Hysteria makes for poor policy choices. For the past three decades, many politicians and the media have promoted inflated claims about the risks of climate change, many of which lack any scientific or empirical foundation.[1] To name just two dramatic claims, the entire disappearance of the Maldives because of rising oceans[2] and the end of snow in Great Britain[3] have failed to materialize. There is also a seemingly never-ending stream of long-term predictions about future catastrophes, including widespread famine from the collapse of agriculture, mass extinctions, and disease,[4] as well as earthquakes[5] and volcanic eruptions.[6] None appear to be based on empirical data, that is, on changes observed over the previous century as emissions increased greatly. Finally, there is a tendency to attribute individual weather events, such as the recent heavy rains in California, to climate change.[7]

The result has been a farrago of ill-conceived and unrealistic energy policies. In Europe, for example, many countries are experiencing energy price increases and shortages that are undermining the Continent's manufacturing and agricultural sectors, causing substantial financial and physical hardship for millions of citizens.[8]

In the U.S., rising energy prices and physical supply shortages have not reached European levels … yet. However, the Biden administration is intent on following the same failed energy policies—policies that will have little measurable impact on world climate but are already imposing long-term economic damage. Moreover**, the U.S. share of world greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions is small enough and decreasing, so any reductions in GHG emissions that the current portfolio of laws and regulations may achieve will have little effect.[9] Even if one believes policies to address climate change are still crucial and that technological diffusion of low- or zero-emissions technologies will provide worldwide benefits, the current smorgasbord of green energy subsidies and mandates are likely the highest-cost means to achieve them.**

https://www.manhattan-institute.org/an-economically-rational-energy-policy-for-the-united-states

The electric vehicle sales mandate is based on this hysteria.

Demands that hydrocarbons no longer be used—to generate electricity, heat homes, power factories, or transport people and goods from one place to another—emerge from climate-focused objectives. Observations that they aren't being replaced and can't be in any meaningful time frame evoke specious claims of "climate denialism" or the equivalent. But **the realities of the physics, engineering, and economics of energy systems are not dependent on any facts or beliefs about climate change.**

The lithium battery is what made it possible to build useful EVs. Even so, today it still costs at least 50%–70% more to buy an EV instead of a comparable standard car. Purchase price aside, conventional wisdom has it that consumer reluctance to embrace EVs also arises from so-called range anxiety, which, it is argued, is solved with lots of charging stations. Yet most EVs already have a range equivalent to gasoline-powered cars, 200–400 miles. The issue isn't range; it's the time it takes to refuel a battery.

A standard gasoline station pump can fill a fuel tank in about five minutes. It takes about 10 hours to charge an EV with the standard Level 2 charger used for homes and at many public locations.[39] While a so-called supercharger can drop that to 30–40 minutes, both the supercharger hardware and the longer fueling times have dramatic cost implications. A longer time to fuel an EV means that a filling station will need many more fueling "pumps" to support the same number of customers at peak times. And that increased number not only requires far more (expensive) land but also comes with a per-unit capital cost of a supercharger roughly double the cost of a gasoline pump.

The combination of these factors translates into 10 to 20 times the costs of the fueling infrastructure to provide the same functional utility. This doesn't include the incremental costs to upgrade local electrical distribution infrastructures to handle the higher power levels needed for fast charging. A single supercharger requires electrical infrastructure equivalent to that needed for 10 homes.

https://www.manhattan-institute.org/the-energy-transition-delusion

ELECTRIC CARS ARE NOT "ZERO-EMISSION VEHICLES"In reality, electric cars emit substantial amounts of pollutants and may be more harmful to the environment than conventional cars.

The notion that electric vehicles are "zero-emission" is rooted in a deceptive narrative that ignores all pollutants which don't come out of a tailpipe. Assessing the environmental impacts of energy technologies requires measuring all forms of pollution they emit over their entire lives, not a narrow slice of them. To do this, researchers perform "life cycle assessments" or LCAs. As explained by the Environmental Protection Agency, LCAs allow for:

the estimation of the cumulative environmental impacts resulting from all stages in the product life cycle, often including impacts not considered in more traditional analyses (e.g., raw material extraction, material transportation, ultimate product disposal, etc.). By including the impacts throughout the product life cycle, LCA provides a comprehensive view of the environmental aspects of the product or process and a more accurate picture of the true environmental trade-offs in product and process selection.

LCAs are subject to multiple levels of uncertainty, but an assessment published by the Journal of Cleaner Production in 2021 shatters the notion that electric cars are cleaner than conventional ones, much less “zero emission.” The LCA found that manufacturing, charging, operating, and disposing of electric vehicles produces more of every major category of pollutants than conventional cars. This includes:
an increase in fine particulate matter formation (26%), human carcinogenic (20%) and non-carcinogenic toxicity (61%), terrestrial ecotoxicity (31%), freshwater ecotoxicity (39%), and marine ecotoxicity (41%) relative to petrol vehicles.
https://www.heartland.org/news-opinion/news/electric-cars-are-not-zero-emission-vehicles

"In all of these fires, these lithium-ion fires, it is not a slow burn; there's not a small amount of fire, it literally explodes," FDNY Commissioner Laura Kavanagh told reporters. "It's a tremendous volume of fire as soon as it happens, and it's very difficult to extinguish and so it's particularly dangerous."
These incidents are becoming more common for a number of reasons. For starters, lithium-ion batteries are now in numerous consumer tech products, powering laptops, cameras, smartphones and more. They allow companies to squeeze hours of battery life into increasingly slim devices. But a combination of manufacturer issues, misuse and aging batteries can heighten the risk from the batteries, which use flammable materials.
https://www.cnn.com/2023/03/09/tech/lithium-ion-battery-fires/index.html

Electrifying the nation’s vehicles and transportation infrastructure exposes drivers and cities to new risks. If cybercriminals hack into electric vehicles, they could not only penetrate the vehicle itself, but also compromise the entire connected infrastructure -- including charging stations, electrical grids, back office utilities and the cloud. Threat actors could damage an EV by overcharging its battery or steal payment information through a charging station. When heavy duty vehicles start charging at multi-megawatt plazas, they can strain cities’ power systems. If these systems are not managed or secured properly, attackers can shut down electrical grids and cause blackouts for entire city blocks, Chhaya said. Fleets of publicly owned vehicles like electric buses, trucks and emergency response vehicles are also at risk.
https://www.route-fifty.com/tech-data/2022/05/ev-infrastructure-vulnerabilities-put-cars-grid-risk/366784/