

Subject: Public Hearing Comments

Date: Saturday, May 20, 2023 at 11:23:13 AM Eastern Daylight Time

From: DoNotReply@delaware.gov

To: HearingComments, DNREC (MailBox Resources), cavane@comcast.net

Comments on 2022-R-A-0011: Low Emission Vehicle Program

Name: Christopher Vane

Phone: 1-302-745-2607

Email Address: cavane@comcast.net

Organization: No

Comments:

Dear Secretary Garvin: I'm voicing my opposition and my family's oppoition to the proposed E.V. mandate and the ban on the sale or registration of new gasoline and diesel powered vehicles. I'm listing the reasons below: 1. The ban will increase the cost of buying a new or used vehicle. E.V.'s are the most expensive type to buy and the price of new or used gasoline and diesel vehicles will rise as people rush to get the vehicle of their choice before the mandate kicks in. 2. This cost increase will disproportionately impact people with lower incomes. 3. Independent vehicle repair shops will most likely, eventually be forced out of business as gasoline and diesel vehciles wear out. E.V.'s are too complicated to repair and will most likely be serviced, if they can be serviced, by manufacturer dealerships. 4. The electrical grid can't handle the increase in demand. 5. Electricity prices, already high, will go higher due to increased demand and strained supply. 6. The vast majority of electricity in the U.S. is generated by natural gas, and coal. Burning fossil fuels to supply electricity for E.V. charging is hypocritical. 7. Charge times are exceedingly long. Who has hours to spend fully charging an E.V.? This is especially problematic when travelling on vacation or for business. Time wasted is money wasted. 8. We are a nation built on representative government. This mandate from an agency, by unelected officials and employees, is not representative government. The mandate is also a violation of our State Constitution. 9. What about consumer choice? If someone wants to buy an E.V., that's fine. To MANDATE and remove choice from our citizens is not fine. 10. An article on Reuters news wire dated March 21, 2023 cited an analysis that public chargers in the U.K. can cost a person up to \$1,854.51, (U.S.dollars), more annually than charging at home. That cost gap is sure to be an issue in the U.S., again impacting lower income people much more who will depend on a public charging network. 11. An article on page 49 in AAA World Magazine, dated March/April 2023 titled, "Taking Charge", cited a survey by researchers at University of California at Berkeley of 657 charging stations in San Francisco and found "23 percent were not in proper working order". Again, this will impact many people who have no choice but to rely on a public network. 12. A report by the U.S. E.P.A. titled, " Our Nation's Air, Trends Through 2020" cited China as the largest emitter of CO2 by far, at an estimated 10,668 metric tons. The U.S.A. was a distant second at 4,713 metric tons. This same report stated in it's introduction that "since 1970, implementation of the Clean Air Act and technological advances from American innovators have dramatically improved air quality in the U.S. Since that time, the combined emissions of criteria and precursor pollutants have dropped by 78%". 13. A report by the U.S. Energy Infrastructure Adminstration dated 12-14-22 cited that transportation CO2 emissions in the U.S.A. have remained relatively steady since 1990 through 2021. 14. A report by Carbon Brief, dated March 2017, cited that U.S. carbon emissions have fallen from their peak in 2005 by 14% at the end of 2016. 15. A report on Bloomberg, dated March 22, 2023, cited the rising technology of E-Fuels, which can be used in today's internal combustion vehicles and can be transported by exisiting fuel logisitcs networks. Feel free to contact me to discuss further.