

Sunnie McAdams

I am against the enactment of these rules. We do not have the energy or the infrastructure to deliver the power for all these new vehicles. The cost of electric cars is not viable for many families and/or individuals, not to mention the necessary spike in electrical cost to force more consumers onto the grid; incentives are not the solution because any money the government hands out comes from the taxpayers, nothing is free! The economy is already struggling, this will only make it worse.

Wayne makes many of the points I would like to make, so I am reposting those questions here:

Wayne Wright

I am 100% opposed to this proposal. ❖

Before any action is taken, I expect a complete and truthful environmental impact statement on the topic. ❖

Specifically,

1) How will traditional fuel operated vehicles be transitioned and what will be the fate of all those vehicles?

2) What will be the source of the energy that charges these EVs and what is that impact?

3) What is the fate of the batteries for EVs? How are they disposed of? ❖ Where are they disposed of? What are the recycling/retrofit options?

4) How will this edict impact outlying communities such as Stevens County, Pacific County, and other impoverished areas in rural WA state? ❖

5) What is the financial and environmental cost of this proposal in terms of infrastructure? Who will pay for it?

6) What market conditions will support this decision? Currently, independent gas stations are common and available to all. This proposal will shift everything and make fueling/charging cars redundant and costly. ❖ This decision could ruin countless gas station owner/operators.

7) It takes decades to get a new hydropower license, solar facility license, wind power license - how can this proposal be effective within the timeline set? ❖ Environmental reviews alone will cause serious delays in the proposal. ANY objections or environmental challenges will create huge delays and costs.

8) Incentives are already in place to promote EV in WA state what alternatives were considered and how they were evaluated. Again a well done EIS will address alternatives and provide a transparent thought process to decision making. ❖

9) What is the overall long term energy strategy for WA state and how does this proposal fit into that strategy? ❖ How does that strategy provide for the citizens of WA state - all citizens - not just city dwellers with short driving distances.

10) How will this proposal affect transportation funding in WA state? Gas tax has been a huge issue and will remain so. With more EVs, how will these vehicles pay their fair share? ❖

11) If I cannot sell my gasoline or diesel powered vehicle in WA state after 2035, will the state pay me fair market value? This proposal portrays a clear property "taking" in the future that makes the state government vulnerable to multiple lawsuits with great cost to WA state citizens.

12) How will the proposal affect long hauling trade and commerce? What affect/impact will that have on WA state ports and trade across state, national, and international boundaries? ❖

13) Based on current data, EV production will not likely meet the forced demand of enacting this proposal. What contingencies or "off ramp" options are being considered if production cannot meet demand? 14) What contingencies are there if electrical energy grids cannot support this increased demand for electrical power? These are but a few of the critical questions that must be answered before this proposal is acted upon! I expect/demand a full and complete SEPA/NEPA review. Please listen to the MANY Washington residents who are against this going forward.