

Subject: Electric Vehicle Mandate

Date: Thursday, April 13, 2023 at 5:09:34 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From: William Yeaton

To: HearingComments, DNREC (MailBox Resources)

CC: State Rep. Jeff Hilovsky

Dear Gentlepersons:

I am vehemently opposed to implementing a mandate of this type without solid published detailed plans for:

- Assumptions for the underlying technology, infrastructure upgrades and financial/tax models
- Implementing the supporting infrastructure (financially, timeline, taking into account the growth rate of persons moving to DE, availability of resources to get the infrastructure in place)
- production capabilities for the vehicles that will not require importing mined material imported from other countries,
- financial models that will not burden those remaining on combustion engines for the transition to the mandated infrastructure (no increased gas tax)
- model to transition from gas tax to an electric vehicle based tax model to ensure road maintenance without burdening those remaining on combustion engines for an uneven percentage of the revenue stream
- solid technology plan to ensure that Delaware can be evacuated without everyone with an electric vehicle having to recharge the batteries right around the Bay Bridge or the Del Mem Bridge. Not just a plan based on vapor hope that technology will be available to give the necessary range.
- I want someone that the public may hold personally and professionally responsible for the mandate if it proves to be a failure, not just a faceless organization.
 - Failure in part meaning: that vehicle costs exceed today's combustion vehicle costs (purchase and maintenance) by more than inflation, that implementation does not cause brown outs or black outs, that the mandate does not drive DE gas prices to the same level as California has (25% higher than national average), that the mandate does not drive supplemental payments/grants/or other compensation to low income purchasers that need to be funded by other Delaware residents.
- This should not be a mandate forced on the public without representation of the people. Therefore no department or organization of the administration should be forcing this on the people. Something of this magnitude must be by a statewide referendum specifically voted on by the people with no ability for the Administration, or legislature to modify the implementation after the referendum is voted.

Finally, it is my opinion, that a referendum with a goal to move main stream use of electric vehicles should include attainment "goals" at 5 year increments with review of the transition and adjustment of the goals based on the public's acceptance of electric vehicles and the ACTUAL attainment of the underlying assumptions that the referendum is built on (e.g. battery technology, weight and longevity, initial and long term vehicle costs, infrastructure capabilities, tax revenue). Further, the overall goal of moving to 100% electric vehicles should not occur prior to 2050. Any mandate that doesn't recognize that it will take approximately twenty-five (25) years to support the 100% attainment is not well thought out and is based on a lay-person's understanding of the underlying technologies and the real level of the people's support of the objective.

Regards,
William Yeaton

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

