

Low Emission Vehicle Program Comments

Bob Barwick <bob.barwick@gmail.com>

Fri 12/16/2022 12:17 PM

To: Krall, Kyle (DNREC) <Kyle.Krall@delaware.gov>

Cc: Smyk, Steve (LegHall) <Steve.Smyk@delaware.gov>; Pettyjohn, Brian (LegHall) <Brian.Pettyjohn@delaware.gov>

Mr. Krall,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I was not able to make the virtual meeting, but reviewed the online slides. Below are my comments:

1. Your presentation contains a number of acronyms and information that are not easily interpreted by someone without extensive education in air quality and monitoring. CARB, GHG's, nonattainment area? These terms are undefined in the presentation. Interestingly, your last slide, "open discussion ground rules" recommends avoiding jargon or acronyms.

2. Your presentation demonstrates significant improvements in past air quality, particularly in Sussex County, where ozone has rarely been an issue in several years now. I don't think this trend justifies your proposed rules.

3. If the goal of this program is to end the sale of gas-powered vehicles in Delaware, I believe your goals and timing of this regulation are very misguided. Several reasons for this:

3a: Costs of vehicles (particularly of electric vehicles) are excessive and not something those of a low socioeconomic class have the luxury of affording currently. Requiring electric vehicles as the only type of vehicle sold in Delaware will only make this worse- with much of the burden being shouldered by the poor and unemployed. This is only made more difficult by the significant increases in costs for other goods and services over the past couple of years.

3b: The current electric grid has trouble supporting normal demand during hot summer days. I have not seen any plans on how you will address a significant increase in electrical demand. Your presentation refers to "beat the peak" and refers to a specific charger for electric vehicles. This program was implemented because of excessive electric demands and reinforces to me that electrical infrastructure is not in place to support this proposed rule.

3c: Your regulations significantly infringe on consumer choice. I have no problem with the development of electrical vehicles and admit I may even buy one in the future, but I have a real problem with being told by DNREC that I WILL buy an electric vehicle in the future. Until they become an affordable, reliable choice for transportation, I believe your proposed regulations are inappropriate and wrongfully force the public to purchase inferior and expensive vehicles. I would much prefer to see DNREC support the development of these vehicles through nonregulatory means, i.e. incentives to purchase electric vehicles, working with manufacturers to develop a cost-effective electric vehicle, etc.

4. Your statement that "ACCI is not a requirement that consumers purchase an electric vehicle" is COMPLETELY misleading. If vehicle manufacturers are required to sell only electric vehicles going

forward, the public IS being required to purchase electric vehicles. Statements like this are why there is such poor trust in government agencies.

5. Your analysis of health benefits (presumably by reducing chronic respiratory disease as a result of lower NOx and particulates) is misleading. If only using COBRA data, these estimates are very likely to be inaccurate. Worsening health is multifactorial and without additional details on how these calculations were made, I find this information extremely dubious and a far-fetched attempt to justify these rules, particularly in Sussex County where your own slides show air quality is rarely a problem.

6. Why is DNREC proposing these changes? Why isn't this being taken up at the level of the house or senate? It seems to me DNREC is overstepping their authority. You'll have to forgive me if I don't have much confidence in DNREC right now. The past debacles with semi-automatic rifles during deer season, surf fishing tag sales last year, and the recent proposals to develop a restaurant at Cape Henlopen State Park really make me question the intentions of the agency as a whole and how well the agency understands what is currently important to the public. Would recommend pursuing issues that are more appropriate and timely.

7. What is the full "carbon footprint" of developing an electric vehicle? Are costs associated with electric vehicle battery replacement included in the cost analysis? Battery replacement can cost half of what the electric vehicle cost initially. Until some of these issues are addressed, I doubt you'll see much widespread public support for these initiatives.

8. Your presentation shows that New Castle County new construction should be EV-ready. Is this gas stations, new homes, etc? If this is a statewide proposal, why are new gas stations in Kent or Sussex County not being required to be EV-ready? This makes me question how much planning has been done to make sure this proposal can be implemented without issues.

Overall, I'm very much in opposition to this proposed rule and look forward to your feedback. Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.

Bob