

Anonymous Anonymous

I find this pro 1 find this proposed rulemaking to be incredibly idiotic. The recent strain on the California power grid (<https://nypost.com/2022/09/01/californians-asked-not-to-charge-electric-cars-amid-heat-wave/>) as witnessed by CA Gov. Newsom begging Californians NOT to charge their EVs just days after the simple reasoning would state that adding more electric consumption by artificially increasing demand with mandated purchase of EVs instead of gas-powered cars with flat electrical generation supply is going to create a disequilibrium. In fact, in this very state (WA, many are supporting the removal of hydro nuclear, hydro, or natural gas components of the power grid. As such, demand will increase with an artificial EV mandate. Couple that with ill-advised pressure to replace NG heating and appliances when natural gas is a relatively clean and reliable component of domestic US power. <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&pp=f2351b81c7b5862fmltdHM9MTY2MzAyNzIwMCZpZ3VpZD0wZmEwOGQ1YS03NmRlLTY0NjEiMmVmMj05YzE1NzJkYTZlTUmaW5zaWQ9NlTlNng&pin=3&hsh=3&fclid=0fa08d5a-76da-6461-2ed2-9c7572da66e5&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly9rdW93Lm9yZy9yZGZl> In addition to the pressure on the electric grid/supply, the proposed rulemaking has several other economic and societal issues. EVs continue to be extremely expensive. Even with federal tax incentives, something that can be legislatively ended with a change in the control of either the Oval Office or the House. <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&pp=7c339d1694c48274jmltdHM9MTY2MzAyNzIwMCZpZ3VpZD0wZmEwOGQ1YS03NmRlLTY0NjEiMmVmMj05YzE1NzJkYTZlTUmaW5zaWQ9NlTlNng&pin=3&hsh=3&fclid=0fa08d5a-76da-6461-2ed2-9c7572da66e5&u=a1aHR0cHM6Ly9rdW93Lm9yZy9yZGZl> <https://www.npr.org/2022/08/27/119360031/california-gas-cars-electric-cars-zero-emission-climate-change> So not only are EVs extremely expensive, but with an arbitrary mandate, the State will create an economic imbalance. The rule will stop the sale of new gas-powered cars effective 2035. What will happen if, after the re-sale of gas-powered cars will boom as simple economics shows that WA state in its infinite wisdom has created an economic imbalance (supply and demand) with a limitation of supply. This means upward pressure on the price of used cars. Since low to middle income families typically use cars for their entire lives, this will further extend the use of gas-powered cars and see an active re-sale market (<https://www.caranddriver.com/news/33457915/average-age-vehicles-on-road-12-years>). I personally have a truck that is in good condition and is 18 years old. It has another 10 years of realistic life in it at a minimum. That vehicle would now be faced with the 2035 supply imbalance and see gas-powered cars as alternatives even more pricey and being on the road even longer. The EV charging network is nascent. Until EVs can be readily and rapidly charged just like pulling into a gas station to fill up your tank, EVs will continue to be inconvenient for all but shorter driving (under 300 miles). From J.D. Power - Owner satisfaction with availability of public charging stations differs the same time, it has the highest concentration of EV owners, yet they are not as satisfied with the availability and condition of public chargers as EV owners in some other geographic areas (<https://www.jdpower.com/business/press-releases/2022-us-electric-vehicle-experience-evx-public-charging-study>). A Rare earth minerals. EVs are very reliant upon rare earth minerals such as Lithium and unfortunately, China and the CCP ("ChiComs") have been very adept at aggressively moving to control rare earth minerals over the past decade. America cannot be reliant upon ChiCom as illustrated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Other considerations. First, the gas tax will need to be adjusted more equitably to impose a like-for-like tax on EVs. WA state has one of the most punitive gas taxes in the nation at approximately \$0.52/gallon, which is the third highest in the nation (<https://worldpopulationreview.com/state-rankings/gas-taxes>). My last thoughts are simple. If this rule were to be enacted, it could and should be challenged in court, but more importantly, it shows further overreach by a 'hannya' state that knows best. In all likelihood, I'd be one of the many, many people buying up a nice gas-powered SUV just before the deadline and mil maintain. This rule will hurt the lower and middle class the most, but as evidenced by the gas tax and sales tax in this state, which seems to be Washington State's plan A. In the words of President Reagan, "Government is not a solution to our problems. Government is the problem." The "government's view of the economy could be summed up in a few phrases: if it moves - tax it; if it keeps moving - regulate it; and, if it stops moving, subsidize it." Unfortunately, this proposed

er stating that CA would ban new gas-powered vehicle sales starting in 2035 is beyond ironic.
power from the Snake River dams. Solar and wind power are not reliable replacements for
yaWVzL3NlYXR0bGU1YmFuYy1uYXR1cmFsl.Wdhey1pbi1uZXR1bnVpbGRpbmdz&ntb=1)
se/Senate. EVs are still out of reach for most Americans. The average price of a new EV is
MuZ292L2FydGJjbGVzL2J1eWluZy1uZXR1bnVpbGRpbmdz&ntb=1 and
appen is easy to foresee. A lot of gas-powered cars will be bought (new) before the cutoff date.
se cars for near the economic life of a vehicle (nearly 12 years), that means that individuals will
would see it's resale value increase if this was 2035. Furthermore, those who can least afford
by region. Led by California, the Pacific region has the highest number of public chargers. At
home charging station currently runs around \$500
demic (PPE and origins). We are in a nascent Cold War with the CCP, and we cannot
-by-state). Gas taxes are a regressive tax.
king along the life of my gas-powered vehicles until they are economically unfeasible to
rule only further confirms the truth in Reagan's axiom.