

California Could Phase out Diesel Locomotives

CARB expected to take up regulation on zero emissions



Union Pacific could be required to use zero-emissions locomotives if the California Air Resources Board approves regulation calling for the use of such locomotives.

The California Air Resources Board is poised to take action this week on a proposed regulation that seeks to reduce locomotive emissions in the state by phasing out diesel locomotives and requiring zero-emissions locomotives within a certain time frame.

“In the absence of federal action to address harmful emissions from locomotives, CARB is developing regulatory concepts to reduce criteria pollutants, toxic air contaminants, and greenhouse gas emissions for locomotives in-use,” CARB says on its website. *“These concepts are intended to be implemented statewide, and provide an opportunity for the railroads to better address regional pollution and long-standing environmental justice concerns with communities near railyards. The goal of the regulatory concepts is to accelerate immediate adoption of advanced cleaner technologies for all locomotive operations.”*

The proposed regulation, which would apply to both passenger and freight rail operations that involve travel to seaports, rail yards and other locations, consists of the following:

In 2024:

Locomotive operators would need to fund a trust account based on how much emissions their locomotives produce and that account would help fund the purchase of cleaner locomotives or the upgrade of existing locomotives.

Locomotives with automatic shutoff devices would not be permitted to idle for longer than 30 minutes, except for certain circumstances such as maintaining air brake pressure or providing heat or cooling to the locomotive cab.

Locomotives operating in the state would be required to register with CARB and locomotive activity, emission levels and idling data would be reported annually.

In 2030:

Locomotives must be 23 years old or younger in order to be used in California.

“All switch, industrial and passenger locomotives with an original engine build date of 2030 or newer would be required to operate in a ZE [zero-emission] configuration — i.e., qualify as either a ZE locomotive or ZE capable locomotive to operate in California.”

In 2035:

“All Class I line haul locomotives with an original engine build date of 2035 and beyond would be required to operate in a ZE configuration — i.e., qualify as either a ZE locomotive or ZE capable locomotive to operate in California.”

CARB estimates that between 2023 and 2050, this regulation statewide would reduce approximately 7,455 tons of particulate matter (PM), 389,630 tons of NOx emissions and 21.9 million metric tons of greenhouse gas emissions. The agency says that would be equivalent to removing all heavy-duty diesel trucks from California’s roads for all of 2030.

CARB projects in 2022, locomotives used in passenger and freight operations emitted more than 640 tons per year of PM2.5 and over 29,800 tons per year of NOx emissions.

Rail industry, environmental advocates differ on rule’s usefulness

This week’s deliberations will be the latest in a debate that has been going on for years on whether to regulate locomotive emissions. This proposed regulation was released in November 2022.

The American Short Line and Regional Railroad Association (ASLRRA) have said the regulation could render a number of short line railroads operating in California to become “financially insolvent.”

“CARB has dramatically underestimated the cost of the Proposed Rule. While the rule proposes extremely onerous recordkeeping and anti-idling requirements, the spending account provision provides the most severe burden to small businesses,” ASLRRA said in an April 2021 statement to CARB.

The trade association also said costs for new locomotives that could be compliant range between \$5 million and \$7 million for each locomotive.

“Combined with necessary infrastructure upgrades needed for things like hydrogen fueling or battery recharging, other regulations from local air districts in some parts of the state mandating additional improvements such as exhaust scrubbers in shop facilities, and new indirect emission source rules, these new regulations would significantly destabilize the state’s short line railroad industry, which already operates on relatively small profit margins,” ASLRRA said. “The result of such a destabilization would be California shippers cut off from rail service, impacting their cost structure and ability to compete effectively in the U.S. and world economies.”

ASLRRA also questioned the legality of the regulation since locomotives — including the ones that travel to California from out of state — participate in interstate commerce.

Environmental advocate Earthjustice said the regulation would clean up the air in communities situated nearby rail yards.

“There are few places where this dirty diesel locomotive pollution is more saturated than in communities located near railyards. Southern California’s Inland Empire and Los Angeles regions are all too familiar with locomotive pollution,” Earthjustice senior associate attorney Yasmine Agelidis said Wednesday on the group’s website. *“Not only do these areas suffer from some of the worst air quality in the country, but of the 18 major railyards in California, at least 10 are situated in this region.”*

Agelidis also pointed to an environmental analysis by CARB that determined that trucks and not trains would be the cleaner mode to move cargo in 2023.

This would be due to the shift toward zero-emissions trucks in California, per CARB regulations. CARB is seeking to accelerate a target requiring zero-emission vehicles in California’s trucking sector to 2036 from 2040.

CARB’s regulation on locomotive emissions would affect Class I railroads Union Pacific and BNSF. Both railroads have been involved in testing alternatively powered locomotives with state officials.

What CARB fails to tell the public is that recent regulations placed on California’s trucking sector has resulted in huge delivery problems as a result in a decline of owner-operator and trucking firms caused by a shortage of trucking operations either unable or unwilling to invest in newer equipment needed to meet California emissions requirements. Because of CARB’s latest stricter emissions limits, California has 70,000 fewer tractor-trailers serving California.

In addition, California regulators are being pressured by Prince Charles of Wales “Zero-Emissions” being imposed upon the entire world to achieve the impossible. Prince Charles agenda is passed down and carried out by Klaus Schwab’s “Great Reset” and

their Nazi plan to build back better in what is really a Nazi Fourth Reich, promoted as the Fourth Industrial Revolution.

Wake up folks, as one UK citizen said last night on 'Siri News', *"Now that we know how wealthy Charlie is, why should we pay for his coronation; let him pay for his own coronation?"* The man was arrested and fined under a local ordinance for speaking out against the Royals! My local Kroger store is no longer carrying Pastrami as a measure to please the likes of old "sausage fingers" Prince Charles and Bill Gate because livestock belches and farts too much CO². The "ESG" plans of Prince Charles being implemented by the World Economic Forum cease to be humorous when one understands this insanity will lead to the death of millions.

As if the U.S. military was not already crippled by woke activism at the highest levels of the Department of Defense, the latest news suggests that the nation's military vehicle fleet will be hobbled as well.

Biden Energy Secretary Jennifer Granholm, a Canadian born lawyer with no military background, testified Wednesday to the Senate Armed Services Committee that she supported requiring the United States military to move to an all-electric vehicle fleet by 2030. That's less than seven years.

She added:

"And I do think that reducing our reliance on the volatility of globally-traded fossil fuels where we know that global events, such as the war in Ukraine, can jack up prices for people back home – it does not contribute to energy security."

"I think energy security is achieved when we have homegrown, clean energy that is abundant, like you see in Iowa. We think we can be a leader globally in how we have become energy-independent..."

Her assertions rest on a number of fallacies.

First, Granholm does not address where the energy would come from to power the lithium based batteries that an EV fleet would rely on. Generally, green energy options are highly inefficient and carbon based fuels are the primary source of electricity for much of the nation. They seem to think electricity is magic, but every time a climate activist charges up their EV they are most likely using "fossil fuels" to do it.

Iowa is held up as a golden idol among climate activists for its large windmill farms that produce up to 40% of the state's power, but such systems tend to fail under harsh conditions and are in no way portable, which makes one wonder why Granholm cited Iowa as a reference for justifying military EVs?

The advantage of gas based vehicles over EVs is obvious – There is no long wait time for recharging, refueling is instant and access to a large energy producing source is not

required. In a war zone, there are few places to plug in your Tesla Humvee. Shifting to EVs would essentially bottleneck operations, making vehicles less independent with less range and easier to disrupt.

Second, as a side note, gas prices were rising well before the war in Ukraine due to inflation caused by government mismanagement and central bank fiat money creation. Let's stop trying to perpetuate the lie that Russia is somehow responsible for our economic troubles.

Third, a few years ago the U.S. was a net exporter of crude oil, and after Biden's entry into the White House this advantage suddenly disappeared. This increased production along with the completion of the Keystone XL pipeline would have ensured US energy security for many years to come. That was until the government interfered with oil output and Biden blocked Keystone. He then began selling off US strategic oil reserves in order to artificially manipulate market prices down while depleting military resources.

It also important to realize that the lithium needed to create the batteries for EVs is primarily mined overseas in countries like China (often with child slave labor). How does switching to EVs reliant on lithium make the U.S. energy secure, let alone the military more capable?

Fourth, there is no evidence of a "climate crisis." It doesn't exist. So why are we talking about this at all? Ask Prince Charles of Wales? He is the originator of the "Sustainable Development" policies being crammed down the throats of the nations of the world!

There is no telling how much damage the climate agenda will ultimately do to U.S. defensive capabilities, but the overall trend in energy is more and more centralization. Centralization, as opposed to redundancy, leads to weakness. The reduction of U.S. carbon based energy and the over-reliance on a green electrical grid is expected to trigger skyrocketing consumer prices over the next several years. Transfer this dynamic of high cost and logistical uncertainty over to the military and you have a recipe for disaster.

Steve Coerper posted a segment of a House Transportation Committee hearing that nailed the insanity issue on climate change.

ALL of this discussion on climate change and CO₂ and "greenhouse gasses" that will allegedly lead to global warming and kill everyone - then one guy steps up and asks a question no one else is asking, and apparently even the power players running this "climate change" panic theater don't know the answer to:

"What percent of our atmosphere is CO₂?"

"Close" is probably close enough, but these professionals had no realistic idea. Its four-tenths of 1%. God designed it that way. Plants need CO₂. So do we. Take half of the CO₂ out of the atmosphere and plants begin to die. Air is 78% nitrogen and 21%

oxygen.

God bless Doug LaMalfa but he asked the question last month. Should have pushed it back in 1980 when this Chicken-Little "Climate change" game began. Sadly, "climate change" is now big business - a political and commercial agenda that has nothing to do with the climate and everything to do with profits, panic, and political control.

Tell your friends, forego the panic - break out the bubbly! ***We're NOT all going to die from too much carbon dioxide.*** It's safe to breathe and it's okay to use renewable petroleum-based fuels to travel and cook. God knew what He was doing when He created this planet.

Blessings,

Pastor Bob, EvanTeachr@aol.com
www.pastorbobreid.com