

Subject: RE: Climate Change Solutions Act and EV Mandate Bill

Date: Wednesday, May 24, 2023 at 9:13:55 AM Eastern Daylight Time

From: Clay Greer

To: Carney, John (MailBox Resources), Garvin, Shawn M. (DNREC), HearingComments, DNREC (MailBox Resources)

CC: Smith, Michael (LegHall), Sturgeon, Laura (LegHall), Hansen, Stephanie (LegHall), Heffernan, Debra (LegHall), Krall, Kyle (DNREC)

Governor Carney, Secretary Garvin, Steph, and Deb,

Aside from the destructive cost, flawed 'Science', and lack of measurable benefits, the proposed EV Mandate and Climate Solutions Act represent a fundamental shift in the relationship between the general public and their government. These and the related bills take the powerful tools designed to tame the 'evil polluter' on behalf of the general public and re-direct them, at the general public.

Whatever the measures taken to soften those tools over the years, they inevitably created an adversarial relationship between the government and their targets, now effectively everyone. Is this the relationship you want our State Government to have with its people? Haven't we long ago learned the lessons of the Superfund approach, the hard way? Why can't we approach this using the Brownfields model of encouraged voluntary participation?

It may feel like this is inevitable, the way of the future, and no doubt DNREC presents it as the only choice, that the forthcoming painful austerity is the future we all deserve.

It is not.

The likely underestimated \$50 Trillion this will take is too much money to force down the public's throat in this way. This is not a Moon Shot. It's All In.

The Al Gore theory of Climate Change is wrong. Give me 2 minutes and a soda can and I can show you. With 3 more minutes and a glass of tea, I can show you why we have little to fear from sea level rise. In about half an hour, I can give you real solutions to combat localized flooding.

Don't let them use you to sell their contrived carbon offsets.

Best regards,

Clay

From: Clay Greer

Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2023 3:49 PM

To: 'John.Carney@delaware.gov' <John.Carney@delaware.gov>; 'Shawn.Garvin@delaware.gov' <Shawn.Garvin@delaware.gov>; 'DNRECHearingComments@delaware.gov' <DNRECHearingComments@delaware.gov>

Cc: 'Michael.F.Smith@delaware.gov' <Michael.F.Smith@delaware.gov>; 'Laura.Sturgeon@delaware.gov' <Laura.Sturgeon@delaware.gov>; 'Hansen, Stephanie (LegHall)' <Stephanie.Hansen@delaware.gov>; 'Debra.Heffernan@delaware.gov' <Debra.Heffernan@delaware.gov>; 'kyle.krall@delaware.gov' <kyle.krall@delaware.gov>

Subject: RE: Climate Change Solutions Act and EV Mandate Bill

Governor Carney, Secretary Garvin, Stephanie, Deb, et al,

Since I haven't seen any public responses with answers to any of the below questions, I thought I'd offer some assistance. In recent testimony to Congress, Biden Administration officials have testified that current Federal Government estimates indicate it will cost approximately \$50 Trillion (with a 'T') to achieve 'net-zero' emissions on a nationwide basis. As such things go, this is likely grossly underestimated.

Based on the numbers published by OMB (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/historical-tables/>), total Federal Government receipts in 2022 were roughly \$4.9 Trillion. So, the push to 'net zero' will cost taxpayers and businesses over 10 times their annual tax burden.

So, a second mortgage. A big one.

For which, the taxpayer will receive no measurable benefits. Other than DNREC's 'assistance' with each individual's journey toward 'net zero' through all the items outlined below, and presumably many others I haven't yet thought of.

Needless to say, I'm opposed.

Thoroughly.

Clay

From: Clay Greer

Sent: Wednesday, March 29, 2023 11:19 AM

To: John.Carney@delaware.gov; Shawn.Garvin@delaware.gov; DNRECHearingComments@delaware.gov

Cc: Michael.F.Smith@delaware.gov; Laura.Sturgeon@delaware.gov; Hansen, Stephanie (LegHall)

<Stephanie.Hansen@delaware.gov>; Debra.Heffernan@delaware.gov; kyle.krall@delaware.gov

Subject: Climate Change Solutions Act and EV Mandate Bill

Governor Carney and Secretary Garvin,

I have a few questions regarding the attached Climate Bill and Associated Zero Emissions Vehicle Regulations:

- Where is the cost vs. benefit analysis demonstrating that 50% greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 and net zero by 2050 are necessary, achievable, and fiscally-responsible goals?
- That an EV mandate is necessary, achievable, and fiscally-responsible?
- What will it cost?
- What are the measurable benefits?
- How much will this bill and associated regulations reduce CO2 concentrations in Earth's atmosphere vs. business as usual vs. voluntary transition?
- How much corresponding temperature reduction and sea level rise reduction will this generate?
- What is the correlation between this purported reduction in CO2 in the atmosphere and the temperature reduction we should expect? Is it the 10ppm CO2 to 1 deg C in the 400,000-year ice core record? Is it the 100ppm CO2 to 1 deg C in the last 100 years of historical global temperature records? Is it the 500ppm CO2 to 1 deg C in the global temperature record since 2000? If CO2 in the atmosphere is a significant factor in determining the climate, why are these correlations so different?
- Why is the only discussion of measurable benefits in the Climate Bill deferred to a future group of State agency heads and extremely vague and qualitative? Section 10004(d)(5) – "A discussion of changes in the State's current and future vulnerability to climate change risks from the prior update of the Climate Action Plan, including but not limited to impacts on human health, infrastructure, agriculture, water resources and natural resources. Such discussion shall reference the most recent climate change planning scenarios issued by the Scientific Committee on Climate Scenarios."

The preamble to the bill should include known and knowable costs associated with this bill. For example:

- Increases in the cost of electricity generation required to replace existing generation with more expensive 'zero emissions' versions (please define, including associated taxpayer-funded subsidies)
- Costs to the consumer to purchase zero emission equipment, some of which does not currently exist in solely electric-powered form, to replace existing, functional equipment. For example, working furnaces, hot water heaters, gas stoves, grills, boats, mowers, snowblowers, etc. (please define, including any associated taxpayer-funded subsidies)
- Costs to industries and small businesses to purchase zero emission equipment, some of which does not currently exist in solely electric-powered form, to replace existing, functional equipment. For example, in addition to the above consumer list, excavating equipment, off-road vehicles, cranes, backup generators, blowers, space heaters, other hydraulic equipment driven by gasoline and diesel-powered engines (please define, including any associated taxpayer-funded subsidies)
- Costs to individuals, industries, and small businesses to dismantle the existing working infrastructure supporting existing vehicles, energy production, and heating (please define)
- Costs to construct the increased infrastructure required to deliver additional electricity to homes, businesses, and public charging stations (currently standing at 260 in Delaware) to replace the above

equipment (please define)

- Costs for the disruptions required to construct the associated infrastructure (please define)
- Costs to construct the additional power generation required to transition all the above new equipment to electric-power (please define)
- Price increases for zero emissions technologies in response to artificially-increased demand and subsidies (please define)
- The cost to comply and track compliance with all the new regulations from various agencies this bill will trigger (please define)
- Associated increases in the cost of goods and services that use such electricity generation (please define)
- Associated decreases in the ability of consumers to purchase goods and services at higher prices after purchasing zero emissions vehicles, furnaces, hot water heaters, mowers, snow-blowers, stoves, boats, etc. (please define)
- Associated loss of jobs in all industries other than 'Green Tech' due to higher employer costs and decreased consumption of goods and services (please define)

An elementary understanding of our State's geographic, population, and economic proportions relative to global contributions and the apparent answers to the above questions suggests that you already know this bill will have devastating consequences to our State's economy with no measurable impact on the Climate. So, why are we doing this?

One final question: how can the Climate Action Bill and EV regulations advance without determining and presenting to the public for review the answers to the above questions?

Sincerely,
Clay

R. Clayton Greer, P.E.
Newark, DE