

**Subject:** ETACC near future schedule and comments on the draft report.  
**From:** EPorter95@aol.com  
**Date:** Wed, 06 Feb 2008 03:47:56 -0500 (EST)  
**To:** schurch@arb.ca.gov

To: Steve Church  
Research Division  
California Air Resources Board  
1001 I Street, PO Box 2815  
Sacramento, CA 95812

From: Ed Porter  
Santa Cruz City Council  
(831) 427-0836  
[epporter95@aol.com](mailto:epporter95@aol.com)

Subject: ETACC near future schedule and comments on the draft report.  
[http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/etaac/012508pubmeet/etaac\\_discussion\\_draft\\_12-21-07.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/etaac/012508pubmeet/etaac_discussion_draft_12-21-07.pdf)

Dear Mr. Church,

I'm writing to submit comments on the draft ETACC report.

Also, I would like to learn the schedule of meetings and other activities for ETACC over the next few months. If you could be so kind, please send me such a schedule or, a link to a website that displays it.

Thanks in advance for including my comments and for providing the schedule of events.

An abbreviated version of my comment follows.

Ed Porter  
Santa Cruz City Council  
(831) 427-0836  
[epporter95@aol.com](mailto:epporter95@aol.com)

-----  
First, I suggest that the treatment of Personal Rapid Transit (PRT) in the draft report is inadequate. I strongly support the comments submitted by Dennis Manning and I support the substitution of his rewritten PRT portion in place of the original. ( [http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/etaac/012508pubmeet/comments\\_received\\_since\\_12-12-07/manning2-etaac\\_prt\\_appendix\\_revisions-1.pdf](http://www.arb.ca.gov/cc/etaac/012508pubmeet/comments_received_since_12-12-07/manning2-etaac_prt_appendix_revisions-1.pdf) )

Specific comments on the draft report:

I dispute to the cost figures of PRT shown on page 9-90. The report states: "**Costs are estimated to be similar or lower than those for light-rail systems at \$30-\$50 million per mile.**"

It appears that these numbers came from the recent New Jersey PRT study. However, those numbers were dated and stale before the report was published. That was because the report was delayed about two years before its publication.

These cost figures are NOT based on information from the newest PRT developments and probably should actually be from \$10 - \$20 million per mile. To choose the highest known estimates of PRT costs would lead an educated reader to conclude that the ETACC report has authors who wish to discredit PRT as a viable transportation alternative. Obviously, it would not be desirable to have readers draw such a conclusion about the ETACC report.

Also on page 9-90, the draft report says that "**the use of new technologies may cause delays.**" This is an unsubstantiated and gratuitous assertion and should be removed.

Further, the Timeframe section should simply cite real construction times that are readily available from the Cardiff test system, the Heathro installation, and from the Vectus demonstration system in Uppsala, Sweden. With these construction times being available, it is poor practice to use the conjecture of the New Jersey report instead.

Again, on page 9-90, The draft report concludes: "**GHG Reduction Potential: Depends on the carbon intensity of liquid fuels and electricity.**"

No PRT design that I know of uses liquid fuels. All of the different designs are electric.

The author also ignores the distinct possibility that any PRT guideway can be completely canopied with solar panels. Such a deployment of solar panels holds the definite potential of providing ALL of the electrical power needed by the PRT system. In addition, the system would likely put noteworthy amounts of power into the grid. This would certainly be true in the early days of such a system before the ridership reaches its peak value. The feature of a PRT system using all solar power means that the avoided GHG emissions from the equivalent number of auto trips is a major reversal of those GHG emissions. That potential asset must NOT be ignored by this part of the report.

Again, on page 9-90, The draft report concludes: "**Ease of Implementation: Unclear, in part because elevated guideways are needed.**" This is an unresearched conclusion. My comment about the Timeframe section applies equally well to this section. It should be researched as I suggested and replaced with information from the Cardiff, Heathro, and *Uppsala* installations.

---

Who's never won? [Biggest Grammy Award surprises of all time on AOL Music.](#)