TAR SANDS IN YOUR TANK
EXPOSING EUROPE’S ROLE IN CANADA’S DIRTY OIL TRADE
Extracting tar sands bitumen from the forest wilderness in Alberta, Canada has major environmental impacts. Not least of these is the significant increase in greenhouse gases (GHG) produced by extracting and processing the bitumen into a usable product. On average the extraction process is thought to produce three times the GHGs than average conventional oil production.¹

Oil produced from tar sands is generally consumed only in Canada and the USA, but public concern in Europe has been growing, particularly around the financial links between European financial institutions and the tar sands industry.²

Greenpeace can now reveal that petroleum products containing tar sands crude oil have been regularly entering the EU market. The trade is supported by a structural diesel deficit in the EU market and a similar surplus in the US. While the level of contamination with tar sands crude in the diesel reaching Europe from the US Gulf Coast (USGC) is currently low, the construction of the Keystone XL pipeline could change this significantly. The proposed pipeline could deliver up to 500,000 barrels per day (b/d) of tar sands crude directly from Alberta to Texas by 2013. Currently only around 100,000 b/d enters the region.

RECOMMENDATIONS

i) Implement changes to the EU Fuel Quality Directive

European legislators must seize the opportunity provided by this directive and:

- introduce and implement a set of conservative default values for the GHG intensity of different sources of crude oil, including tar sands
- establish a GHG intensity ceiling at the earliest opportunity in the review of the Directive in 2012. This would guarantee that the most polluting fuels do not contaminate the European supply chain
- introduce the opportunity to take into account improvements in refinery efficiency
- enable fuel suppliers to prove that they are performing better than the default values by investing in better technology, reducing flaring and switching to cleaner fuels and;
- introduce, with immediate effect, accurate and robust reporting of the carbon intensity of oil. This is necessary to create transparency for future reviews of the law.

ii) Reduce oil demand

While reducing the GHG content in transport fuels is helpful, much more can also be done to reduce oil demand. This will not only help tackle climate change and reduce the environmental impacts of extracting and refining petroleum products, but can also increase the resilience of the EU economy and its transportation system.

To reduce emissions and increase energy security, Greenpeace advocates the following hierarchy of principles for the transport sector:

- localise services and reduce the need to travel
- use fuel more wisely, and
- harness and develop clean technologies

These principles can be applied to both passenger transport and freight.
The extraction of tar sands (also known as oil sands) in Alberta, Canada has been described as the most destructive project on earth and images of the open cast mining that has dominated the industry to date have shocked people around the world.

But while the impacts on land and water resources in the region are disturbing, the implications for climate change are of equal concern. While the worldwide extraction and processing of oil and gas is responsible for around 6% of global greenhouse gases (GHGs) and oil use in road transport alone is responsible for another 12%, producing tar sands increases oil’s impact still further because the process of extracting it is on average three times more GHG intensive than for conventional oil.

Outside of Canada and the United States, concern about tar sands production has been growing. Investors in London-listed oil giants Shell and BP have been questioning the companies about their role in tar sands extraction, concerned that the flow of capital from London to Alberta carries with it greater risk than the firms are prepared to admit.

But because it is widely believed that Canadian tar sands crude is currently only consumed in Canada and the US, public concern has not been focused on markets outside the region.

Greenpeace can now reveal, however, that the reach of tar sands crude is wider than previously thought. In fact, petroleum products derived partly from tar sands crude oil have been regularly entering the EU’s petroleum supply chain for some time. What is more, this trade is set to grow significantly, meaning access to the European petroleum products market will help bolster the growth in tar sands production. This places European regulators in a unique position to stem the growth in tar sands production.

In this report we reveal how petroleum products, primarily diesel, are being regularly exported to the EU from US Gulf Coast (USGC) refineries that frequently process tar sands crude oil. We also detail how the leading company involved in this trade, Valero Energy Corporation, plans to significantly increase its supply of tar sands crude through a controversial new tar sands pipeline to the USGC from Canada, while maintaining its position as the leading exporter of diesel and other products from the USGC to the EU.

The EU does in fact have legislation in development that should restrict these imports of high carbon intensity petroleum products, the Fuel Quality Directive, but this needs significant strengthening – and rigorous implementation – to do the job. If European regulators fail to get this right, European consumers will be increasingly putting tar sands fuel in their tanks and playing a major role in driving the destructive growth of tar sands production.

**INTRODUCTION**

Tar sands (also known as oil sands) are deposits of sand and clay saturated with bitumen and water. Bitumen is oil in a solid or semi-solid state. Because it is in this less fluid state, the bitumen requires specialised methods of extraction, which fall into two categories: mining and in situ.

Today around 55% of tar sands production is mined. But of the 173 billion barrels of technically recoverable tar sands in Alberta, about 80% can only be retrieved through in situ production.

Mining: Where tar sands are close to the surface, generally at depths of less than 100 metres, the reserves are mined. This involves excavating the bitumen out of the ground in an open cast mine. The land is cleared and the bitumen soaked earth is dug out with giant mechanical shovels and loaded into trucks to be taken to a separation plant. It takes on average about two tonnes of mined tar sands to extract a barrel of bitumen.

Only about 20% of the ultimately recoverable tar sands are in deposits shallow enough to be mined. The rest requires in situ production.

In situ production: More deeply buried bitumen requires drilling wells to pump it out, somewhat like conventional oil production. However, unlike conventional production, getting the bitumen to flow more like oil generally requires injecting steam into the reservoir. In situ production therefore requires steam generating plants, a large number of wells, often spread out in groups known as pads, and extensive roads, pipelines and product collection areas.

The two main methods of in situ production are cyclic steam stimulation (CSS) and steam assisted gravity drainage (SAGD).

CSS involves pumping high-pressure steam into a well for an extended period to fluidise the bitumen. The fluidised bitumen is then pumped to the surface through the same well.

SAGD also pumps steam into the reservoir but it does so by continuously injecting steam through one pipe while pumping the fluidised bitumen to the surface via an adjacent one.

Creating the steam for these processes consumes huge quantities of natural gas. It is primarily the steam-to-oil ratio, the amount of steam needed to produce a unit of oil, that determines the amount of natural gas needed and the associated GHG emissions. In situ tar sands production is generally more GHG intensive than tar sands mining and is among the most GHG intensive forms of oil extraction commercially operating today.

Upgrading: Once the bitumen has been extracted it needs to be diluted with solvents or lighter oils in order to be piped to an upgrader. Upgrading is the process of converting bitumen into synthetic crude oil, or syncrude, which can then be refined into petroleum products.

All bitumen produced from tar sands needs to be upgraded before it can be refined into traditional petroleum products. This has primarily been carried out in dedicated upgraders in Alberta with the resultant syncrude piped to refineries to be further processed into petroleum products. However, increasing quantities of diluted bitumen (dilbit) are being shipped to complex refineries in the US, where it is upgraded and refined in the same plant.

Whether it is upgraded and refined in a two-step or one-step process, the process of converting bitumen into petroleum products is significantly more energy intensive than the refining of lighter conventional oils.

**BOX 1: TAR SANDS: WHAT ARE THEY AND HOW ARE THEY TURNED INTO OIL?**

Sources: Pembina Institute, Alberta Energy and Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers
This report reveals for the first time that petroleum products, in part derived from Canadian tar sands crude, are being regularly imported into the EU from the US. It also explains that unless we regulate against this, the trade will grow and could become one of a number of drivers leading to an expansion in tar sands production. This is primarily due to the growing importance of transatlantic trade to some of the same refineries that are planning to increase their commitment to tar sands processing.

Our analysis of US government and industry data for petroleum imports and exports revealed that at least seven refineries located in the US Gulf Coast region (USGC) – primarily Texas and Louisiana – imported Canadian tar sands crude oil in the 12 month period from 1 November 2008 to 31 October 2009. Similarly, we identified 13 refineries in this same region that exported diesel and other distillates to Europe in the 12 month period from 1 December 2009 to 30 November 2009. The one month time lag allows for the crude to travel through the pipeline and refinery system.

By cross referencing these two lists, we found that there are at least three refineries which both source from the Alberta tar sands and export products to Europe. These are dominated by Valero Energy’s Port Arthur refinery, which since at least June 2009, has regularly processed tar sands crude while exporting diesel to Europe (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: USGC refineries that process tar sands crude and export diesel to Europe

Table 1 provides a more accurate picture of this refinery’s tar sands consumption. ** where percentages have been rounded to one decimal place, columns may not total 100%.

Table 1: USGC refineries that import crude oil from the tar sands (1 November 2008 – 31 October 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refinery</th>
<th>Confirmed tar sands crude usage (b/d)</th>
<th>Estimated Sunoco allocation</th>
<th>Estimated Unnamed allocation</th>
<th>Estimated total tar sands crude usage (b/d)</th>
<th>Percentage of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WRB Borger</td>
<td>20,016</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33,870</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valero Port Arthur*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19,057</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExxonMobil Beaumont</td>
<td>6,830</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>15,523</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon Garyville</td>
<td>11,921</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11,921</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExxonMobil Baytown</td>
<td>10,679</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>10,679</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP Texas City</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valero Three Rivers</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunoco Nederland Terminal</td>
<td>9,710</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>9,710</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unnamed</td>
<td>30,134</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>30,134</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>93,044</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93,044</td>
<td>99%**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These figures differ from Table 2 as they are spread across a full year, whereas this refinery only appeared in the data in the last five months of the study period.

**Estimates for the refineries in Table 2 are based on reported trade to some of the same refineries that are planning to increase their commitment to tar sands processing.

Notes:

- ExxonMobil’s 573,000 b/d refinery in Baytown near Houston, the Marathon Garyville refinery in Louisiana, and the ExxonMobil Beaumont refinery in Texas are significant users of tar sands crude, but the refinery does not appear in US export data. However, many traders ship petroleum products from the Port of South Louisiana where this refinery is located.

- Similarly, the ExxonMobil’s Beaumont refinery, which is located far inland and not directly linked to a port, it is not identifiable in US export data as a shipper to Europe.

- ConocoPhillips’ Sweeny, Texas and Alliance/Westlake, Louisiana refineries also ship products including diesel, jet fuel and petroleum coke to various European countries including the UK, Spain and Italy, but it is unclear if these products are made using tar sands crude. These refineries have used tar sands crude in the past, but not during the one year time frame this study.

- Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 detail the data we have gathered on tar sands use in the USGC and exports of diesel to Europe from the region.

- This refinery purchased about 11% of the tar sands crude entering the USGC and made at least one shipment of diesel to Europe in the time period. It also made over 1,000 shipments to Europe of lubricants, solvents and other petrochemicals.

- Four other refineries received tar sands crude in the time period but these sites do not directly export products. Only 46% of the diesel exports from the USGC are made directly from refining companies – the rest are exported by independent traders such as Mabanaft, Westport Petroleum, Trafigura, Glencore and many others (see Table 3). Therefore, it is possible that some of the products from these refineries are exported to Europe by traders.

- The Marathon Garyville refinery in Louisiana is a significant user of tar sands crude, but the refinery does not appear in US export data. However, many traders ship petroleum products from the Port of South Louisiana where this refinery is located.

- Similarly, the WRB Borger refinery, 50% owned by ConocoPhillips and 50% owned by Canadian tar sands company Cenovus Energy Inc., is the largest user of tar sands oil in Texas (see Table 1) – up to one quarter of its crude supply – but as it is located far inland and not directly linked to a port, it is not identifiable in US export data as a shipper to Europe.

- ConocoPhillips’ Sweeny, Texas and Alliance/Westlake, Louisiana refineries also ship products including diesel, jet fuel and petroleum coke to various European countries including the UK, Spain and Italy, but it is unclear if these products are made using tar sands crude. These refineries have used tar sands crude in the past, but not during the one year time frame this study.

- Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 detail the data we have gathered on tar sands use in the USGC and exports of diesel to Europe from the region.

- This refinery purchased about 11% of the tar sands crude entering the USGC and made at least one shipment of diesel to Europe in the time period. It also made over 1,000 shipments to Europe of lubricants, solvents and other petrochemicals.

- Four other refineries received tar sands crude in the time period but these sites do not directly export products. Only 46% of the diesel exports from the USGC are made directly from refining companies – the rest are exported by independent traders such as Mabanaft, Westport Petroleum, Trafigura, Glencore and many others (see Table 3). Therefore, it is possible that some of the products from these refineries are exported to Europe by traders.

- The Marathon Garyville refinery in Louisiana is a significant user of tar sands crude, but the refinery does not appear in US export data. However, many traders ship petroleum products from the Port of South Louisiana where this refinery is located.

- Similarly, the WRB Borger refinery, 50% owned by ConocoPhillips and 50% owned by Canadian tar sands company Cenovus Energy Inc., is the largest user of tar sands oil in Texas (see Table 1) – up to one quarter of its crude supply – but as it is located far inland and not directly linked to a port, it is not identifiable in US export data as a shipper to Europe.

- ConocoPhillips’ Sweeny, Texas and Alliance/Westlake, Louisiana refineries also ship products including diesel, jet fuel and petroleum coke to various European countries including the UK, Spain and Italy, but it is unclear if these products are made using tar sands crude. These refineries have used tar sands crude in the past, but not during the one year time frame this study.

- Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4 detail the data we have gathered on tar sands use in the USGC and exports of diesel to Europe from the region.
WHERE DOES IT GO?

We tracked a sample of vessels that shipped diesel from Valero’s Port Arthur refinery to Europe. Most of this (130,000 mt) was delivered to Eurotank Amsterdam (owned by the Dutch trader Vitol Inc.). Another offload point was Vesta Terminal Antwerp (owned by the Swiss-based Mercuria Energy Group).

Some 60,000 mt of diesel that BP shipped from Valero’s Port Arthur refinery was delivered to the BP Terminal in Amsterdam and elsewhere in Europe. Shortly after BP’s Texas City refinery received its one tar sands crude consignment, it shipped diesel to Vopak’s terminal in London.

It should be noted that this search is far from exhaustive; we tracked only a small number of shipments that are clearly identifiable as having originated at Valero Port Arthur. We were not able to investigate the refinery source of an additional 14 million tons of deliveries from Port Arthur by third party shippers such as Vitol Inc., Morgan Stanley Capital and Merrill Lynch Commodities.

We also tracked vessels from other Valero refineries. We found that in addition to the above mentioned terminals, Valero ships significant quantities of diesel to Vopak Terminal London and numerous other depots throughout Europe. While these particular deliveries are not currently from tar sands derived sources, this does show that if Valero increases tar sands processing at most of its USGC refineries, as it plans to do, the tainted fuel may be distributed throughout Europe, including the UK.

Diesel is a fungible commodity (i.e. can be traded interchangeably, so each barrel has an identical value) and a significant amount is sold on the spot market. It is therefore impossible to trace exactly where this tar sands derived diesel ends up once it leaves the port of origin and enters the European petroleum products distribution system. Needless to say, European diesel suppliers are today tainted with tar sands, albeit by a small proportion of the overall supply. However, in the not too distant future, the amount of diesel coming from USGC is likely to increase and its level of contamination with tar sands crude could also grow significantly.

In the not too distant future, the amount of diesel coming from USGC is likely to increase and its level of contamination with tar sands crude could also grow significantly.
Only around 100,000 b/d of tar sands crude reaches USGC today, a small amount of the region’s total refining capacity, which at 8.4 million b/d is the most concentrated in the world. With seven refineries currently sharing that supply, the level of contamination of the region’s diesel exports to Europe is relatively low. But the potential demand in the region for Canada’s tar sands crude is in fact much greater. Valero Energy in particular is heavily committed to a proposed tar sands pipeline called Keystone XL, which could potentially ship 500,000 b/d of tar sands crude direct to USGC. Additionally, many USGC refiners including Valero are planning to expand their diesel trade with Europe in order to gain some advantage in a future that many predict will be increasingly treacherous for refiners.

ALBERTA TO TEXAS: HOW TAR SANDS CRUDE REACHES THE GULF COAST

In our research period, an average of 93,000 b/d of tar sands crude reached USGC refineries, entering the region via two channels. The primary channel is through the ExxonMobil owned Keystone XL, which could potentially ship 500,000 b/d of tar sands crude direct to USGC. Additionally, many USGC refiners including Valero are planning to expand their diesel trade with Europe in order to gain some advantage in a future that many predict will be increasingly treacherous for refiners.

The other channel is by tanker from the Westridge Terminal in Vancouver. Tar sands crude reaches Vancouver through the Kinder Morgan Trans Mountain Pipeline. In 2008, about 22,800 b/d of western Canadian crude was shipped to the USGC from here. However in our research period, with the Pegasus Pipeline expansion coming on stream, tanker shipments reduced to around 12,000 b/d. This would suggest a limited capacity for tar sands crude in the Gulf Coast’s refineries. However, proponents of the Keystone XL pipeline envision demand coming from 15 refineries in the region.

KEYSTONE XL: THE TAR SANDS FLOODGATES OPEN

XL will have the capacity to pump 500,000 b/d the 1,980 miles from Hardisty, Alberta to Nederland, Texas (near Port Arthur), with a possible addition running to the Houston area. It will also indirectly supply the Texas City and Lake Charles, Louisiana regions via separate pipelines.

Tar sands crude will be the primary source of oil for the Keystone XL pipeline. Tar sands producers which have committed to supply Keystone XL include Canadian Natural Resources Limited (CNRL) and EnCana Corporation. Shell and ConocoPhillips are also backing the plan.

At the other end of the pipeline, TransCanada says that USGC refiners have already committed to long term contracts for delivery of 380,000 b/d from XL. Valero is cited as having major commitments and in the past year its executives have frequently referred to their support for the pipeline. The Port Arthur refinery is likely to be the main taker, up to 80% of its 310,000 b/d capacity is configured to process heavy sour crude. Valero has supply commitments in place from several Canadian oil companies to deliver tar sands oil via XL, including at least 100,000 b/d from CNRL alone.
According to Valero Energy executives, the commitment to tar sands crude via Keystone XL is aligned with its plans to increase ultra-low sulphur diesel production at the Port Arthur refinery.iii The 15 refineries that will have access to XL deliveries together account for around half of the entire capacity of the USGC, approximately 4.3 million b/d. They include BP Texas City and Shell’s Motiva Port Arthur refinery, which although slowed, is still undergoing a major expansion that will make it the biggest refinery in the US with a significant expansion of heavy oil capacity.ii It also includes Shell’s Deer Park refinery and Total’s Port Arthur refinery.ii A full list of the refineries that could be served by XL is shown in Table 5. Several of these are regular exporters to Europe.iv

If XL is built, the proportion of tar sands crude that will be processed by these refineries will certainly increase. Judging by Valero’s statements regarding its contractual commitments to the new pipeline, it appears likely that its supply chain will be significantly tilted towards tar sands crude once XL comes on stream, particularly at the Port Arthur refinery. While our research to date has shown that Valero Port Arthur is currently running on 9.5% tar sands crude, it could potentially be running up to 80% with XL on stream.iv

Of concern to Europeans should be the possibility that not only is Valero poised to dominate tar sands processing in the USGC, but it is also the biggest USGC exporter of diesel to EU countries (see Table 4) and has plans to expand that trade. The next chapter explains why USGC refiners are likely to increase the transatlantic trade and how Valero and other heavy oil refiners in the USGC are likely to dominate that trade.

GLOBAL REFINING IN FLUX: WHY THE DIESEL TRADE TO EUROPE IS INCREASING

In the past year the refining industry has come to realise that an economic recovery will probably not bring with it a return to the boom years that the industry was enjoying prior to the recession. While during those years, refineries ran close to full capacity and margins were high, today they are cutting throughput and struggling with low margins. The immediate cause of this is the slump in demand caused by the recession, particularly in the US. But as economic recovery begins many industry analysts are pessimistic about the future.v The ill portents for the industry derive from three main factors:

1. an excess of capacity following expansions that were sanctioned during the boom years, many of which were well into construction when the recession hit;
2. a structural downward shift in demand for oil derived transport fuels due to market encroachment from biofuels and improvements to vehicle efficiency; and
3. increasing competition from new refiners based in Asia and the Middle East.

Decreasing demand

The US and European refining industries are facing the consequences of a peak in demand for their products. US oil demand is thought to have peaked in 2007.vi while demand in member countries of the Organisation for Economic and Cooperation Development (OECD) as a whole probably peaked in 2005.ii The demand slump derives from a long standing downward trend in oil demand for power generation and a trend towards greater efficiency in transportation.

The use of oil in power generation in OECD countries has decreased 40% since 2000 and is forecast to continue its decline.ii In transportation, the source of the majority of oil demand, oil’s share of the liquid fuels market is being challenged by increasing use of biofuels, mandated by government policy, while overall liquid fuels demand is set to decline due to improved vehicle efficiency standards and the growing market penetration of hybrid and electric vehicle technologies. As the IEA stated in its February 2010 Oil Market Report, demand growth in the OECD may well have peaked, with all the negative consequences for OECD refining this implies.vi

New sources of competition

On top of this decline in demand, refiners in these countries are also having to contend with increasing competition from new export-orientated refineries based in Asia and the Middle East. One refinery in India, Reliance’s massive 1.2 million b/d Jamnagar refinery in Gujarat, has a clearly articulated strategy to target OECD markets.vii Meanwhile, planned refineries in the Middle East are also likely to target market share in Europe and the Americas.viii

At a refining seminar in London in February 2010, Alan Gelder, the head of downstream consulting at energy market consulting firm Wood Mackenzie, told those gathered that the outlook for refining was extremely weak for the next four to five years. He explained that after that period US and European refiners would face competition from new export-orientated refineries in the Middle East and Asia. He added that, “export focused plants currently under construction in the Middle East will benefit from lower crude and product export costs and [sic] well as being less burdened with growing environmental legislation.”viii

Table 5: USGC refineries that will potentially be served by the Keystone XL Pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refinery</th>
<th>Capacity b/d</th>
<th>Known processor of tar sands crude</th>
<th>Known diesel exporter to EU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valero Port Arthur</td>
<td>310,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motiva Port Arthur</td>
<td>285,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motiva PA Expansion (2012)</td>
<td>325,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Port Arthur</td>
<td>232,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExxonMobil Beaumont</td>
<td>349,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valero Houston</td>
<td>83,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston (Lyondell)</td>
<td>271,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena Refining</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Deer Park</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExxonMobil Baytown</td>
<td>567,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP Texas City</td>
<td>478,000</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marathon Texas City</td>
<td>76,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valero Texas City</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcasieu Refining</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITGO Lake Charles</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ConocoPhillips Lake Charles</td>
<td>239,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4,328,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Motiva Port Arthur’s expansion will make it the biggest refinery in the US. The new capacity is included in this table as it should come on stream around the same time XL does should it go ahead.

Figure 3: Historical and projected growth of western Canadian crude oil to the USGC (thousand b/d)\textsuperscript{iv}

Table 4: USGC refineries that will potentially be served by the Keystone XL Pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Thousand barrels/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>239,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>430,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>567,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>630,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{iv} 50% owned by Shell and 50% by Saudi Aramco.
\textsuperscript{ii} Based on it running all of its potential heavy sour capacity (248,000 b/d) on tar sands crude.
\textsuperscript{v} Based on a negative trend in demand for the industry.
\textsuperscript{vi} Based on a negative trend in demand for the industry.
\textsuperscript{v} Based on a negative trend in demand for the industry.
The slowdown in demand, new capacity and rising biofuel production has led to a global refinery capacity surplus of some 6 million b/d, according to the Wood Mackenzie consultant. So with refiners in the US and EU competing with a growing number of players for a shrinking domestic market, are there strategies that some of them could implement to claw back some advantage? It would appear that a persistent deficit of diesel in Europe could provide respite for certain well positioned US refiners. But the potential for this to link Europe with Canadian and US tar sands production threatens to undermine European ambitions to decrease the environmental impact of its energy use.

THE ALBERTA–TEXAS–EUROPE CONNECTION

The US is a net petroleum importer but nevertheless exports a considerable quantity of petroleum products. For example, in 2008 the US exported 17.7 million b/d of petroleum products, equivalent to 9.7% of total refinery and blander production. More than 22% of this entered the EU. The vast bulk of these exports are distillates (various grades of diesel for transport and heating), residual fuel oil (mainly used for shipping and heavy machinery) and petcoke (a coal like substance used in cement kilns and other industrial furnaces). The EU suffers from a diesel fuel deficit.67 While some diesel fuel is used for freight, heating buildings and fuelling off-road vehicles, it is the continued popularity of the diesel engine in private car use that is primarily responsible for the persistent market imbalance. In 2007 the EU imported 26.8 million tonnes of diesel fuel, equivalent to more than 530,000 b/d.68

Two-way traffic

The reason European refiners do not make enough diesel to satisfy demand is that the refining process inevitably produces a range of products from heavy residual fuel oil to light gasoline and diesel, and liquid petroleum gas.69 While complex refineries can produce a greater proportion of diesel to other products from each run of crude oil, the imbalance in EU demand is such that European refineries persistently produce a surplus of gasoline and a deficit of diesel for domestic markets. As a result the EU imports diesel, primarily from Russia, and exports gasoline, primarily to the US.70

In 2007 Russia was the source of 89% of the EU’s diesel imports, equivalent to about 10% of diesel consumption.71 But in 2008, Russia diverted around four million tonnes of diesel, nearly 17% of its 2007 EU exports, to China and Ukraine without a commensurate increase in production.72 This meant less Russian diesel was available for the EU market, allowing other suppliers to fill the gap.

In March 2009 Wood Mackenzie’s Gelder told the US refining industry that this situation will continue at least in the short term. ‘Our outlook for Russia is that diesel/gasoline exports will decline short term, before increasing again in the 2011–12 timeframe – so providing a window of opportunity for US refineries capable of exporting diesel to Europe.’73

But he went on to explain that the structural shifts in the Atlantic Basin petroleum products market may well favour a continuing diesel trade between the USGC and the EU beyond that time frame. His reasoning was as follows.

With gasoline demand in decline in the US, due to biofuel mandates and higher vehicle efficiency standards, there is excess gasoline capacity in the US system. This is exacerbated by European refiners pushing their surplus gasoline to the US at competitive prices. Some refiners will have to shut down and until they do, margins will remain low and many refineries will be operating at reduced capacity. Refineries that are able to increase diesel production and access export markets are less likely to face production cuts or closure.

The persistent deficit in domestic EU diesel supply and generally sluggish demand for diesel in the US means that wholesale diesel prices in the EU are higher than those in the US. Many of the USGC refineries that have recently expanded capacity have also increased complexity. This favours diesel production and these refineries can use that advantage to access export markets for some of that diesel.

An added factor that favours sending diesel to Europe is that with the EU pushing its surplus gasoline on the US market, shipping rates for tankers that would otherwise return to the EU empty are at a discount.

So as Gelder sees it: ‘The situation of surplus European gasoline being pushed into the US whilst promoting a reverse diesel trade will remain for the foreseeable future.’74

The trend that Gelder spoke of is clearly demonstrated in the US Department of Energy data for US diesel exports over the past decade. Between 2000 and 2007, US diesel exports to EU countries averaged 29,000 b/d and in 2009 it reached 276,000 b/d.75

In 2008 Russia diverted around four million tonnes of diesel, nearly 17% of its 2007 EU exports, to China and Ukraine without a commensurate increase in production. But in 2008 US diesel exports to EU countries averaged 29,000 b/d and in 2009 it reached 276,000 b/d.

Similarly, the percentage of US diesel exports coming out of the USGC also rose from 62% between 2000 and 2007 to 71% in 2008–09.76

The increasing complexity of USGC refineries means that many of those that are configured to process tar sands crude are the same ones that are poised to take advantage of the diesel trade to the EU. In fact judging by the difficulties the US refining industry is facing, this trade may be a significant lifeline for certain of these refineries.

Valero targets Europe with tar sands

Our research revealed that Valero is currently the second biggest consumer of tar sands crude in the USGC (see Table 1). We also found that Valero dominates USGC refinery exports of diesel to Europe (see Table 4). We have also explained that Valero is a major backer of the proposed Keystone XL pipeline that would increase access to tar sands crude in the USGC by up to 500% (see page 11).

The percentage of overall US diesel exports that were going to the EU rose from an average of 17% between 2000 and 2007, to 35% in 2008 and 46% in 2009. The EU market was clearly driving the growth in US diesel exports.

Since the middle of 2008, Valero has, on average, shipped between 150,000 and 200,000 b/d of diesel to Europe.77 In an investor presentation in July 2009, CEO Bill Kleese told analysts that, ‘We look at Europe as a good trading, good arbitrage, good opportunity for us to work more aggressively in the Atlantic Basin’ in a number of recent presentations to industry analysts Valero has stressed, among other things, that part of its strategic focus is to refine low quality crudes into high quality products. In part that means tar sands crude processed into products such as ultra-low sulphur diesel. In its presentations it has frequently reiterated its perception that ‘world demand favors diesel’ and that ‘growing global diesel demand is an export opportunity for US refineries.’78

If Keystone XL becomes a reality and Valero continues to dominate USGC exports to the EU, the latter will find it has become a significant market for a highly polluting fuel it thought it had nothing to do with.

Figure 4: Growth in diesel exports from US to EU

The EU will find it has become a significant market for a highly polluting fuel it thought it had nothing to do with.

Source: US Department of Energy – Energy Information Administration

iv From here on we shall refer to all distillates and gasoline as diesel or diesel fuel
The exploitation of tar sands is a retrogressive step for the oil industry as rather than assisting the push towards cleaner oil production and the development of cleaner fuels, the extraction and processing methods required are actually significantly dirtier than for conventional oil.

The harmful effects include high GHG emissions; high levels of other air pollutants such as volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen oxide (NOx) and sulphur dioxide (SO₂); health and livelihood impacts on local populations including First Nations communities; unsustainable consumption and pollution of water resources; forest clearance and land devastation. Industry and government claims concerning carbon capture and storage, land reclamation and the amelioration of pollution issues have been shown to inadequately address the great scale of these problems.

GREENHOUSE GASES (GHGS)

Just as the world is starting to get serious about tackling climate change, the production of oil from tar sands is significantly increasing the GHG intensity of oil use.

Whether we look at the well-to-refinery emissions (three times worse on average) or the well-to-wheel emissions that include the burning of the fuel in motor vehicles (around 17% worse on average), the fact is that emissions are higher than for conventional oil (see box 2). Therefore, rather than reducing GHG emissions per unit of energy produced, oil from tar sands is more polluting than ever. The higher emissions from in situ extraction methods are of particular concern (see table 6), because if the exploitation of tar sands oil grows in line with industry plans, in situ production will expand significantly; forming a greater share of overall production than it does today. This will lead to a rise in the average carbon intensity of tar sands production and absolute emissions will soar.

A 2009 peer reviewed study of the emissions intensity of tar sands extraction and processing up to the refinery gate puts the average at three times that of conventional production. The range of figures from this study is shown in Table 6. The total emissions for the industry, including our own calculations based on current production forecasts is shown in Table 7.

Table 6: GHG emissions for crude oil production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of production</th>
<th>GHG emissions – kg CO₂e / barrel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tar sands mining and upgrading</td>
<td>62–164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tar sands in situ and upgrading</td>
<td>99–176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional oil production</td>
<td>27–58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measuring the GHG intensity of tar sands production and comparing it with conventional oil production is a contested exercise. The result of any comparison depends on what range of activities are included in the analysis as well as what kind of oil production is being compared with tar sands production. The vast range of different crude oil qualities and production, processing and transport methods worldwide also makes a definitive comparison very difficult.

It is important to be clear about whether the comparison is of well-to-refinery (up to refinery entrance gate), well-to-tank (all processes prior to combustion in an engine), or well-to-wheel (entire life cycle including combustion) emissions. As about 80% of the entire life cycle emissions occur when the fuel is combusted in an engine, comparing well-to-wheel emissions increases the total emissions being compared and thereby makes the difference between production methods appear much smaller – a method commonly used by the tar sands industry to attempt to trivialise the issue.

Figures in this report are based on a 2009 peer reviewed paper that reviews 13 previously published studies comparing emissions from tar sands production and conventional production. The paper finds there is a wide range of reported emissions for both tar sands and conventional production and that there is not yet a consensus on the ‘characterization of life cycle emissions of the oil sands industry’. Using the range of figures in the peer reviewed paper, we calculated an average increase between conventional oil production and tar sands production of 195% (just under three times) for well-to-refinery emissions and 17% for well-to-wheel emissions.

Since California’s Low Carbon Fuel Standard was introduced to reduce the life cycle GHG emissions of transport fuels sold in the state, the Alberta government and tar sands industry have been at pains to show a minimal difference between emissions from tar sands derived fuels and other fuels. In July 2009, the Alberta government commissioned two studies from oil industry consultants. Based on the results, the government claimed that well-to-wheel emissions for tar sands projects studied were in fact not yet in operation. Using theoretical data from proposed projects rather than actual operations data is a tactic not used in any other study and significantly skews the results towards theoretical best practice. If we accept such tactics we could equally skews the figures the other way by discounting Nigerian oil production emissions significantly as in theory, the high levels of gas flaring associated with Nigerian oil production can be greatly reduced and has been proposed. This would serve to make Nigerian emissions figures much lower and consequently the percentage increase for tar sands emissions would widen. Any comparison of theoretical best practice should surely apply to all the examples in a study.

Neither of the Alberta government’s studies was peer reviewed. The study we base our estimate on is the most recent study to our knowledge to be published in a peer reviewed journal. The debate about how much worse for the climate tar sands production is compared with conventional oil production is likely to continue. The striking thing about the Alberta government’s attempt to make light of the issue is that it claims that the best possible tar sands production is only a little worse than the worst possible conventional; hardly an achievement to be proud of.

Whichever analysis you base your conclusions on, tar sands production is a step in the wrong direction. While the world desperately needs to cut GHG emissions, tar sands production undeniably makes oil production dirtier. Industry’s efforts to trivialise this are a distasteful example of blatant self-interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008e</th>
<th>2015f</th>
<th>2020f</th>
<th>2030f</th>
<th>2041f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Million tonnes of CO₂ equivalent/year) e=estimate f= forecast

Tar sands production is the fastest growing source of GHG emissions in Canada and is a key contributor to Canada’s failure to achieve its Kyoto Protocol commitments. Canada’s emissions rose by 26.2% between 1990 and 2007, and in 2007 were 32.2% above its Kyoto target. Around 44% of the projected increase in Canada’s GHG emissions from 2006 to 2020 is expected to derive from new tar sands projects.

Bio-carbon: so far unaccounted for

The atmospheric carbon created by clearing the boreal forests, peatlands and wetlands from tar sands project sites are not included in the official estimates of emissions from tar sands extraction. Most of the land is covered in boreal forest, beneath which lies carbon rich peat and muskeg. Devastating this land through mining and other land use changes, releases into the atmosphere carbon locked up in these soils as well as destroying their carbon absorption potential.

Government and industry have not attempted to adequately measure or study this issue. The most comprehensive attempt do so has estimated that under a full development scenario, an average of 8.7 million tonnes of CO₂ per year should be added to the official annual emissions figures. An earlier study concluded that on a per barrel basis, up to 11% of the well-to-tank emissions should be added in the case of existing tar sands mining projects.

OTHER AIR POLLUTANTS

Alberta is becoming Canada’s industrial air pollution hotspot as a result of tar sands extraction and processing. The processes produce nitrogen oxides (NOx) and sulphur dioxide (SO₂) which are not only respiratory irritants in their own right, but also contribute to smog and acid rain. Benzenes, a volatile organic compound (VOC), is associated with tar sands operations and is a known carcinogen.

NOx and SO₂ emissions per barrel are double those for conventional oil. Despite reductions in emissions intensity per barrel, industry expansion has caused total emissions of NOx, SO₂, VOCs and particulates from the oil sands to increase sharply.

There is increasing concern that acid deposition in Saskatchewan, partially caused by tar sands operations, could exceed the buffering capacity of lakes and soils in the region – that is, their ability to absorb and neutralise the acid without experiencing a change in pH value.

TAR SANDS AND INDIGENOUS POPULATIONS

First Nations and Métis people in Alberta are affected by tar sands development through the loss of habitats for hunting and fishing, the contamination of water and habitats leading to contamination of fish and game, and by high levels of air pollution. One downstream community in particular is concerned that tar sands pollution is the cause of unusually high levels of cancer in the area.

Given the destructive nature and high toxicity of tar sands production it is remarkable that not a single project application has ever been turned down by the Alberta government. First Nations have called for a moratorium on further development and at present there are three legal challenges in progress citing alleged treaty violations.

A recent study of company practice has found that not a single company operating tar sands projects has adopted the principles of free prior and informed consent – in which local people are granted a formal role, and some form of veto, with regard to decisions about local development projects – as a goal in its consultation process.

There is currently no coordinated programme for monitoring pollution in the environment of Alberta. This is exacerbated by the failure of the Alberta government to conduct baseline studies prior to tar sands development. The only programme for monitoring and measuring the impact of tar sands production on the aquatic environment is oil industry funded and has been found to use an analytically weak, biased and inconsistent approach.

WATER

Tar sands extraction and processing takes a heavy toll on the region’s water resources. Tar sands mining operations are currently licensed to divert 445 million m³ of fresh water each year from the Athabasca River, roughly the annual water needs for the oil sands industry.
for a city of three million people. Serious concerns have been expressed about the continued draw of water during periods in the winter when the river drops to about a tenth of its spring and summer flow.\textsuperscript{111}

The mining process has already created tailings lakes formed by leftover slurry covering 130 km\textsuperscript{2}, an area larger than the entire metropolitan area of Manchester. They are filled with toxins including naphthenic acids, phenolic compounds, ammonia–ammonium and trace metals, such as copper, zinc and iron. These are suspected to be leaking at least 11 million litres a day into the Athabasca watershed. The lakes could grow to 3.10 km\textsuperscript{2} by 2040.\textsuperscript{111}

**LAND CLEARANCE**

We begin to comprehend the sheer scale of the tar sands industry, which has been labelled the largest industrial project on earth, when we look at figures for land use. The scars and toxic lakes created by mining in the region can be seen from space. The resource in Alberta lies beneath a land mass greater than that of England, indicating the vast area that could be affected should all possible development go ahead. There are also tar sands deposits in neighbouring Saskatchewan that are as yet undeveloped.

Only about 20% of the bitumen is shallow enough to mine. The remaining 80% requires in situ methods of production, usually involving injecting steam into the reservoir. Although less visually dramatic than the destruction caused by tar sands mining, in situ production still has a devastating impact on the forests and wildlife in which it is located. Seismic exploration lines, complex networks of pipelines carrying steam and oil, power and steam generation plants, product collection tanks, well pads and roads mean that in most project areas you are never much further than 250 metres from an industrial feature.\textsuperscript{111}

The fragmentation of the forest poses a severe threat to wildlife, which has suffered a noticeable decline in areas affected by in situ production.\textsuperscript{111} The kind of forest destruction caused by in situ extraction methods has been described by Canadian think tank, the Pembina Institute, as ‘death by a thousand cuts’.\textsuperscript{111}

The companies and Canadian government point to plans and experiments with land reclamation to claim that one day the land impacted by mining will recover. To date there is little firm evidence that this is possible. For example, claims made by Syncrude that its Tar Island Pond has been reclaimed have been shown to be misleading. The toxic contents of the pond were simply pumped to another site.\textsuperscript{112}

**CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE: WILL IT REALLY MAKE A DIFFERENCE?**

Industry and government point to the development of carbon capture and storage (CCS) as the answer to the high GHG emissions of tar sands production. However, a recent report suggests that the potential of CCS to address the GHG emissions of tar sands operations may be limited. It states that, ‘the overall reductions from upstream operations could be in the 10% to 30% range at the best process locations by 2020 and the 30% to 50% range industry wide by 2050.’\textsuperscript{113}

Furthermore, the cost of making these marginal reductions could be prohibitively expensive at $110 to $290 per tonne. This compares unfavourably with estimates for CCS for coal fired generation at $60 to $150 per tonne\textsuperscript{114} and throws into question whether it will ever be implemented.

**TAR SANDS IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A RECIPE FOR DISASTER**

Canada is the world’s only major tar sands producer but it is not the only country with tar sands resources. Russia, Madagascar, the Republic of Congo (also called Congo–Brazzaville), Trinidad and Tobago, Nigeria and Venezuela also have significant tar sands reserves and all are actively exploring the potential to develop this dirty fuel.

Russian Tatneft oil company was in talks with both Shell and Chevron over tar sands reserves in the Republic of Tatarstan in 2006–2007. The talks fell through but the reserves are thought to be capable of supporting up to 500,000 b/d of production and Tatneft has talked of developing the resource alone.\textsuperscript{115}

The Italian oil company Eni is involved in plans to develop tar sands resources in the Republic of Congo. The company is exploring a land area of 1,790 km\textsuperscript{2} and is bizarrely linking the project to plans to simultaneously develop palm oil plantations across 70,000 hectares. In the words of Congolese human rights activist Brice Mackossa, from the Justice and Peace Commission in Pointe-Noire: ‘Local people, already suffering the impacts of oil development, have not been meaningfully consulted over the new projects. This violates Eni’s own human rights and environmental policies.’\textsuperscript{116}

French oil company Total, already a big player in the Canadian tar sands, is exploring similar reserves in Madagascar. The company announced plans in June 2009 to drill 130 exploration wells in Berolanga in the Morondava Basin. If production were to go ahead, it could reach 200,000 b/d over 30 years, all of which the company expects to export unreﬁned.\textsuperscript{117}

Elsewhere, the governments of Trinidad and Tobago\textsuperscript{118} and Nigeria\textsuperscript{119} have urged national and foreign oil companies to develop their tar sands reserves. Venezuela was recently assessed by the US Geological Survey, which announced in October 2009 that the country’s technically recoverable tar sands resources were double previous estimates at more than 500 billion barrels.\textsuperscript{120} Some limited commercial production is already underway in Venezuela.\textsuperscript{120}

Given the immense destructive power of tar sands mining and the increased pollution associated with all forms of tar sands production, the prospect of this industry expanding into countries with poor regulatory frameworks and histories of inadequate governance of natural resources is of great concern.

As we explain in the next section, the oil industry’s assertion that these resources have to be exploited to meet future demand is inaccurate and dangerous.
Tar sands production involves some of the highest capital and operating costs in the industry, making it the most expensive source of oil worldwide. As such, future projects can only come on stream if oil prices stay high. The minimum price of oil needed to support new tar sands projects in Canada, for example, is often cited as being between $80 and $90 per barrel. Prices required for specific projects depend on the technology used for extraction and upgrading, the quality of the resource and the prevailing prices of equipment and labour in the Alberta market.

Before the recession Alberta was among the most expensive labour and equipment markets in the oil industry. Costs have declined due to project cancellations following the recession, but it is becoming clear that a resumption of activity in Alberta is also seeing a return to unsustainable inflation in the region. One forecast has placed the long term oil price needed for production growth at more than $120 per barrel.

The assumption that the global economy will sustain oil prices on an inexorable upward curve appears misguided. High oil prices cause a slowdown in economic activity and thereby suppress oil demand. High oil prices also increase the take up of new technologies that use oil more efficiently and encourage consumers to switch to alternatives and more efficient patterns of use. Compounding this is the effect that high oil prices have on the energy policies of economies that are dependent on imported oil.

Concerned about high oil prices and energy security, countries such as China and the US are starting to tackle the issue of excessive dependence on oil. For the US in particular, this means addressing the extreme inefficiency with which oil is used in transportation in that country as well as diversifying a proportion of transportation to other sources of energy such as electricity. Some progress has already been made in this regard and as a result projections for oil demand in the future have been significantly revised in recent years. As new technologies gain ground these forecasts could be revised further.

There is therefore a growing consensus that oil demand in developed countries has peaked. There is also fervent debate about how far the burgeoning growth in oil demand in developing countries will go.

With oil demand growth slower than previously expected, it might be assumed that the problem of tar sands production should also diminish, but with traditional supplies of oil from giant fields in Mexico, the North Sea and elsewhere in decline, tar sands oil is expected to play a major role in filling the gap.

CONTROLLING CLIMATE CHANGE REQUIRES LESS NOT MORE OIL

Allowing tar sands oil to fulfil such a role, however, would fail to take account of the trajectory of oil demand that will be necessary to limit the concentration of carbon in the atmosphere in order to prevent average global temperatures rising above the critical 2°C level. To achieve this crucial goal we need strong policies that will not merely constrain the growth in oil demand but actually shrink demand significantly.

In the IEA 2009 annual report the choice facing the world regarding energy use and climate change was clearly outlined. The IEA presented two scenarios, the Reference Scenario and the 450ppm scenario. The Reference Scenario discusses energy use and GHG emissions on the basis that no new government policies aimed at reducing GHG emissions come into force, in other words business as usual. In this scenario oil demand grows from about 86 million b/d in 2010 to 105 million b/d in 2030. Canadian tar sands production is cited as growing strongly to meet this rising demand in the face of a limited increase in conventional oil supplies. The figures cited for future tar sands production are similar to those which the Albertan government and industry bodies such as the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers (CAPP) predict. But there are some aspects of this that the IEA discusses that Alberta and CAPP fail to mention. The IEA states:

‘But these Reference Scenario trends have profound implications for environmental protection, energy security and economic development. The continuation of current trends would have dire consequences for climate change. They would also exacerbate ambient air quality concerns, thus causing serious public health and environmental effects, particularly in developing countries’.

The IEA’s 450ppm Scenario is one in which the organisation expects atmospheric concentrations of GHGs to be stabilised and the catastrophic consequences of the Reference Scenario avoided. This scenario sees fossil fuel consumption and its associated GHG emissions peaking by 2020. US oil demand in 2030 is predicted to be 30% less than it was in 2007. The contraction in oil demand is expected to impact tar sands production particularly hard.

But to achieve these reductions requires stronger emissions regulations and more aggressive efficiency policies than are in place today. Achieving a stable climate, reducing oil demand and stopping the growth in tar sands production are all clearly linked by policies and actions that need to be taken by governments not only in North America but in Europe and all around the world.

The urgency with which we need to control GHG emissions and the decline in easy-to-produce oil suggests that the world is at a critical juncture in which society’s relationship with oil requires a new approach. The decline in easy-to-produce oil presents policy makers with a choice between two pathways: to either perpetuate an unsustainable supply based approach by pursuing increasingly expensive and polluting sources such as tar sands and other difficult-to-produce oils, or to constrain demand for oil through a combination of vehicle efficiency improvements, a shift to hybrid and electric vehicles, greater support for public transport and changes in spatial planning that reduce the need to travel. The latter option is really the only one that provides a long term solution to both the oil supply problem and climate change.
The Fuel Quality Directive (FQD) was adopted by the EU Council and Parliament on 22 April 2009 as a modification of an earlier directive (98/70) on the quality of petrol and diesel. One of the aims of the legislation is to reduce the well-to-tank GHG intensity of transport fuels used in the EU.

The FQD intends to reduce the life cycle GHG content of fuels used in the EU by 10% by 2020 with 6% of this target being mandatory and 4% voluntary. While the legislation is now law, the way it will be implemented is yet to be decided and the methodology chosen will make a significant difference to its effectiveness.

The methodology currently proposed is inadequate. It would potentially leave the EU market wide open to tar sands derived fuels. This is unlikely to adequately restrict imports of fuels with the highest life-cycle carbon content because as the proposed reductions are based on the average for all, their effect will be much weaker on the fuels with the highest value. This would potentially leave the EU market wide open to tar sands derived fuels and other fuels with high life-cycle carbon content. Using differentiated values for different categories of sources would provide an incentive for all high carbon sources to improve or would discourage their entry into the EU market by imposing a penalty.

As a matter of urgency Greenpeace is asking the commission to implement a series of recommendations on the GHG methodology of the FQD, which are shown in the ‘Conclusion and recommendations’ section that follows.

With the adoption of Article 7a of the Fuel Quality Directive, the EU has sent a clear signal that the GHG intensity of transport fuels is a target for significant reductions. It is crucial that Europe does not allow this legislation and its leadership on this issue to be undermined by lobbying from the oil industry or the Canadian and Albertan governments.

This report reveals that petroleum products partly derived from tar sands crude are regularly entering the EU and have been for at least one year. It shows that the trade from the USGC to the EU, particularly in diesel, is likely to become entrenched and if the Keystone XL pipeline is built, the contamination of this trade with tar sands crude is bound to grow significantly. The trend suggests the Canadian tar sands industry needs the EU petroleum products market for its growth strategy. This poses a dilemma for the EU and its member countries that have sought to position themselves as leaders in the effort to fight climate change.

The EU has adopted legislation that could restrict the import of the most carbon intensive fuels by giving them differentiated default values under the Fuel Quality Directive. This legislation must enshrine the strictest default values possible for diesel sourced from refineries that process high carbon tar sands crude. If the legislation fails to do this, it will encourage an increase not a decrease in the environmental impact of oil and make a mockery of Europe’s claim to be leading the world in the fight against climate change. Without effective legislation Europe will send the wrong signals to the global market, locking in a high carbon infrastructure that will be in place for decades to come.

Greenpeace urges EU legislators to strengthen the Fuel Quality Directive so that petroleum products with any link to tar sands crude cannot find a market in the EU. We also encourage EU legislators and European governments to take bold steps to tackle the issue of declining conventional oil production through demand reduction measures. Strengthening support for vehicle efficiency, diversifying transport technologies through electric vehicles and hybrids, increasing and improving public transport and pursuing spatial planning policies that reduce wasteful travel will speed the
decline in oil demand, improve air quality in our cities and towns, and enhance energy security.

RECOMMENDATIONS

i) Implement changes to the EU Fuel Quality Directive

European legislators must seize the opportunity provided by this directive and:

- introduce and implement a set of conservative default values for the GHG intensity of different sources of crude oil, including tar sands
- establish a GHG intensity ceiling at the earliest opportunity in the review of the Directive in 2012. This would guarantee that the most polluting fuels do not contaminate the European supply chain
- introduce the opportunity to take into account improvements in refinery efficiency
- enable fuel suppliers to prove that they are performing better than the default values by investing in better technology, reducing flaring, switching to cleaner fuels and;
- introduce, with immediate effect, accurate and robust reporting of the carbon intensity of oil. This is necessary to create transparency for future reviews of the law.

ii) Reduce oil demand

While reducing the GHG content in transport fuels is helpful, much more can also be done to reduce oil demand. This will not only help tackle climate change and reduce the environmental impacts of extracting and refining petroleum products, but can also increase the resilience of the EU economy and its transportation system.

To reduce emissions and increase energy security, Greenpeace advocates the following hierarchy of principles for the transport sector:

- localise services and reduce the need to travel
- use fuel more wisely; and
- harness and develop clean technologies

These principles can be applied to both passenger transport and freight.

For Greenpeace’s UK transport policy paper see appendix.
Cut the roads budget by a further £2.8bn once the method for calculating costs and benefits has been reformed to properly price costs of carbon and other negative impacts on society and the climate.

- Instigate a moratorium on fulfilling our biofuels obligation until sustainability standards are in place to protect forests, biodiversity and food prices. The money that would have been paid to biofuel producers in an increased fuel price could instead be levied by government and used elsewhere, and<br
- Put into practice other reforms to public expenditure as outlined in a recent Green Alliance paper.134

GUIDING PRINCIPLES
To reduce emissions and increase energy security, the following hierarchy of principles for the transport sector, both passenger and freight, must be adopted:

- Localise services and reduce the need to travel
- Use fuel more wisely, and
- Harness and develop clean technologies.

POLICY GOALS
Below, we outline why each of these guiding principles is important, what can be achieved if this principle is applied and provide key examples of the kinds of policies that can be employed to achieve it. A short briefing cannot provide all the answers but shows key policies underlying the most desirable direction of travel. For clarity we have placed the policies under individual headings below, but they are in reality a package, working together to deliver the desired outcomes. We also recommend other analysis that would deliver supportive policies.151

Localise services and reduce the need to travel
Why?
There is currently huge inefficiency within the transport system, exacerbated by a mismatch between transport and planning policy. The result is that money and fuel are being wasted, communities are cut off from essential services (such as health centres and post offices) and, as we saw as recently as January 2010, vital UK distribution networks have been shown to be far from robust.141 Some 57% of household car journeys are less than five miles, a further 37% are between five and 25 miles, and together they account for around two thirds of emissions from cars. Increasing car use has been linked to a rising obesity problem,157 and the International Energy Agency (IEA) forecasts that OPEC’s domination of the global oil trade is set to rise.142 This, by implication, alerts us to the potential problems of a low diversity of supply.

Added to this, Britain faces other challenges: meeting our emissions targets, the obesity crisis, the fragmentation of local communities, and contributing to the health of Britain’s people, industries and environment.

ROAD TRANSPORT POLICY FOR THE FUTURE
It is globally acknowledged that oil supply will be subject to huge pressures over the coming decades, which Deutsche Bank reports will lead to volatile prices.143 Since 2005, the UK has returned to being a net-importer of primary oils. Exports in 2008 were 19% lower than imports, a difference of 12 million tonnes. As indigenous production continues to decline, the UK will be forced to import more and more oil144 and the International Energy Agency (IEA) forecasts that OPEC’s domination of the global oil trade is set to rise.142 This, by implication, alerts us to the potential problems of a low diversity of supply.

The 2008 Climate Change Act commits the UK to reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 80% below 1990 levels by 2050. Transport currently accounts for around one fifth to one quarter of the UK’s total domestic emissions.145 The majority of these (92%) come from road transport (52.5% from passenger cars, 19.8% from heavy goods vehicles, 15.2% from light goods vehicles and 4.5% from other road transport such as buses).146

A carbon test needs to be placed at the heart of transport policy making in order to ensure we are on track to meet our emissions reduction targets. Given the dependence of road transport on high carbon oil, this approach will also help to re-orient the UK away from its damaging dependence on oil.

By 2050 the road transport sector can be better integrated, totally de-carbonised, economically efficient and powered from clean, secure energy sources. There are no technical, financial, organisational or other obstacles that would put this objective out of reach. All it requires is the political will to move boldly and decisively, for central government to give the right lead and allow local government and communities to implement effective solutions.

Costs
Many of the initiatives that could make UK transport more resilient, healthy and low carbon, are low or zero cost on the public purse. Where investment is required, however, public finance could be redirected via the following programmes:

- Implement a two year moratorium on road expansion – saving £2.4bn over two years
- Cut the roads budget by a further £2.8bn once the method for calculating costs and benefits has been reformed to properly price costs of carbon and other negative impacts on society and the climate.

What can be achieved?
Localising services and reducing the need to travel (shinking both the number of journeys made and the distances travelled) will have a huge impact: improving quality of life, creating more resilient and motivated communities, reducing carbon emissions as well as local air pollution, cutting the costs and improving the productivity of businesses and helping address the obesity problem.

Policies that can be employed
- Adopt spatial and urban development strategies based on compact development. This emphasises mixing land uses, clustering development, providing services locally and offering multiple transportation choices. The result is reduced congestion, less pollution and stronger, more motivated communities. If design is orientated around pedestrians and if road space is reallocated to bikes, buses and high occupancy vehicles, then urban car vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) can be reduced by 10%145 and urban car CO₂ emissions reduced by 11%.146
- Prioritise walking and cycling and extend the smarter choices programme. Implementing a 20mph speed limit on all residential roads in urban areas, would create the safe, calm conditions for walking and cycling needed to help people overcome their real fears about moving around sustainably in dangerous car-centric environments. The current government’s smarter choices programme has had success, but requires political vision for it to be extended across the country to encourage greater walking, cycling and bus use.147
- Implement a regional cooperation model for HGVs: Greater cooperation, through better planning guidance and regulation, will stop large numbers of half empty vehicles making long journeys and traffic and cause significant physical damage to roads. What can be achieved?
Localising services and reducing the need to travel (shinking both the number of journeys made and the distances travelled) will have a huge impact: improving quality of life, creating more resilient and motivated communities, reducing carbon emissions as well as local air pollution, cutting the costs and improving the productivity of businesses and helping address the obesity problem.

Policies that can be employed
- Adopt spatial and urban development strategies based on compact development. This emphasises mixing land uses, clustering development, providing services locally and offering multiple transportation choices. The result is reduced congestion, less pollution and stronger, more motivated communities. If design is orientated around pedestrians and if road space is reallocated to bikes, buses and high occupancy vehicles, then urban car vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) can be reduced by 10%145 and urban car CO₂ emissions reduced by 11%.146
- Prioritise walking and cycling and extend the smarter choices programme. Implementing a 20mph speed limit on all residential roads in urban areas, would create the safe, calm conditions for walking and cycling needed to help people overcome their real fears about moving around sustainably in dangerous car-centric environments. The current government’s smarter choices programme has had success, but requires political vision for it to be extended across the country to encourage greater walking, cycling and bus use.147
- Implement a regional cooperation model for HGVs: Greater cooperation, through better planning guidance and regulation, will stop large numbers of half empty vehicles making long journeys and traffic and cause significant physical damage to roads.

What can be achieved?
Localising services and reducing the need to travel (shinking both the number of journeys made and the distances travelled) will have a huge impact: improving quality of life, creating more resilient and motivated communities, reducing carbon emissions as well as local air pollution, cutting the costs and improving the productivity of businesses and helping address the obesity problem.

Policies that can be employed
- Adopt spatial and urban development strategies based on compact development. This emphasises mixing land uses, clustering development, providing services locally and offering multiple transportation choices. The result is reduced congestion, less pollution and stronger, more motivated communities. If design is orientated around pedestrians and if road space is reallocated to bikes, buses and high occupancy vehicles, then urban car vehicle kilometres travelled (VKT) can be reduced by 10%145 and urban car CO₂ emissions reduced by 11%.146
- Prioritise walking and cycling and extend the smarter choices programme. Implementing a 20mph speed limit on all residential roads in urban areas, would create the safe, calm conditions for walking and cycling needed to help people overcome their real fears about moving around sustainably in dangerous car-centric environments. The current government’s smarter choices programme has had success, but requires political vision for it to be extended across the country to encourage greater walking, cycling and bus use.147
- Implement a regional cooperation model for HGVs: Greater cooperation, through better planning guidance and regulation, will stop large numbers of half empty vehicles making long journeys and traffic and cause significant physical damage to roads.
Use fuel more wisely

Why?
Millions of tonnes of fuel are currently wasted by inefficient vehicles, unnecessary journeys and imports, and irresponsible use of these vital resources. The UK must drive to change this culture of waste as it prepares to make the transition away from fossil fuels to an economy based on clean and independent energy.

What can be achieved?
With the right incentives, the UK population can be encouraged to use fuel more wisely, which will bring savings for consumers and businesses, increase energy security, produce huge cuts in emissions, and help to drive forward the clean energy economy.

Policies that can be employed

- Implement a new European efficiency target of 80gCO₂/km average emissions by 2020. This achievable target will be an essential mechanism to drive the decarbonisation of road transport, encourage cleaner technologies and help to use remaining fuel more wisely.
- Adopt strong targets for publicly owned fleets. The government should lead the way by setting an average level of CO₂ emissions from government procured cars. This level should reflect the range of lower emission vehicles available and should initially be set at 110g CO₂/km for cars purchased in 2011. The fleet average should go down to 100g CO₂/km by 2015 and to 80gCO₂/km or lower by 2020.
- Make public transport more accessible. London's transport system is an example of initiatives that could be taken across the country. By introducing and increasing workplace car parking charges, there will be greater uptake of public transport options, which will help cut congestion and emissions. The revenue raised can be used to help improve public transport and so cut transport emissions. A 30% reduction in fares is predicted to cut car CO₂ emissions by 2%. Local authorities should be given the power to re-regulate bus services to ensure that, as has happened in London, all routes are still served even though buses are running around empty. In Germany, a new lorry tax, the Lastkraftwagen Maut, has started to change this by using GPS satellite technology to charge all lorries a small tax per kilometre. This provides an incentive to businesses to reduce the number of trips by making better use of lorry capacity and improving efficiency.
- Introduce a new lorry tax. Around 25% of our lorry capacity runs around empty. In Germany, a new lorry tax, the Lastkraftwagen Maut, has started to change this by using GPS satellite technology to charge all lorries a small tax per kilometre. This provides an incentive to businesses to reduce the number of trips by making better use of lorry capacity and improving efficiency.
- Reintroduce the fuel price escalator. The practice of automatically increasing fuel tax ahead of inflation sends a clear message that it is in the interests of both the individual and the country as a whole to reduce oil dependency and CO₂ emissions. A 5% per annum fuel price escalator introduced from 2010 would result in a 40% reduction in CO₂ emissions for all fossil fuel powered road vehicles by 2050. In the absence of other supportive measure this will be unpopular, emphasising the need for a package approach to support access to services.
- Implement a package of fiscal measures to drive innovation in the vehicle supply chain and incentivise efficient vehicles. This can either be revenue neutral or it can be used to raise fresh money. The measures should include increasing the spread in vehicle excise duty between low and high efficiency vehicles, and the possible introduction of a car purchase tax – common in other EU countries – which does the same.
- Promote more responsible driving. Information campaigns, better vehicle maintenance, in-car information systems and courses on driving style (smoother driving) can all help reduce fuel use. Vehicle CO₂ emissions vary with speed: a reduction in the motorway speed limit to 60 mph, for example, would result in a 10% reduction in motorway CO₂ emissions.
- Give communities the power to run their own bus services. A German scheme in the state of North Rhine-Westphalia known as the ‘Bürgerbus’ or Citizens’ bus has empowered local communities, provided vital connections, particularly for the older population, and reduced bureaucracy for local government.
- Help to bring about a flourishing market for electric vehicles. Introduce a new car tax and business-in-kind company car tax band of 75g/km or less to help stimulate electric vehicles and hybrids. Raise the level of differentiation between bands by a factor of five.
- Continue to support the consumer rebate scheme for hybrid and electric vehicles and invest in a national electric vehicle recharging infrastructure.
- Support regulation such as the adoption of new European efficiency targets for car emissions. This not only drives efficiency in conventionally fuelled vehicles but also stimulates the uptake of very low carbon technologies.
- Invest in new technologies. Maintain and enhance low carbon economic areas (LCEA) to create regions in UK which can drive innovation and help stimulate research and development of low carbon vehicles.
- Raise standards. All passenger cars, vans, motorcycles and HGVs should be subject to standards on fuel efficiency that are progressively tightened over time, giving long term signals for innovation.