

Townsend, Erle

From: John Bott <johnbotthouse@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 5, 2024 4:50 PM
To: DEP Rule Comments
Subject: Comment on Chapter 127-A: Advanced Clean Cars II Program (Reposting)

Categories: Red Category

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of the State of Maine Mail System. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Sir/Madam:

I would like to add my comments about the EV “California Rule” Act but clicking on the [Comment on this Rule](#) link did not work for me. If possible, please forward my comments so they are included in the record. By the way, my name is Thomas A. Smith and I live in Kennebunkport ME.

Comments as follow:

Like most of the negative responders, I am very much supportive of reducing our national “carbon footprint”. However, as in most things in life, the “devil is in the details”. I have 3 objections to HOW this irresponsible program is being foisted on an unwitting public:

1. Infrastructure – we simply do not have the support system in place necessary for a massive increase in electric vehicles. This deficiency is in 3 critical areas:
 - a. Generation – we are going to need a lot more electricity to be able to power a large increase in the number of EV’s. Current so-called green technology (solar, wind, hydro) do not have the capacity to provide all the electricity we will need. Worse, some of these “green” sources have environmental negative impacts. Solar panels require land that could be used for vegetation that either feeds people or absorbs CO2. Wind gives us “noise pollution” and potentially harms wildlife, not to mention the towers destroy scenic views and lessen property values. Hydro is less environmentally negative but the installations are very capital-intensive and are 100% dependent on sufficient water energy and therefore are limited where they can be positioned – this leads to the second category of negatives, distribution.
 - b. Distribution – all electricity generating facilities have to consider the inefficiencies inherent in great transmission distances. No one wants any of these operations in their back yard so they will probably have to be sited far away from where demand is greatest – this means a lot of extra electricity will have to be generated just to compensate for transmission losses. Of course, this drawback also obtains with fossil-fuel powered electricity plants – but they already exist whereas the “green” sources will probably have to be located further from major population centers, national attractions, etc. Otherwise, we are going to have millions of angry citizens if we place a plant in Yosemite or in the Everglades.

- c. Charging – one of the biggest disadvantages of EV’s today is charging time - it just takes too long to charge a car (longer, of course, for a truck). We are going to need an add an entirely new component to our energy infrastructure – yes, they can probably replace the ubiquitous gas station, but we are going to need many times the present number of gas stations if a driver has to wait an hour or more to “fill up” as opposed to the 5 minutes it now takes to “gas and go”. And, given the shorter distance EV’s travel between charges, long journeys will be inconvenient and may impossible. You can say Goodbye to the family driving vacation.
2. Cost – EV’s are much more expensive than gasoline and diesel powered vehicles and most people will not be able to afford them until the price comes way down, which does not seem likely in the near future. Of course, people can now get bargains as EV manufacturers recognize EV’s are not popular so they revert to their usual solution, i.e., reduce the price. This will stimulate demand, but we will still have the above disadvantages – but, in addition we still have environmental and economic issues:
 - a. Batteries – they have to come from somewhere and that will probably be China. So we will continue to fund our most likely strategic enemy – today mostly an economic enemy, but tomorrow probably a miliary enemy as well. We are feeding the beast that will eat us and, until we wake up to the fact China is not our friend, we might need to learn Mandarin.
 - b. Chips – EV’s are highly technical and, as with other tech items, we are dependent on China. We also buy a lot of chips from Taiwan, but that’s another story – at least when China takes over the island the Taiwanese won’t have much difficulty transitioning from Hokkien to Mandarin.
3. Alternatives – my last point. We do have another choice between our present dependence on fossil fuels and EV’s – HYBRID vehicles. I have driven a few hybrids and found they were very dependable and economical.
 - a. Hybrids are a solution that can be implemented IMMEDIATELY and give us many of the benefits of pure EV’s. Yes, they still need gasoline, but a lot LESS which means less CO2 going into the air. So, we decrease CO2 emissions and reduce personal energy cost – who can argue with that?
 - b. Because Hybrids can use gas, we will NOT need new charging stations and will NOT need to require any more time to “recharge” than we now need when gassing up a car. And, plug-in hybrids are available, so a driver can recharge at home. So, there may be fewer gas stations in the future – less pollution, possible gas stations being turned into parks or playgrounds. Certainly better alternatives that what we now have.
 - c. For some reason hybrids do not get much attention which makes we wonder what ulterior motive the “green or die” people have in arguing for 100% EV’s?

Thank you, and please take the sensible approach – let’s “go green” but don’t ruin the country and the economy (and don’t further empower China) by forcing us to adopt a suboptimal solution to a legitimate concern.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Smith

Kennebunkport ME

tsmitty@alum.mit.edu