that you claim to operate. We need to directly favour low emission modes such as public transport and support those households who choose to reduce their car ownership. This would also greatly improve road safety, as well, as your own studies find Public Transport 7 times safer than car travel.

Below is an example of how we could at least have a more genuine mode neutral approach to emission reduction.

The intended subsidy for electric vehicles has been set as \$8000. Most of this will benefit the first owner. In return, the nation gets an electric vehicle, which over 20 years, will avoid up to 42tonnes of CO₂ being generated. At \$8000, that CO₂ is being valued at \$190 per tonne

But a central policy of Ministry of Transport is to not favour one mode over another. What about more burdensome emission reducing behaviours, such as giving up one or all cars, and what about buses.

If a two-car household gave up one car, the second car would be used more. The saving would be about 0.9tonnes per year (value \$170). A household giving up all cars but using Public Transport would save 1.75 tonnes per car per year. True mode neutrality would suggest a reward for that behaviour of \$330 per year for the one-car household and \$660 per year for the two-car household.

Over its 12year life, the electric bus equivalent of an urban diesel bus would save about 854tonnes of CO₂, at a value of \$162,000; about half the difference in price between an electric and conventional bus.

What is our goal? Is it to subsidize just wealthy car owners or reward all major transport emission eliminating behaviours?