

Subject: NO EV MANDATE!!!

Date: Tuesday, May 23, 2023 at 6:22:26 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From: michael senisch

To: HearingComments, DNREC (MailBox Resources)

CC: michael senisch

Priority: High

Michael C. Senisch
Physician Assistant-Certified / MICU Paramedic Retired
8 Darley Road
Claymont, Delaware 19703-2722
(609) 226-9901 / senycz@hotmail.com
05/23/2023

Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC)
89 Kings Highway
Dover, DE 19901

Subject: Opposition to Your Authority on The EV Mandate

Dear DNREC, Secretary Garvin, et al,

I am writing to vehemently oppose the unconstitutional overreach of authority demonstrated by the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control (DNREC) in mandating Delaware citizens' modes of transportation.

As free American citizens, we staunchly defend our inherent right to choose our preferred mode of transportation without intrusive interference or government mandates.

DNREC's recent actions encroach upon our fundamental liberties, and constitutional rights, and undermine the principles that form the bedrock of our nation. Our right to select the transportation method that best suits our needs should remain inviolable, and safeguarded from unwarranted regulatory control.

While I understand the importance of environmental conservation, I believe it is crucial to strike a balance between these goals that affect our US Constitutional individual freedoms. Your attempts to regulate and mandate specific modes of transportation encroach upon everyone's personal liberties and rights which are a fundamental and essential provision of our democratic society.

As an American citizen, I have the right to freely choose my preferred means of transportation based on my lifestyle, finances, and personal preferences. It is not the role of the DNREC or any government agency to dictate, dictate, or levy their personal decisions. I strongly believe that authority to determine how I travel should be solely in my hands, as long as my choices comply with pre-existing DMV laws, statutes, and regulations.

As concerned citizens, we must vigorously remind public servants of their duty to prioritize the welfare of Delaware's citizens. Moreover, elected officials and appointed representatives are entrusted with the responsibility to make informed decisions on behalf of their constituents. I feel compelled to remind you that as a public servant, your primary duty is to serve and work for the best interests of all the citizens of Delaware, not a self chosen select group, and not to levy and impose yours or anyone's misguided personal beliefs or agendas upon us.

It is worth noting that implementing measures that are perceived as "unlawful" or "unconstitutional" is a very serious allegation. Allegations of unlawfulness or unconstitutionality should only be addressed by the judiciary and not via such departmental mandates. By attempting to enforce unlawful and unconstitutional mandates, you are betraying the trust placed in you by the people who supported and/or elected you and/or appointed you into office.

I would like to emphasize that your actions in these and other matters have severe consequences. As a concerned citizen, I will actively and diligently work towards removing those supporting all who support this unconstitutional mandate from office and also further support the removal of any public officials who engage in the such further egregious overreach of authority. It is my belief that true democratic governance should reflect the will of the people and respect the principles of individual freedom.

I seriously urge you to reconsider your approach and redirect your efforts towards engaging in continued productive dialogue with the public, fostering understanding, and encouraging voluntary adoption of sustainable and of realistic practices. Only through education, awareness, and cooperation can we create a society that is both environmentally conscious and respectful of individual liberties.

In closing, I reiterate my strong opposition to the DNREC's attempts to regulate and mandate modes of transportation. I implore you to listen to the concerns of the people you serve and respect their rights and freedoms. Failure to do so will undoubtedly lead to increased dissent and further significant erosion of public trust.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that you will consider my words seriously and act in the best interests of the citizens of Delaware.

Sincerely,

Michael C. Senisch, PA-C

My OP-ED: Denying Our Constitutional Rights Limits While Overloading the Grid!

Governor Carney's Executive mandate for electric vehicles raises concerns about not only our personal rights as Delawareans but also the capacity of the grid to handle the additional power demands. This is especially problematic in areas where the grid infrastructure is outdated and cannot support the changing needs of a growing number of EVs and chargers.

Straining the grid: Electric vehicles require a significant amount of power to charge, and if too many of them are charging at the same time, it could overload the grid. In areas where the infrastructure is outdated or not built to handle the increased demand, this is a significant problem. Delaware's outdated power grid: One concern with the widespread adoption of EVs is that it could place additional strain on an already outdated power grid. In areas where the grid is not equipped to handle the increased demand for electricity, it could lead to power outages, brownouts, and/or rolling blackouts or other related issues as what has happened and is happening in California arising due to their better-than-Delaware per populous power grid being stretched to its limit. If the electricity used to power EVs comes from fossil-fueled charging sources where Delaware generates approximately 86% of their power, it negates most, if not all of the environmental benefits of EVs. Furthermore, increasing a carbon emission "footprint." So, these sources of electricity used to charge and fuel the EV are very important, but the governmentally ignored part of the equation.

Carbon footprint of battery production: The production of batteries for EVs can have significance depending on the country in which they are produced and the type of battery. This is because the production process requires a significant amount of machinery and energy and often involves the extraction of raw materials in environmentally sensitive areas not without significant environmental and human impact. This process employs cheap workers and child labor in a dangerous "dirty" environment and due to the non-considerations of third-world countries, non-OHSA-protected "workers" may progress from exposures within eight hours to seven days to acute chemical pneumonitis and pulmonary edema. This can result in prolonged recovery, permanent lung damage, or death.

Limited range: Electric vehicles can't typically travel as far on a single charge as gas-powered cars can on a tank of gas. This means that people who frequently drive long distances may need to plan for more frequent charging stops. The driving range of EVs on a full charge is also a concern, challenge, and consideration for people, particularly those who frequently take long drives. Gas-powered cars typically boast a range of around 400 miles per tank of gas, while electric vehicles generally have a lower range which may raise anxiety and worry for those who frequently drive long distances.

Charging station availability: Charging electric vehicles can also be more challenging in finding than filling them up at a gas station with the limited charging infrastructure: Compared to gas stations, EV charging stations are currently fewer and further between, making it more challenging to find a place to charge your vehicle even while on a city street parking by your home that does not have a dedicated spot, within an apartment complex without assigned parking, or when on long trips, especially with a line of vehicles in wait.

Longer charging times: Charging an EV takes longer than filling up a gas tank, which can be an inconvenience for some drivers who are used to the convenience of traditional gasoline-powered vehicles and not planning ahead of adding more time to their busy schedules.

Purchase Pricing: Furthermore, the initial purchase cost of electric vehicles is higher than comparable traditional gas-powered vehicles, although there are state and federal incentives and rebates available to help offset this cost but not everyone qualifies. However, most do not understand these "bonus" incentives are funded through taxes that all taxpayers suffer and are required to pay, regardless of whether or not they own or even support the adoption of

electric vehicles. Most do not realize that getting your own monies back from the government is still your original money and is a violation of your personal freedom and right that in this case is grossly infringed upon.

Replacing the batteries: Batteries in an EV are also an expensive undertaking. Although they typically come with a manufacturer warranty, generally only between 5 and 8 years, replacing the battery after the warranty expires can be a significant expense.

Roadwork funding: Loss of gasoline tax revenue: Taxes on the sale of gasoline fund a significant portion of roadwork, including much-needed repairs, repaving, and DelDOT safety concerns. As the push to ban the sale of new gasoline and diesel-fueled vehicles grows, there are concerns about how this diverted loss of and recouping this revenue will be replaced, potentially leading to additional new fees for drivers.

IMPORTANT: Delaware is exploring user fees that bill drivers for the number of miles a car is driven, based on a device installed in your vehicles. Most, as I would, would view this as another infringement on our personal rights and freedoms to privacy and unrestrictive travel. This user fee could potentially become a regressive tax on lower-income households and people living in rural areas, who often have older, less fuel-efficient vehicles, and/or those who have to travel long distances to work and access necessities. These individuals may not have the option to drive less or access public transportation, and as a result, could end up paying more in user fees than those with newer, more fuel-efficient vehicles. As a small example, workers driving long distances on crowded roads from western Sussex to jobs in the eastern part of the county and people commuting from southern New Castle and northern Kent to jobs would suffer.

Let's get a strong public vote for leaders for 2024 legislative seats who are opposed to carrying out this unconstitutional mandate!

Sincerely,

Michael C. Senisch, PA-C

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows