

# Michael Gomez

I oppose and disagree; Washingtonians are already struggling to make ends meet! I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed updates to Chapter 173-423 of the Washington Administrative Code regarding the Clean Vehicles Program.

While I fully support efforts to reduce emissions and protect our environment, I believe the current rulemaking goes too far, too fast—without adequately considering the economic and practical impacts on Washington residents, especially those in rural and low-income communities.

## 1. Burden on Consumers:

Mandating a transition to zero-emission vehicles (ZEVs) imposes significant upfront costs on consumers. Electric vehicles remain significantly more expensive than internal combustion engine (ICE) vehicles, and not all Washingtonians can afford or justify such purchases. The rule could limit affordable vehicle options for working families.

## 2. Infrastructure Challenges:

Our current EV infrastructure—charging stations, grid capacity, and access in remote areas—is not yet sufficient to support widespread ZEV adoption. Forcing this transition prematurely risks stranding consumers without reliable transportation.

## 3. Technological and Market Readiness:

Mandating a specific technology path (i.e., battery electric vehicles) risks stifling innovation and ignoring other potentially viable emissions-reducing technologies like hybrid vehicles, hydrogen fuel cells, or cleaner synthetic fuels. A technology-neutral approach would better serve long-term environmental goals.

## 4. Impact on Small Businesses and the Used Vehicle Market:

Small auto dealerships, especially those dealing in used vehicles, will be disproportionately harmed. These businesses often lack the capital and access to inventory needed to comply with rapidly changing regulatory requirements. This will also limit affordable used vehicle options for lower-income buyers.

## 5. Coordination with Federal Policy:

It would be more effective and less disruptive to align with evolving federal standards and incentives, rather than pushing forward state-specific rules that may create confusion and duplication. Let the market evolve with federal support rather than through top-down mandates.

I respectfully urge the Washington Department of Ecology to reconsider this rulemaking or at least delay implementation until technology, infrastructure, and affordability concerns can be addressed. We all want a cleaner future—but we need a more balanced and inclusive approach to get there.