

Subject: Public Hearing Comments

Date: Saturday, May 20, 2023 at 10:56:03 AM Eastern Daylight Time

From: DoNotReply@delaware.gov

To: HearingComments, DNREC (MailBox Resources)

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

Name: Frank D Cannon Jr

Phone: 3022283446

Email Address: seafordski@hotmail.com

Organization:

Comments:

To: DNREC, State of Delaware, Dover DE From: Dan Cannon, 411 Nylon Blvd, Seaford DE 19973 302.228.3446 seafordski@hotmail.com RE: PUBLIC COMMENT: ELECTRIC VEHICLES Date: 5/20/23 With keen interest I have been listening to the on-going national, state and even regional/local debates about electric vehicles (EVs) replacing vehicles with internal combustion engines (ICE). Like many, I guess the Tesla revolution turned the tables on my thinking about EVs as the initial Model S was (at least) American-midsize, (not quite) as fast a a bullet, had a range of more than 200 miles before needing a charge, a growing network of charging stations, regular over-the-air electronic updates/improvements and no tailpipe CO₂, NO_x, etc. emissions. What was not to like—except the PRICE? My older (2014) midsize BMW diesel sedan was/is pretty efficient (30+ mpg city; 39+ mpg highway) with massively reduced particulate Carbon but it is still an ICE vehicle. A lot of people are rightly hollering about rapidly increasing levels of CO₂, CH₄, etc. greenhouse gases from ICE vehicles, cows, power plants, etc. contributing to trapping light energy and warming the Earth. While I have had raucous debates with my scientist friends, the overwhelming consensus is that the trends look BAD—increased levels of CO₂ and CH₄, warming land, sea and air masses, sea level rise due to melting ice and especially ocean expansion, weather extremes becoming more frequent—and more. Therefore, it seems clear that every little change we can make to reduce the impact of this scenario is a good change. To help do this, switching from ICE to EVs is a no-brainer. And the manufacturing race to make, sell and maintain EVs is on! But... Some people reject the massive scientific evidence linking human caused greenhouse gas emissions with a warming earth along with the inherent consequences. It is likely that no amount of evidence would convince these people otherwise, but fortunately they represent a small minority. Others doubters have serious concerns as to whether human efforts to reduce the quantities of greenhouse gasses are or will be effective to any large degree. All of us at least partly share this concern, but most feel it is better to make the efforts at reduction than to simply wait until the warming reaches and exceeds a potential crisis level. Part of those efforts is the elimination/massive reduction in ICE vehicles in favor of ZE (zero emissions) vehicles including EV's. So a majority favor ZE vehicles of which EV's are the vast majority at this point and likely to be the vast majority for at least a couple of decades. Even among ZE advocates some would argue that the overall Carbon pollution (e.g CO₂) "costs" for production and operation of EV's (batteries, electricity, etc.) outweigh the benefits of their ZERO emissions. For those skeptics, the Wall Street Journal (5/11/23 p B1) has an excellent article laying out the overall Carbon pollution numbers for EV's, even quantifying the effects of different electricity production methods (natural gas, coal, hydroelectric, wind, solar, nuclear, etc.). Perhaps the most encouraging aspect of this WSJ piece is the rather optimistic outlook for falling CO₂ "costs" of electricity over time and that even now the CO₂ "costs" for EV's are 50% of average ICE vehicles. This kind of evidence should be helpful to everyone. Finally, there are those who may not necessarily oppose ZE vehicles/EV's but strongly resent government mandates regarding the switch from ICE to ZE vehicles. The Governor of DE's plan is to have DNREC enforce regulations that would begin to drastically reduce the % of new ICE vehicles until no new ICE vehicles (with some exceptions I think) would enter the DE market after 2035. Debate over this plan is certainly appropriate, but going on the warpath as some appear to be doing does and will do little to help matters. Without becoming too polemic, I would remind these freedom of choice advocates that unpopular limitations of individual choice because of safety/other legitimate concerns are not new. RECALL THE UPROAR OVER LAWS MANDATING THE USE OF SEATBELTS. Reasonable people would argue that some limitations on freedoms, such as mandatory seat belt usage, are justified for the overall benefit to individuals and society. I now own an EV and am hopeful that the cumulative effects of even small individual efforts to reduce CO₂ "costs" such as mine will make a significant difference in overall

CO2 "costs" to our environment over the long haul.