

Comments For Regulation PR2023-023

Comment Period 7/21/2023 - 8/30/2023

Comment ID: 1

First Name: Jack

Last Name: Neubieser

Commenter Email: jack@jlncontracting.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/26/23 01:40:28 PM

Comment:

Name: Neubieser, Jack Submission Date: 7/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would urge our elected officials not to vote for this legislation. Why would CT want to emulate California? On September 1, 2022 the NY Times ran a story that Gov Newsom asked the people of California not to charge their electric vehicles during the a recent heat wave. Connecticut needs to invest in critical infrastructure upgrades to its power grid BEFORE mandating electric vehicles. How about Gov Lamont lead on this front instead of following California's failed policies.

Comment ID: 2

First Name: James

Last Name: Olsen

Commenter Email: jimnaug@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/26/23 08:50:46 PM

Comment:

Name: Olsen, James Submission Date: 7/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I completely oppose the use of electric cars for the following reasons - 1) Charging times are not acceptable on a long trip - 2) While away, out of state accommodations may not provide charging - 3) My son owns a condo, cannot charge there, city dwellers cannot charge their cars - 4) Electric cars are heavier and more dangerous than gas cars, making for deadlier accidents - 5) battery technology is dependent on foreign sources - 6) I do not want my house to become a charging station. In my opinion, most Clean energy is really a farce, it takes as much energy to produce 'clean' energy vehicles and production as it does to use them, more fossil fuel is consumed in manufacturing, and the proceeds go to China.

Comment ID: 3

First Name: Luis

Last Name: Ortiz

Commenter Email: luisito_ortiz@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/26/23 11:20:12 PM

Comment:

Name: Ortiz, Luis Submission Date: 7/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Where in these new clean air regulations do you consider the homeowner costs with having to upgrade their electric panels to 200 Amp service, plus any side associated costs to that, and to install the charging ports in garages.

Comment ID: 4

First Name: Barry

Last Name: Abrams

Commenter Email: barryabramsvoice@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Juniper Ridge Tax District

Commenter Title: Vice President

Posted Date: 07/27/23 08:58:15 AM

Comment:

Name: Abrams, Barry Submission Date: 7/27/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To Whom It May Concern: With the growing push (both here in CT and nation/worldwide) toward electric vehicles for ostensible reasons, I decided to rent an electric car for a recent business trip to Maine. I had never experienced the workflows of an electric vehicle, and I learned an awful lot. I love the idea of electric vehicles, and I want this experiment to work. With that said, some of what I learned resulted in concerns I would like to share with you. The first, and most pressing, concern is the national grid. The grid is already stretched quite thin, especially during the summer, and with everyone needing to charge vehicles by 2035, what improvements and reinforcements in the national grid are in the works to support the additional strain? Secondly, what education programs are in the works for people to learn the workflows of electric cars? For example, I knew nothing about the differing speeds of charging, and the different costs therein. There are what I call "slow speed chargers" (2.2kWh) and "fast speed chargers" (6.2kWh). People will need to be educated that they cannot fill up a car in 2-3 minutes and be on their way, as can be done when dumping gasoline/diesel into a vehicle's fuel tank. Most charging stations that I encountered on my trip were not covered by any roof, the way gas station pumps are. Many, if not all, EV charging stations are open to all elements. When I tried to charge my rental car in a driving rainstorm, the charging station shut off after 10 minutes, presumably because water does not mix well with electricity. That obstacle needs to be overcome because people will need to charge their EVs regardless of weather conditions. People will also need to be educated about "idling fees." Charging stations will add additional fees if the connector remains attached to the vehicle after it has finished charging. For example, if you leave your vehicle in the parking lot of a Wal-Mart, where there happens to be a charging station, and you are still in the store when the car's battery reaches 100%, you will start to be charged "idling" fees. Either those need to go away and/or the public needs to be educated about this. Other concerns you as lawmakers - and we as consumers/users - should have include: * How long the battery lasts before it needs replacement * Does recharging a battery that is not empty build up "memory" and shorten the battery life, as often happens with other electronic devices? * If a car runs out of charge, for some reason, are roadside assistance vehicles able to provide a little charge to get the motorist on his/her way? If a combustible engine car runs out of fuel, a roadside assistance service (ex: AAA) can bring just a little gasoline for that engine so the motorist can find a filling station. How does it work with electric cars? Have you as lawmakers thought this through? With all that said, the Kia EV I rented had basically the same mileage as a tank of traditional fuel - 311. The car handled equally well to a traditional combustible engine vehicle, and so other than in the re-fueling, the two types act the same. Presumably, improvements will be forthcoming in battery life so it lasts even longer than, say, the 311 miles that my rental car did. I believe in the technology and I want to buy such a vehicle, but as you can see, I have significant concerns. One of those is that our lawmakers have issued this decree without consideration of the above concerns. Thanks very much for reading these comments.

Comment ID: 5

First Name: Dawn

Last Name: Garcynski

Commenter Email: durlossen@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/28/23 11:03:29 AM

Comment:

Name: Garcynski, Dawn Submission Date: 7/28/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 You are creating an undue financial hardship on the residents of this state who cannot afford to purchase an EV, its limited life battery replacement, or the requisite charging hubs installed in their homes. Many people here drive ICE used vehicles because they cannot afford \$60k+ to buy a new one nor \$500+ to lease one. If they buy a used EV, the battery is on a limited life and IF it can be replaced can cost over \$10k. We also live in a state that experiences cold winters which further reduces the effectiveness of an EV and its range and can in certain circumstances leave people stranded. This new regulation is economical discrimination in the so called Constitution State forcing the implementation of a product that is neither equitably affordable, financially viable or remotely fair. This discriminatory regulation should be put to the PEOPLE

for a vote on the ballot as this was NOT something our reps ran on and thereby give the people no say. To force this burden upon the people who can least afford it is not the function of our government and serves to reduce the rights and freedoms of the movement of and ability for people to travel freely. You need to come up with better alternatives than a paltry incentive that does not cover the costs to those who can least afford it... which is most people. These vehicles cost more than most people make in a year. We are not yet ready for the implementation of this mandate, nor is our power grid. Was it not just this past winter, the Energy companies feared rolling blackouts for not having enough fuel to power the grid? Find another way! This way is not acceptable! Then again, I doubt you care who you trample over to achieve your goals. Clean air is important, but people cannot pay their bills with it, they cannot eat it, they cannot charge their vehicles with it. Further, what does the state intend to do with mountains of depleted batteries that cannot be recycled? What does the state intend to do with how the lithium ion batteries are sourced? Does it not care how the strip mining to create these batteries damages and the damage depleted batteries cause the environment? While I am but one voice shouting from the darkness, I am not the only voice. I implore you to consider the hardship YOU will be responsible for. If this was a good and affordable product... you would not need to mandate its implementation. In addition EVs are dangerous just like the EBikes because batteries explode. They are limited use, having a life span of about 10 years then become junk that the state has no plan for. Perhaps if you considered what one foreign company has implemented in Asia where instead of charging stations you had battery changing stations it might be more viable because it eliminates the issue of expensive batteries and their disposal and extends the life of EVs to where they become more fiscally responsible, but that is not even on your radar. I also doubt the governors statement about car manufacturers telling him to put the pedal to the metal. Look at the CEO of Toyota who said this is simply ridiculous and EVs are not the way to go. You are creating problems rather than solutions. If I wanted to live under California's rules I would live there. I don't get a vote there and apparently I don't get one here either.

Comment ID: 6**First Name:** Hans**Last Name:** Vandeberg**Commenter Email:** hans.vandeberg@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 07/29/23 06:04:19 AM**Comment:**

Name: Vandeberg, Hans Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The year of implementation, 2027 is far too early, it also appears the proposed legislation does not discuss self a charging electric vehicles. As to the implementation date it is too early, the current and projected charging infrastructure does not exist within Connecticut or the country as a whole. In addition, Connecticut's electric power costs are excessive due to deregulation decades ago and no new generation capacity has been added. Solar power currently should not count until solar power storage can be implemented on a municipal supply level. This proposed legislation removes all incentives, to further develop low carbon or zero carbon emission vehicles such as those currently based on hydrogen. I suggest moving the proposed date further into the future when vehicle manufacture solve the current issues with battery hazards, longevity, replacement, and disposal.

Comment ID: 7**First Name:** Stephan**Last Name:** Simon**Commenter Email:** sjsimon25@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Elders Climate Action**Commenter Title:** N/A**Posted Date:** 07/29/23 12:12:47 PM**Comment:**

Name: Simon, Stephan Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region, and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for

our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. These regulations are critical to address the climate crisis and clean up the air we breathe in Connecticut.

Comment ID: 8

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Auster

Commenter Email: pjauster@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/29/23 12:26:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Auster, Peter Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I fully support these proposed regulations for clean vehicle standards. They represent significant progress in our efforts to combat climate change and hydrocarbon pollution as well as protect our environment and public health. Enforcing stricter tailpipe emission standards and increasing the availability of zero-emission vehicles is the key to our future. Sustainable transportation in Connecticut is not only possible but is a necessity.

Comment ID: 9

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Buchan

Commenter Email: Rabuchan@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/29/23 12:34:38 PM

Comment:

Name: Buchan, Robert Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and the Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations are needed to enforce stricter tailpipe emission standards and mandate a higher proportion of zero-emission vehicles for sale within the state. We support clean cars and trucks for healthier, more breathable air and a more livable climate. Reducing pollution from cars and trucks can protect our air, our climate, and our health. Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region, and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. These regulations are critical to address the climate crisis and clean up the air we breathe in Connecticut. Cleaning up these emissions is particularly important for the health of low- and moderate-income populations living in our dense urban communities and along the state's major transportation corridors. Adopting the California standards will reduce carbon emissions by over 350,000 tons per year in 2050. Medium and Heavy Duty trucks account for 6% of on-road vehicles, but account for 25% of economy-wide greenhouse gas emissions in Connecticut. Adopting the California standards will reduce smog and air pollution by over 750 tons per year in 2035 and over 900 tons per year by 2050. These regulations will make cars and trucks up to 90% cleaner and require vehicle manufacturers to deliver more zero-emission vehicles to Connecticut drivers while increasing consumer protections. There are significant Health Benefits associated with deployment of Medium and Heavy Duty Electric Vehicles, which will save Connecticut \$270 million dollars in avoided health care costs over the period of 2020-2040. This could be as much as \$500 million to \$1.4 billion by 2050. Communities of color and other vulnerable populations located near highways, ports, warehouses, and distribution centers are disproportionately impacted by transportation related air pollution that now contributes to poor air quality in these areas. It is important that Connecticut is now alongside Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and New Mexico in announcing its intention to adopt new standards. We need to join states such as Massachusetts, New York, and Vermont who adopted standards in 2022 to create a unified market. CT must adopt these standards as soon as possible? we don't have any time to waste!

Comment ID: 10

First Name: Wayne

Last Name: Pipke**Commenter Email:** pipman77-news@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 07/29/23 12:46:45 PM**Comment:**

Name: Pipke, Wayne Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and the Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations are needed to enforce stricter tailpipe emission standards and mandate a higher proportion of zero-emission vehicles for sale within the state. The affordability of e-cars should also be addressed. They are much more simply constructed than internal combustion or hybrid cars and should therefore be MORE affordable. Government should prevent the public from being gauged, just because it is something new. We support clean cars and trucks for healthier, more breathable air and a more livable climate. Reducing pollution from cars and trucks can protect our air, our climate, and our health. Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region, and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. These regulations are critical to address the climate crisis and clean up the air we breathe in Connecticut. Cleaning up these emissions is particularly important for the health of low- and moderate-income populations living in our dense urban communities and along the state's major transportation corridors. Adopting the California standards will reduce carbon emissions by over 350,000 tons per year in 2050. Medium and Heavy Duty trucks account for 6% of on-road vehicles, but account for 25% of economy-wide greenhouse gas emissions in Connecticut. Adopting the California standards will reduce smog and air pollution by over 750 tons per year in 2035 and over 900 tons per year by 2050. These regulations will make cars and trucks up to 90% cleaner and require vehicle manufacturers to deliver more zero-emission vehicles to Connecticut drivers while increasing consumer protections. There are significant Health Benefits associated with deployment of Medium and Heavy Duty Electric Vehicles, which will save Connecticut \$270 million dollars in avoided health care costs over the period of 2020-2040. This could be as much as \$500 million to \$1.4 billion by 2050. Communities of color and other vulnerable populations located near highways, ports, warehouses, and distribution centers are disproportionately impacted by transportation related air pollution that now contributes to poor air quality in these areas. It is important that Connecticut is now alongside Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and New Mexico in announcing its intention to adopt new standards. We need to join states such as Massachusetts, New York, and Vermont who adopted standards in 2022 to create a unified market. CT must adopt these standards as soon as possible? we don't have any time to waste!

Comment ID: 11**First Name:** Royal**Last Name:** Graves**Commenter Email:** royal2203@outlook.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 07/29/23 01:22:49 PM**Comment:**

Name: Graves, Royal Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 These regulations are critical to address the climate crisis and clean up the air we breathe in Connecticut. Communities of color and other vulnerable populations located near highways, ports, warehouses, and distribution centers are disproportionately impacted by transportation related air pollution that now contributes to poor air quality in these areas. Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region, and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. Reducing pollution from cars and trucks can protect our air, our climate, and our health. There are significant health benefits associated with deployment of medium and heavy duty electric vehicles, which will save Connecticut \$270 million dollars in avoided health care costs over the period of 2020-2040. This could be as much as \$500 million to \$1.4 billion by 2050. It is important that Connecticut is now alongside Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and New Mexico in announcing its intention to adopt new standards. We need to join states such as Massachusetts, New

York, and Vermont who adopted standards in 2022 to create a unified market. CT must adopt these standards as soon as possible? we don't have any time to waste!

Comment ID: 12

First Name: deborah

Last Name: dimock

Commenter Email: debdimock@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/29/23 01:45:52 PM

Comment:

Name: dimock, deborah Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am concerned that "all electric or hydrogen by 2035" will not address inner-city dwellers, and will cause greater problems for the poorest in our state. Here in the suburbs everyone can be enthusiastic about EVs because we have no barriers to plugging in at home. Will apartment owners provide multiple charging stations on every big city street? Most renters share driveways and can't park next to the house to charge. Single parents, and those working two jobs don't have the luxury to travel to a central place and wait for their charge. What is the plan for city neighborhoods?

Comment ID: 13

First Name: Nancy

Last Name: Najarian

Commenter Email: najariannancy@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Ct league of Conservation Voters

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/29/23 02:29:39 PM

Comment:

Name: Najarian, Nancy Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We have an opportunity to act in concert with our neighboring states to reduce emissions and improve our air quality. The health and quality of life of all our citizens depends on taking action now. Please support the Advanced Clean Cars II act.

Comment ID: 14

First Name: Stephanie

Last Name: O'Donnell

Commenter Email: stephanie.j.odonnell@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: O'Donnell, Stephanie Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Environmental action is my number one priority as a voter and resident of CT. I support stricter emissions standards for vehicles.

Comment ID: 15

First Name: Svetlana

Last Name: Wasserman

Commenter Email: stsalik@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/29/23 04:13:52 PM

Comment:

Name: Wasserman, Svetlana Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I wholeheartedly support the adoption of CA's clean vehicles standards. Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region, and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. Adopting the California standards will reduce smog and air pollution by over 750 tons per year in 2035 and over 900 tons per year by 2050.

Comment ID: 16**First Name:** Joseph**Last Name:** Wasserman**Commenter Email:** joewass64@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 07/29/23 04:28:46 PM**Comment:**

Name: Wasserman, Joseph Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly support the Governor's proposal for reduced car emissions and cleaner cars. It is essential that we reduce green house gases in a time of climate crises. This will also greatly improve public health , especially in urban areas.

Comment ID: 17**First Name:** Jill**Last Name:** Amari**Commenter Email:** amarij@sacredheart.edu**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 07/29/23 06:05:44 PM**Comment:**

Name: Amari, Jill Submission Date: 7/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To whom it may concern: Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and the Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations are needed to enforce stricter tailpipe emission standards and mandate a higher proportion of zero-emission vehicles for sale within the state. I fully support the proposed regulations for clean vehicle standards in order to mitigate air pollution and climate change. Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region, and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. These regulations are critical to address the climate crisis and clean up the air we breathe in Connecticut. CT must adopt these standards as soon as possible?we don't have any time to waste! Thank you for the opportunity to submit a comment. Sincerely, Jill

Comment ID: 18**First Name:** Martha**Last Name:** Greenwood**Commenter Email:** marniegreenwood50@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 07/30/23 08:12:42 AM**Comment:**

Name: Greenwood, Martha Submission Date: 7/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 There is no question that the Advanced Clean Cars II must be enacted. We have bought our 2nd electric car. This is the most significant action we can take for climate change. Not seeing a truly blue sky, increasing heat, etc., we are clearly losing the battle and must act

now. Hartford in particular has suffered from air pollution with high rates of asthma, especially among Hartford's children children Martha Greenwood, MD

Comment ID: 19

First Name: Joan

Last Name: Tracey Seguin

Commenter Email: traceyseguin@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/30/23 10:34:01 AM

Comment:

Name: Tracey Seguin, Joan Submission Date: 7/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support clean cars and trucks for healthier, more breathable air and a more livable climate. Reducing pollution from cars and trucks can protect our air, our climate, and our health. Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region, and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. It is important that Connecticut is now alongside Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and New Mexico in announcing its intention to adopt new standards. We need to join states such as Massachusetts, New York, and Vermont who adopted standards in 2022 to create a unified market.

Comment ID: 20

First Name: Mary

Last Name: Stevens

Commenter Email: mk-stevens@live.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 07/30/23 01:14:09 PM

Comment:

Name: Stevens, Mary Submission Date: 7/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region, and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. These regulations are critical to address the climate crisis and clean up the air we breathe in Connecticut. It is important that Connecticut is now alongside Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and New Mexico in announcing its intention to adopt new standards. We need to join states such as Massachusetts, New York, and Vermont who adopted standards in 2022 to create a unified market. CT must adopt these standards as soon as possible? we don't have any time to waste!

Comment ID: 21

First Name: John

Last Name: Oblak

Commenter Email: joblak@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Individual

Commenter Title: Head of Household

Posted Date: 07/30/23 02:50:39 PM

Comment:

Name: Oblak, John Submission Date: 7/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No! No! No! The resulting reduction in global warming will be negligible. Subject this initiative to an objective systems economic and technological analysis. It will show the destructive impact regarding costs and devastation to the environment necessary to secure the amount of physical material resources and their recycling. John M. Oblak, Ph.D. Materials Science

Comment ID: 22

First Name: Priscilla
Last Name: Dannies
Commenter Email: priscilla.dannies@yale.edu
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 07/31/23 02:45:07 PM

Comment:

Name: Dannies, Priscilla Submission Date: 7/31/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We should all be horrified that Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region. A major reason is that there is a lot of traffic across our state and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. Cleaning up these emissions is particularly important for the health of low- and moderate-income populations living in our dense urban communities and along the state's major transportation corridors. Adopting the California standards will reduce carbon emissions by over 350,000 tons per year in 2050. Medium and Heavy Duty trucks account for 6% of on-road vehicles, but account for 25% of economy-wide greenhouse gas emissions in Connecticut. It is important that Connecticut is now alongside Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and New Mexico in announcing its intention to adopt new standards. It seems to me that it is obvious that we join states such as Massachusetts, New York, and Vermont, who already adopted such standards in 2022. These regulations are most effective when the states show unity. I feel strongly that we need Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and the Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations to enforce stricter tailpipe emission standards and mandate a higher proportion of zero-emission vehicles for sale within the state. The terrors of climate change are becoming more clear as each year goes by. We must do all we can to help mitigate the consequences.

Comment ID: 23

First Name: Ryann
Last Name: McCabe
Commenter Email: ryann.mccabe@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 07/31/23 05:52:38 PM

Comment:

Name: McCabe, Ryann Submission Date: 7/31/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a Connecticut resident I am writing in support of PR2023-023. Connecticut has the worst air quality in the region, and tailpipe pollution from cars and trucks make up nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. This is bad for our planet and our air, with the worst impacts in low-income and minority neighborhoods. Adopting the California standards will reduce carbon emissions by over 350,000 tons per year in 2050. Medium and Heavy Duty trucks account for 6% of on-road vehicles, but account for 25% of economy-wide greenhouse gas emissions in Connecticut. We need to join states such as Massachusetts, New York, and Vermont who adopted standards in 2022 to create a unified market. The climate crisis is happening in real time and every decision matters. We must do whatever we can to prevent the worst from happening.

Comment ID: 24

First Name: Lori
Last Name: Lore
Commenter Email: lori.a.griffin@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 07/31/23 09:03:37 PM

Comment:

Name: Lore, Lori Submission Date: 7/31/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To whom it may concern, As a CT resident and voter I want to share my support for the new vehicle standards and regulations put forward by Governor Lamont.?

Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and the Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations are needed to enforce stricter tailpipe emission standards and mandate a higher proportion of zero-emission vehicles for sale within the state. Our air quality, health and public safety are all at risk without these new regulations. Thank you, Lori

Comment ID: 25

First Name: Lawrence

Last Name: Sciancalepore

Commenter Email: shank5@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/01/23 06:13:34 PM

Comment:

Name: Sciancalepore, Lawrence Submission Date: 8/1/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I ask that Connecticut not proceed with this plan to have only electric vehicles being sold by 2035. Electric vehicles are much more expensive than gasoline vehicles, they are not as reliable, and we do not have the infrastructure to support having all electric vehicles. Also, everyone will have to update their homes to have multiple electric chargers, which is a very costly expense for the average family. Let the people decide what kind of car they drive. We don't need government shoving the electric vehicle requirements down our throats.

Comment ID: 26

First Name: James

Last Name: Andreson

Commenter Email: mrandreson@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: none

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/02/23 05:52:25 PM

Comment:

Name: Andreson, James Submission Date: 8/2/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly opposed to this proposed regulation. The state should not be limiting the choices of consumers by regulatory fiat. The proposed regulations will have NO measurable impact on climate change. It will cost businesses and consumers significantly. The increase in electric vehicles will adversely impact our electric grid reliability. Electric cars have significant limitations, especially in Connecticut's cold climate. We should not follow California's lead when conditions here in Connecticut are different.

Comment ID: 27

First Name: Azya

Last Name: Thornton

Commenter Email: azya@ctlc.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Communications Coordinator

Posted Date: 08/03/23 10:06:02 AM

Comment:

Name: Thornton, Azya Submission Date: 8/3/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I wholeheartedly support the implementation of Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations in Connecticut. These standards are of utmost importance as they play a critical role in improving air quality, and addressing the pressing challenge of climate change will significantly improve air quality, protect public health, and create a more sustainable future for citizens throughout the state. I am concerned about Connecticut's alarming air quality, exacerbated by cars and trucks contributing nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions and polluting our state,

which affects the disproportionate populations, including my family members who suffer from asthma. These regulations will make a substantial difference in improving our air quality and mitigating the harmful impacts of greenhouse gas emissions on our environment.

Comment ID: 28

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: Markowski

Commenter Email: kmarkow@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/03/23 04:53:02 PM

Comment:

Name: Markowski, Kevin Submission Date: 8/3/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut can and should be every bit the environmental leader that California is. The global-warming crisis destroying our planet is here now and has been here for too long. The time to act is in the past, but I'll settle for right now. Please adopt California's vehicle emissions standards immediately.

Comment ID: 29

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Dempsey

Commenter Email: Elizabethgdempsey@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Town of Greenwich Sustainability Committee

Commenter Title: Legislation and Advocacy Co-Chair

Posted Date: 08/03/23 04:57:52 PM

Comment:

Name: Dempsey, Elizabeth Submission Date: 8/3/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 TO DEEP, the CGA, and Governor Lamont, RE:New Vehicle Standards Critical for Clean Air & Climate Please act now to ensure we meet our critical goals for cleaner air and reduction in carbon. As a Fairfield County resident, I live with poor air quality and we need action now. Suffice to say, our air quality affects our health, as well as our climate. Actions today will save dollars and lives tomorrow. The entire state of Connecticut is in federal non attainment of air quality standards. Per the Environmental Protection Agency, Connecticut has some of the highest asthma rates in the country, and four of our counties receive an F for ozone levels from the American Lung Association. These regulations will significantly improve public health and help Connecticut avoid thousands of missed school days, tens of thousands of asthma attacks, and almost two hundred and fifty missed work days. Sincerely, Elizabeth Dempsey Greenwich CT

Comment ID: 30

First Name: Alison

Last Name: Zyla

Commenter Email: barral11@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/03/23 05:32:59 PM

Comment:

Name: Zyla, Alison Submission Date: 8/3/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut needs to implement Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations. These standards are of utmost importance as they are critical in improving air quality and addressing the pressing challenge of climate change. They will significantly improve air quality, protect public health, and create a more sustainable future for all

Connecticut citizens. The entire state of CT is in nonattainment of air quality standards according to the Environmental Protection Agency.

Comment ID: 31

First Name: Mary

Last Name: Hogue

Commenter Email: maryhogue350@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: n/a

Commenter Title: n/a

Posted Date: 08/03/23 06:11:25 PM

Attachments:

clean_vehicle_standards_talking_points.pdf

Comment:

Name: Hogue, Mary Submission Date: 8/3/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We are in a worldwide climate crisis and must act immediately and aggressively to do whatever we can to mitigate this. As the climate gets warmer, the pollutants become even more dangerous and get trapped in our breathing space. We must fix this! We need to adopt Governor Lamont's proposed regulations for clean vehicle standards. CT residents deserve better air quality. With one of the highest rates of asthma in the country, we must address anything that adversely affects our air quality which adversely affects our residents.

Comment ID: 32

First Name: Madison

Last Name: Platow

Commenter Email: mplatow77@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/03/23 07:10:16 PM

Comment:

Name: Platow, Madison Submission Date: 8/3/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The implementation of Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII) and Medium and Heavy Duty Emissions Standards & Heavy Duty Omnibus Regulations are integral to combatting the climate crisis and enhancing our air quality. Focusing on cleaning up emissions will create a healthier environment that will benefit low- and moderate-income residents in densely populated urban areas and transportation corridors throughout the state.

Comment ID: 33

First Name: Hugh

Last Name: Birdsall

Commenter Email: hdbirdsall@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/03/23 08:19:05 PM

Comment:

Name: Birdsall, Hugh Submission Date: 8/3/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is of paramount importance that we shift away from vehicles powered by fossil fuels to electric vehicles and human powered vehicles if humans are to survive the existential threat of climate change. Anything short of this is likely to accelerate global warming and make large parts of our planet uninhabitable over the next fifty years. Please do the right thing, and set an example for other states and countries to follow. We are counting on you.

Comment ID: 34

First Name: Robert
Last Name: Roman
Commenter Email: Robroman212@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/03/23 09:16:19 PM

Comment:

Name: Roman , Robert Submission Date: 8/3/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Vehicles are more than simply a source of carbon and air pollution. They are a constant reminder of what we need to do. Whenever someone starts their car or sees other cars, they're reminded consciously or unconsciously of the state of the world and what we value as a society. Please, support clean vehicle standards not only for the mathematical and scientific reasons, but moreso for the societal ones, and for our children.

Comment ID: 35

First Name: Pippa Bell
Last Name: Ader
Commenter Email: ZeroWaste@SustainableWestport.org
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: Sustainable Westport
Commenter Title: Co-Leader, Zero Food Waste Challenge
Posted Date: 08/03/23 11:33:08 PM

Comment:

Name: Ader , Pippa Bell Submission Date: 8/3/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 CT should implement the Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations. These standards are of utmost importance as they are critical in improving air quality and addressing the pressing challenge of climate change. They will significantly improve air quality, protect public health, and create a more sustainable future for all Connecticut citizens. Reasons: Connecticut's poor air quality is exacerbated by the transportation sector that contributes nearly 40% of all greenhouse gas emissions. Medium and Heavy-Duty trucks comprise only 6% of vehicles but contribute 25% of greenhouse gas emissions. It is estimated a decrease of over 750 tons per year in 2035 and more than 900 tons per year by 2050 will occur with implementation of these regulations. These regulations will benefit the low- and moderate-income residents in densely populated urban areas and transportation corridors throughout the state, residents who are disproportionately affected by air pollution. The adoption of these regulations will help us take significant strides towards cleaner air and a healthier planet: CT is not on target to meet the climate goals of the Global Warming Solutions Act (Public Act 08-98). and is in federal nonattainment of air quality standards. These standards will make cars and trucks 90% cleaner, requiring manufacturers to provide more zero-emission vehicles, all while ensuring enhanced consumer protections. The deployment of Medium and Heavy Duty Electric Vehicles holds remarkable health benefits, with potential savings of up to \$1.4 billion in avoided healthcare costs by 2050. By aligning Connecticut with other forward-thinking states like Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and New Mexico, we will pave the way for a unified market that includes Massachusetts, New York, and Vermont, collectively creating a cleaner and healthier future for all. These regulations will significantly improve public health and help Connecticut avoid thousands of missed school days, tens of thousands of asthma attacks, and almost two hundred and fifty missed work days. Thank you, in advance, Pippa Bell Ader Westport, CT

Comment ID: 36

First Name: Jeanne
Last Name: Tinari
Commenter Email: blupearle@aol.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/04/23 06:41:21 AM

Comment:

Name: Tinari, Jeanne Submission Date: 8/4/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Governor Lamont, I have zero interest in following any of California's regulations. Look at what a mess they are for pushing these green initiatives and notice all their constituents flooding out of their state. Way too much overreach and their push for electric vehicles that nobody can afford, nor do they have the electrical capacity to maintain them. I think Connecticut is doing fine and our sights should be on China and India as the worst polluters out there if we want to clean up the environment. Thank you. Jeanne

Comment ID: 37**First Name:** Anna**Last Name:** Salo-Markowski**Commenter Email:** asalomark@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Chair**Posted Date:** 08/04/23 08:12:08 AM**Comment:**

Name: Salo-Markowski, Anna Submission Date: 8/4/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support the regulatory proposal adopting RCSA section 22a-174-36d to allow for more stringent emission requirements for ICE passenger vehicles and requiring vehicle manufacturers to increase the sale of electric vehicles. It would be good to have additional information on how this would be enforced.

Comment ID: 38**First Name:** Amber**Last Name:** Garrard**Commenter Email:** amber.garrard@yale.edu**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/04/23 11:44:38 AM**Comment:**

Name: Garrard, Amber Submission Date: 8/4/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a Connecticut resident, I feel very strongly that Connecticut needs to implement Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations. We need standards to help improve our air quality and address the pressing challenge of climate change. I hope that these standards will significantly improve air quality, protect public health, and create a more sustainable future for all Connecticut citizens. Transportation is responsible for a significant percentage of our state's emissions, and must be urgently addressed. As the mother of a small child, I want to ensure that my son, along with all of CT's residents, have clean air to breathe, and appreciate all the work being done to reduce vehicular emissions.

Comment ID: 39**First Name:** Brad**Last Name:** Sheridan**Commenter Email:** bradsheridan@fiddleheadsfood.coop**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/04/23 12:01:12 PM**Comment:**

Name: Sheridan, Brad Submission Date: 8/4/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut is NOT on track to meet the overall climate goals set forth in the Global Warming Solutions Act

Comment ID: 40**First Name:** Richard**Last Name:** Love**Commenter Email:** rlove863@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/04/23 12:48:31 PM**Comment:**

Name: Love, Richard Submission Date: 8/4/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I fully support the adoption of the new CT vehicle emission standards, as proposed in the ?Advanced Clean Cars II? regulation. As the CTDEEP supporting documentation makes clear, CT can in no way address our air pollution non-attainment problems and GHG emission reduction commitments without taking significant action to reduce motor vehicle emissions. And a small state such as ours has no hope of acquiring lower emitting vehicles without participating in a broad enough market to make cleaner vehicles available and affordable. By adopting the California emission standards, and joining with other like minded states, CT consumers will help create and enjoy a market for new products that will provide cost-effective solutions to our future vehicle needs.

Comment ID: 41**First Name:** David and Marge**Last Name:** Schneider**Commenter Email:** margedavidpeace@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/04/23 08:26:33 PM**Comment:**

Name: Schneider, David and Marge Submission Date: 8/4/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It's time for Connecticut to enact legislation and rules to control the exhaust from cars and trucks to assure clean air for the people and environment of our state. These actions will improve the health of our population and save \$\$\$\$'s in the reduction of health care costs throughout the population and lower expenses ameliorating environmental destruction.

Comment ID: 42**First Name:** Arline**Last Name:** Culp**Commenter Email:** ametsfan41@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 06:05:39 AM**Comment:**

Name: Culp, Arline Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut should be a leader in the climate rescue movement. ACCII is a step in the right direction. We need to progress towards net zero carbon emissions.

Comment ID: 43**First Name:** Jeffrey**Last Name:** Schwartz**Commenter Email:** jeff.schwartz2991@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 11:22:43 AM

Comment:

Name: Schwartz, Jeffrey Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Governor Lamont and other Legislators: As a longtime Fairfield resident, I'm writing to support legislation for clean air standards. For 33 years, I commuted from Fairfield to Greenwich on a packed and congested Merritt Parkway. I drove one of between 40,000 and 80,000 cars a day. Another 150,000 cars are driving every day on I-95. As a resident who raised a family living between these two highways, I'm well aware of daily pollution and the need to limit emissions. CT asthma rates are way too high. For the health and well-being of future generations, I ask that you do all you can-- and quickly-- to limit emissions and make it safer and healthier to live in Connecticut. Sincerely, Jeffrey Schwartz

Comment ID: 44**First Name:** Anya**Last Name:** Mezak**Commenter Email:** anyamezak@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** B'nai Israel Congregation**Commenter Title:** Green Team Co-Chair**Posted Date:** 08/07/23 03:26:06 PM**Comment:**

Name: Mezak, Anya Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As the co-chair of my congregations's Green Team as well as a member of the Fairfield Bike 7 Pedestrian committee, I am all too familiar with the harms of large vehicles. Amongst them, Medium and Heavy-Duty trucks comprise only 6% of vehicles but contribute 25% of greenhouse gas emissions. These regulations are essential steps toward a more sustainable and cleaner future for our state.

Comment ID: 45**First Name:** Janet**Last Name:** Dahlberg**Commenter Email:** jddahlberg@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Mrs.**Posted Date:** 08/07/23 03:44:54 PM**Comment:**

Name: Dahlberg, Janet Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please stop this insanity on forcing us to purchase EV cars and or trucks. The batteries are unstable and will burst into flames when exposed to saltwater, crashes and can reignite releasing toxic fumes. Only 5% of these batteries can be recycled and lithium is extremely toxic. EV cars if damaged are not easily repaired and battery replacement can cost more than the car is worth. Right now the cars can only go 250 miles and we are not factoring outside temperature fluctuations which affect their performance. Connecticut produces little of its own electric energy. The infrastructure for the unreliable wind turbines has gone from 90 million to 255 million so far. You seem to like to make energy policies on wishes and not reality. How about we build the already approved natural gas pipelines that provide plenty of clean and cheap energy and leaved this experiment to California that has the highest poverty and homelessness in the country. Lastly ,we can not afford to chase out another industry and job creator. Wake up! sincerely Janet Dahlberg

Comment ID: 46**First Name:** Barbara**Last Name:** Lewis**Commenter Email:** Bmlewis299@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 03:59:47 PM

Comment:

Name: Lewis, Barbara Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We aren't ready for this type of far reaching law!
 The infrastructure isn't set up for it. I don't believe that the ozone will benefit from this reduction in the gas cars
 and trucks in the US when China continues to have much more carbon emissions.

Comment ID: 47**First Name:** Antoinette**Last Name:** Osterhout**Commenter Email:** toniosterhout@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Broker/ owner**Posted Date:** 08/07/23 04:04:44 PM**Comment:**

Name: Osterhout, Antoinette Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental
 Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Why are they getting after the little
 people that make this economy run? How many people will be able to afford this cars? Why not get after the big
 companies that contribute to the land and air pollution. I'm not going to afford to buy an electric car.

Comment ID: 48**First Name:** James**Last Name:** Greene**Commenter Email:** jamesgreene6076@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 04:04:55 PM**Comment:**

Name: Greene, James Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am supportive of this proposal. Connecticut
 should be a leader in the nation in moving away from carbon emissions and toward clean energy vehicles. This
 proposal, while ambitious, will set the State on a path forward that supports our communities, creates jobs, and helps
 respond to the climate crisis that impacts our State and the world.

Comment ID: 49**First Name:** Martin**Last Name:** Georgescu**Commenter Email:** martyg3@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 04:10:03 PM**Comment:**

Name: Georgescu, Martin Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Worse idea ever ! A real disaster for citizens of
 Connecticut. STRONGLY opposed to every provision of this horrible proposal.

Comment ID: 50**First Name:** Alyssa**Last Name:** Siegel-Miles**Commenter Email:** alyssajsiegel@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:**

Posted Date:**Comment:**

Name: Siegel-Miles, Alyssa Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support Connecticut implementing Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations. These standards are extremely important, as they are critical in improving air quality and addressing the pressing challenge of climate change. They will significantly improve air quality, protect public health, and create a more sustainable future for all Connecticut citizens. Connecticut's alarming air quality is exacerbated by cars and trucks contributing to nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. Vulnerable communities are disproportionately affected by this pollution. The adoption of these regulations will help us take significant strides towards cleaner air and a healthier planet. The implementation of Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII) and Medium and Heavy Duty Emissions Standards & Heavy Duty Omnibus regulations are integral to combatting the climate crisis and enhancing our air quality. Focusing on cleaning up emissions will create a healthier environment that will benefit the low- and moderate-income residents in densely populated urban areas and transportation corridors throughout the state. By aligning Connecticut with other forward-thinking states like Rhode Island, Maryland, New Jersey, and New Mexico, we will pave the way for a unified market that includes Massachusetts, New York, and Vermont, collectively creating a cleaner and healthier future for all.

Comment ID: 51**First Name:** Deborah**Last Name:** Selby**Commenter Email:** dselby18@cox.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 06:11:38 PM**Comment:**

Name: Selby, Deborah Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO TO BANNING GAS POWERED CARS!!!!!!

Comment ID: 52**First Name:** Margaret**Last Name:** Maybury**Commenter Email:** mayburys3@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 06:31:23 PM**Comment:**

Name: Maybury, Margaret Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Rep. Candelabra - I am not a person who usually expresses my opinion publicly, but I need to comment on legislation on electric cars and doing away with gas mowers, weed whackers, etc. and going green on air conditioners, gas stoves, oil furnaces, etc. I have said many times that I am glad I am old because I don't want to see how our country is being destroyed by this legislation. I am not only against all these changes, I could never afford to live in this new green world. One of the major principles everyone seems to forget is that the U.S. is only one small part of the world. Do you think China, Russia, and many other European or South American countries care to about smog and changing their policies? I don't think so. Why would CT ever want to follow CA? They can't even correct their own problems. It is time to take a step back and be realistic. Changes are being made too fast and I don't trust all this new technology. After I saw the new electric bus go up in flames, I would be scared to death to park an electric car in my garage. My family could actually lose their life. Now what about our farmers. Many would say it's time to give up this business because they would never be able to change their whole fleet into electric. Who could afford it? We would become a third world country because we would not have enough food to supply the population. Trucks wouldn't be needed because the product would not be there to move across the country unless everything is imported from countries without regulations. What have we gained? So sad to see how we have and are destroying America. Margaret Maybury

Comment ID: 53**First Name:** Mike**Last Name:** DUKETTE**Commenter Email:** MIKEDUKETTE@GMAIL.COM**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Double Green LLc**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 06:31:35 PM**Comment:**

Name: DUKETTE, Mike Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut will be making a huge mistake taking away gas and diesel powered vehicles. We are not going to reduce global warming and instead will cripple our competitive ability to do business locally and globally. I sell and use fertilizer which doubled in price last year due to decisions based on importing oil and natural gas instead of becoming less dependent on foreign countries controlling our energy needs. I don't see nuclear power as a sound long term solution for our energy needs because of nuclear waste and earthquake concerns.

Comment ID: 54**First Name:** Scott**Last Name:** Schweizer**Commenter Email:** scotts2@optonline.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Mr.**Posted Date:** 08/07/23 06:41:16 PM**Comment:**

Name: Schweizer, Scott Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This comment is in support of Governor Lamont's Regulations for Cleaner Cars and Trucks in CT (eRegulations PR2023-020). I support these stronger standards to combat air pollution, enhance public health and to promote more sustainable transportation. I urge you to support and implement these improved Regulations for a brighter, cleaner and greener future in the Nutmeg state. Thank you for time for supporting Governor Lamont.

Comment ID: 55**First Name:** Virginia**Last Name:** Anderson**Commenter Email:** gindragon12@cox.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** None**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Anderson, Virginia Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think it is not feasible to eliminate and discontinue the use of gas cars or trucks. We don't have enough years or research on electric cars and the longevity of them. It is also not feasible to think that everyone will be able to afford that type of vehicle. It is bad enough that the state of CT has a very high cost of living. It would be one more burden on us.

Comment ID: 56**First Name:** Stephen**Last Name:** Getman**Commenter Email:** stevemarygetman@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** none

Commenter Title: none**Posted Date:** 08/07/23 07:25:42 PM**Comment:**

Name: Getman, Stephen Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut has neither an ample supply of electricity (I am doing my part with solar panels) nor enough fast charging stations for a conversion to all electric cars. That infrastructure will take longer to construct. Forgotten is the cost of electric cars, primarily building batteries and the disposal and cost of replacing batteries which no longer take a charge. In my opinion, California's solutions will not work in Connecticut. Connecticut Yankees can invent a better solution.

Comment ID: 57**First Name:** Jamila**Last Name:** Viandier**Commenter Email:** emilyviandier@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 08:39:34 PM**Comment:**

Name: Viandier, Jamila Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against regulations banning the sale of gas powered passenger vehicles after 2035. Gas powered vehicles are getting better and better at controlling their emissions over the years. Forcing people to only buy electric takes away consumer choice and, as with most things, is better off encouraged, not mandated or pushed on the public. Only offering electric vehicles, while a lofty goal, cannot be expected to be translated into reality; as is, electric grids are strained and this would only strain them more. If people choose, of their own free will, to buy more electric cars over time, then that's free-market capitalism and the infrastructure will slowly change to accommodate that.

Comment ID: 58**First Name:** Jack**Last Name:** Potter**Commenter Email:** jack_potter@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/07/23 09:06:18 PM**Comment:**

Name: Potter, Jack Submission Date: 8/7/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a citizen of Connecticut, I implore that Mr. Lamont approve of this regulation. Vehicles running on clean energy not only make the environment healthier, but also make people healthier. Thank you for your time.

Comment ID: 59**First Name:** Richard**Last Name:** Toney**Commenter Email:** rjtasb@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 06:37:50 AM**Comment:**

Name: Toney, Richard Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am a senior on disability and a very, very fixed income. It's amazing to me that in just a few short years both the economy and the country have been turned to shit!!!! The priorities of the current administrations both at the federal and state levels are miserable. What's more

important I have the feeling that the government representative have forgotten that they are in place to follow the peoples needs and wishes. Two years ago I was in the market for a car and my son (who is very tech savvy) did everything he could to talk me into an EV.....after we discussed it I downloaded all the needed apps and tried to plan a trip to western PA to visit my daughter (which I do often). With the current resources or lack of them it would have taken me 12 hours to travel the normal 6 hours and I would need to stop at least 4 times to charge (if I could even find stations). More importantly the route had to be extended to find the chargers..... Thinking of what to do for charging at home I drive at least 200 mies a day locally. Even with a home charger and the fact that there are no convenient chargers in town, I could not use an EV the way I use a conventional car. Anyone that thinks there is some altruistic rationale is fulling themselves. I'm not going to get into all the political and personal reasons this is being shoved down our throats, simply put....we are NOT stupid but we are frustrated. America used to do the right thing at the right time but no any more.

Comment ID: 60

First Name: Al

Last Name: September

Commenter Email: Alseptem@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/08/23 09:02:53 AM

Comment:

Name: September , Al Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello, Upon reading the regulations I did not see anywhere the mention of an infrastructure to support electric vehicle charging in this state. Or that the electric grid will be upgraded and sufficient to support the additional usage. I also did not see where the state would contribute to the individual who has to purchase a very expensive car. Nor help pay for the electricity to charge the vehicle at home in one of the most expensive states for electricity. It is easy to sit back and say look what I did but unless you anticipate everybody in this state becoming millionaires the majority of people will not be able to afford these cars or pay to recharge them. So what did you really do? Perhaps give people another reason to leave this state just like they are leaving CA. Hurray for you.

Comment ID: 61

First Name: Tim

Last Name: Morse

Commenter Email: timmorse@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Climate Reality Project, Southern Connecticut Chapter

Commenter Title: Chair

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Morse, Tim Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We (The Southern CT Chapter of the Climate Reality Project) fully support the Advanced Clean Cars II regulation. It is imperative that we dramatically reduce out carbon emissions and the transportation sector is one of the most important for Connecticut, both in terms of carbon emissions as well as air pollution. Utilizing the pioneering efforts in California is the most efficient way to advance our standards in Connecticut. We strongly encourage adoption of these standards.

Comment ID: 62

First Name: Linda

Last Name: Heinig

Commenter Email: LRHC21@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/08/23 10:26:02 AM

Comment:

Name: Heinig, Linda Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have significant concerns about the impact of these proposed bans for ban gas operated vehicles, including their impact on businesses (and their customers) as well as the finances of residents who are already grappling with costs associated with living in one of the nation's most energy-expensive states. An all gas-powered passenger vehicles is just 12-years away. I've seen no evidence that Connecticut will be ready to accommodate this aggressive timeline. I actually see this as causing gas price to increase for those that have gas powered vehicles. Also I'm not sure the reliability and safety of battery powered vehicles will not impact the environment too such as disposing of those costly batteries, fires and etc.

Comment ID: 63**First Name:** stephanie**Last Name:** martinik**Commenter Email:** swmartinik@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 10:30:50 AM**Comment:**

Name: martinik, stephanie Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support the plan of no new gas powered vehicle sales in CT after the next 12 years. Hard choices have to be made to save the planet and humanity. If compromises need to be made then allow commercial vehicles a bit more time.

Comment ID: 64**First Name:** Frank**Last Name:** Keel**Commenter Email:** fakelectric@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 10:35:56 AM**Comment:**

Name: Keel, Frank Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Why CAFE standards? This is adding more cost to live and produce more manufacturing in CT. This is a progressive tax on we citizens. If i read this correctly a antique car prior to selling must meet 2027 standards.

Comment ID: 65**First Name:** Robert**Last Name:** Vercillo**Commenter Email:** Bobber3475@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 10:45:54 AM**Comment:**

Name: Vercillo, Robert Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think it's great, we need to start somewhere even if the final direction is watered down. The transition period will take years but it needs to happen. The climate crisis is not waiting.

Comment ID: 66**First Name:** Alexander**Last Name:** Hoffman

Commenter Email: ahoffman@aledev.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/08/23 10:54:12 AM

Comment:

Name: Hoffman, Alexander Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a perfectly appropriate goal and time frame. This gives us plenty of time to plan and build the infrastructure we need accommodate this shift in how we power our passenger vehicles. Obviously, this legislation will not remove all the gasoline powered vehicles from the road -- despite the implications of its opponents. It simply stops the addition of new gasoline powered vehicles from being sold in this state. This is about speeding a transition, but not about any abrupt or sudden shift to a 100% electric vehicle fleet on the road. That makes it sensible. In an era when vehicles last more years and more miles than ever, the rate of vehicle replacement is far lower than I would have thought possible in my youth. As this legislation does not bar the sale of used gasoline powered vehicles, it is hard to view objections as being both well-considered and made in good faith. Again, 12 years is time to build the necessarily infrastructure to accommodate the increase rate of the shift from gasoline powered vehicles to EVs. Of course, as EV vehicle options increase, as EV technology increase and as EV costs decrease, one might wonder how much of an acceleration this legislation will provide -- but this merely points to the poor quality of arguments against this legislation. However, if this legislation highlights the already existing need to take shifting our power generation and transmission infrastructure and helps to build the political will to do so, that would be enough.

Comment ID: 67

First Name: Terry

Last Name: Hall

Commenter Email: thall6162@Yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/08/23 11:00:16 AM

Comment:

Name: Hall, Terry Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not support this legislation. Please do not pass this bill

Comment ID: 68

First Name:

Last Name:

Commenter Email:

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/08/23 11:05:15 AM

Comment:

Name: , Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am all for trying to save the environment, BUT I am having a hard time seeing how proposing that we all switch to electric vehicles is beneficial to saving the environment. My food for thought is: 1. that most of the electricity is still generated by fossil fuel; 2. the electric grid will not be able to handle the extra consumption of electricity; 3. electricity creates more heat adding to hotter summers; 4. if there is a major power outage (for days) how would we be able to charge our vehicles?(oh that is right we can use our generator which still utilizes fossil fuel) What happens if there is an emergency or you are an essential person (doctor, nurse, police officer, EMT, firefighter) and you can not get to work because you have no battery left?; 5. Stability of the battery is another issue all together. They have been known to create fires etc. When the cold weather comes about and if your battery is not strong your car won't start. What happens to the battery in a electric vehicle when it is weak?; 6. With the price of electricity constantly going up how much more is this going to add to the person who is already struggling to pay the electric bill?; 7. Will the grocery stores and all the other public

places need to add charging stations to the parking lots? Who will regulate how much they charge?; 8. The surcharge that we are taxed on for gas will go away. That is supposed to fix the roads, how will we get the surcharge now to fix the bridges and roads? Extra charge on the already to high electric bill?; 9. Electric cars make very little noise. Living out in the country the wildlife moves out of the roadways and avoids them because of the noise. I am not sure if I would feel safe in an electric vehicle versus a bear; 10. If said vehicle catches on fire how would you put it out? Electricity and water do not mix. Not everyone in the state is privy to public transportation. Please do not punish those of us who live outside of public transportation.

Comment ID: 69

First Name: Chris

Last Name: Brown

Commenter Email: Ftackle1@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/08/23 11:15:50 AM

Comment:

Name: Brown, Chris Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is completely in tolerable that liberal politicians are pushing polices like banning the sale of gas powered vehicles because their policies are failures. You people don't get to just push the public that voted you in into propaganda that you won't follow yourselves. You won't stop flying on planes, or driving your gas vehicles, although you are clearly trying to force the public not to use these sources of travel. If electric vehicles were so good for the world, then people would buy them on their own account because it is the right thing to do. You politicians are only here for your own good and to pat yourselves on the back. You are clearly not concerned about the slave labor in China used to make these batteries needed in these cars. Clearly not concerned about the slave labor camps in Africa that the Chinese have used to get the Cobalt out of the ground. Or that there are something like 40,000 children as young as 6 that are being used to mine it in shafts that cave in and bury the diggers. As well you clearly aren't concerned about how this will only make the cost of living here in Connecticut even higher and the cost of goods in all of our stores higher. This bill is nothing but Politicians feeling good about themselves while penalizing the working class tax payer.

Comment ID: 70

First Name: Rose

Last Name: Roszczewski

Commenter Email: rockenrose@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: none

Commenter Title: none

Posted Date: 08/08/23 11:22:25 AM

Attachments:

CT comment on Advanced Clean Car II regulation Aug 2023.pdf

Comment:

Name: Roszczewski, Rose Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please see attached file. Thank you.

Comment ID: 71

First Name: David

Last Name: Emberling

Commenter Email: david@emberlingstudio.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Citizen Climate Lobby

Commenter Title: En-Roads Ambassador

Posted Date: 08/08/23 11:55:17 AM

Comment:

Name: Emberling, David Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut needs to implement Advanced Clean Cars II (ACCII), Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT), and Heavy-Duty Omnibus regulations. These standards are of utmost importance as they are critical in improving air quality and addressing the pressing challenge of climate change. They will significantly improve air quality, protect public health, and create a more sustainable future for all Connecticut citizens. ? Connecticut's alarming air quality is exacerbated by cars and trucks contributing to nearly 40% of greenhouse gas emissions. Vulnerable communities are disproportionately affected by this pollution. The adoption of these regulations will help us take significant strides towards cleaner air and a healthier planet.

Comment ID: 72**First Name:** Karen**Last Name:** McBreairty**Commenter Email:** kmb328@optonline.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 11:56:31 AM**Comment:**

Name: McBreairty, Karen Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I agree...we will NOT be ready to implement this in 12 years! It certainly will have a negative impact on our economy and the cost of vehicles will definitely increase. I think people forget that electricity is not free and is produced by coal, oil and doesn't miraculously just come out of the outlet. Until the source of electricity is improved this will have little effect on emissions and a huge negative effect on our tax payers pocket books! Can the grid even handle this increase in the usage of electricity??? This is a knee jerk reaction by the left. Little by little ALL of our freedoms to make our own choices are being taken away whether it be light bulbs, gas stoves, cars and our choice to control what is put in our bodies. Enough is enough. We need to move toward decreasing emissions but it must be done smartly with no negative effect on our economy or our basic freedoms.

Comment ID: 73**First Name:** Kim**Last Name:** Craven**Commenter Email:** kim.barker.craven@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 11:58:00 AM**Comment:**

Name: Craven, Kim Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I applaud the pursuit of more offshore wind energy generation to benefit our state and help to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels. You/We are headed in the right direction! This time around, I implore you to place strict requirements in the RFP that requires selected vendors to demonstrate support for the communities and the state and guarantee that their operation will be advantageous and equitable in design. To that end, the vendor(s) should be required to guarantee that they will create long-term jobs for the community, and be supportive, equitable, and respectful of the community in which they operate. This had not been the case with the Park City Wind project. What promised to be a boom to the Bridgeport area has fallen flat - not delivering on their promise to create a clean energy hub, 2,800 full time jobs, and \$890M in economic development. Instead, Park City Wind is now projected to create only 50 jobs (30 of them short-term to build a facility. Let's put some clear stipulations in this new RFP that guarantees the next Offshore Wind project truly does deliver on their promises.

Comment ID: 74**First Name:** Paul**Last Name:** Paquette**Commenter Email:** paul.paquette@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 11:58:04 AM**Comment:**

Name: Paquette, Paul Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Reasons for not implementing 2035 deadline on gas powered vehicles. EVs do not pollute less. Enormous amounts of rare earth elements need to be mined to produce the battery. This mining is not only very bad for pollution but make us dependent on China to produce and make the battery. This is not a stable supplier. There are no energy savings. Huge amounts of electrical production will be needed to charge EVs. The antiquated electrical grid cannot support this charging demand. Brown outs if not total blackouts will occur, unless atomic energy plants are built to provide the amount of electricity needed. Solar and wind do not have the capacity to produce the amount of electricity that will be needed. There are not enough charging stations, especially in rural areas to charge EVs. Some parts of the country could end up un-reachable by vehicles. The current EVs also take far too long to re-charge. This could add many days of travel time on a long trip.

Comment ID: 75**First Name:** Maryann**Last Name:** Flood**Commenter Email:** Mf2956@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 12:10:29 PM**Comment:**

Name: Flood, Maryann Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Are the democrats crazy? I do not now or ever want an electric car. The electric companies can't handle the grid. And I do not want to have to charge my car. Please vote against this.

Comment ID: 76**First Name:** Todd**Last Name:** Smith**Commenter Email:** tsmith@klsmithagency.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 12:31:19 PM**Comment:**

Name: Smith, Todd Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the State of Connecticut imposing a requirement that all automobiles sold in CT after 2034 will be required to be electric. The electric grid cannot sustain that high an increase in demand. I do not believe that Eversource and United Illuminating can build the necessary infrastructure in only twelve years. Is the state going to allow the building of new power plants to keep up with demand? How about new transmission lines? Wind and solar power will not replace natural gas, coal and nuclear power in this short a time period. I believe that "man made climate change" is a hoax.

Comment ID: 77**First Name:** Carmela**Last Name:** Garofalo**Commenter Email:** carmelagarofalo26@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Sisters of Mercy**Commenter Title:** Sister**Posted Date:** 08/08/23 02:06:53 PM

Comment:

Name: Garofalo, Carmela Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My Name is Carmela Garofalo and I am a resident of Bloomfield. I am submitting comments in support of offshore wind with proper consideration of community impacts and equitable job opportunities. Offshore wind will be good for the economy and the environment and the future health of all CT residents.

Comment ID: 78**First Name:** Carmela**Last Name:** Garofalo**Commenter Email:** carmelagarofalo26@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Sisters of Mercy**Commenter Title:** Sister**Posted Date:** 08/08/23 02:14:30 PM**Comment:**

Name: Garofalo, Carmela Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My name is Carmela Garofalo and I am a resident of Bloomfield. Connecticut needs to implement Advanced Clean Cars II and Advanced Clean Trucks and Heavy - Duty Omnibus regulations. It is imperative if we are to fight climate change and to insure the health of our citizens and the planet.

Comment ID: 79**First Name:** MELISSA**Last Name:** REAGAN**Commenter Email:** dragyn_myrlin@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 02:25:31 PM**Comment:**

Name: REAGAN, MELISSA Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose this proposed regulation concerning the banning of new gasoline vehicles after the year 2035. 1. Ct ratepayers already pay exorbitant costs for electricity and yet have an unreliable grid that can take days to repair in after a storm. Imagine if you will adding 100,000 electric cars to that usage, and the added charging facilities both public and private, and know that the strain on the the system will be overwhelming. Eversource has a terrible track record for both repairs and new construction, so this only spells an expensive disaster for residents of this state. 2. As a disabled almost senior, I cannot possibly afford a new electric vehicle. It is highly unlikely there will be a lowering of cost, even in 12 years, that will make these cars affordable not only to me, but to many of our blue collar and lower income workers. The average cost of a new electric vehicle currently is \$53,438 as of June of this year. To buy one of these new, assuming the average person could save for a down payment of \$10,000 (highly unlikely they could), with tax, title and registration, credit score of GOOD, a loan term of 5 years with an interest rate of 5.4%, the loan payment would be \$927 a month. Add on to that the cost of a charging station in the home, average \$1000 up front, and then the monthly cost of charging, that's over \$1000 a month for ONE car. Imagine if you need two cars, because at that rate both people need to work to afford two cars. Not to mention the replacement cost of batteries in a few years. 3. We should have the option to choose what type of vehicle we choose to drive. If we choose to go away, it is camping with a 10,000 lb trailer. Only the most expensive EV's would be able to tow that, at around \$90,000. Yet our much cheaper truck can handle that with ease. I have a very large dog, who needs a very large crate. Large crates don't fit in most EV's, so how do I take my dog to the vet, the kennel, or out for a hike? It is unsafe to have an uncrate dog in a vehicle, so I would have to what, walk? to the kennel? My right as a consumer should always be to have a choice, not be forced to buy something to give people a false sense of saving the planet. 4. Speaking of saving the planet, what is the environmental cost of mining lithium for batteries? What is the environmental plan for disposing of said batteries when they have reached their usefulness? Why are we being forced to use or purchase something that has not been proven to actually help the planet? On top of that, the manufacturers have done a good job of producing gasoline cars that get great mileage, thus cutting down the amount of fuel needed to drive them. More

ways have been (or were being) developed to take oil from the earth with less destruction of our natural areas, certainly without giant holes in the ground that are being dug by children in third world countries. Overall, I oppose this and any type of legislation that does not allow consumer choice in the type of vehicle they want to drive. Forcing people to accept an agenda they do not want or like is always a bad thing for governments to do.

Comment ID: 80

First Name: James

Last Name: Colberg

Commenter Email: jimcolberg@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/08/23 03:24:53 PM

Comment:

Name: Colberg, James Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to have a chance to die of natural causes rather than the pollution from ice vehicles that continues to destroy the planet. I would also like to die knowing that my children, my grandchildren, my future great grandchildren etc will have breathable air well into the future. I support the ban on gas vehicles and only regret that it will have to take another 12 years to get there.

Comment ID: 81

First Name: Donna

Last Name: Napolitano

Commenter Email: napolitano6456@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/08/23 05:31:10 PM

Comment:

Name: Napolitano, Donna Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am totally against this erratic and irresponsible time of regarding the sale of gas powered vehicles.

Comment ID: 82

First Name: Lindsay

Last Name: Suter

Commenter Email: suter16@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/08/23 07:01:27 PM

Comment:

Name: Suter, Lindsay Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My family and I are very glad that CT is moving ahead with the full adoption of electric vehicles in the state. As if this summer were not enough of a wake-up-call, climate change is real, its here, and we are already late to make the necessary changes to avert its effects. We drive electric vehicles, and love them. They are cheaper to drive and maintain. It is even possible for CT residents to make their own 'fuel' - ie generate their own electricity. You can't do that with gas or diesel. Naturally, this means that we have to build a robust infrastructure to provide the energy/charging stations/smart grid to support such a move. Nay-sayers will drag their feet. But we have to do this. We can do this! It's our future, sooner or later, like it or not. (Me? I like it, and want it to be sooner!)

Comment ID: 83

First Name: John

Last Name: Dyckman

Commenter Email: dyckman2@snet.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 07:25:40 PM**Comment:**

Name: Dyckman, John Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Im against any mandate to force consumer to buy electric cars. In fact if steam or coal powered cars still made economic sense, i would be driving that. It is enough that the federal government sets cafe standards for emissions and im all for clean air but to mandate products that the public - me! Dont want is brutish and downright offensive.

Comment ID: 84**First Name:** Oliver**Last Name:** Gaffney**Commenter Email:** gaffero@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/08/23 10:34:31 PM**Comment:**

Name: Gaffney, Oliver Submission Date: 8/8/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing in strong support of our state adopting California's Medium and Heavy-Duty (MHD) vehicle emission standards. As a resident of an environmental justice community in New Haven, I have lived experience with air pollution and the health problems that it causes. Connecticut is currently in nonattainment of federal air quality standards, and we have some of the highest rates of asthma in the entire country as a result. The current Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations are inadequate to solve this problem. We need some new tools in our public health toolbox, and California's standards are immediately available. Adopting this regulatory framework would also put us in partnership with several other New England and Mid-Atlantic states who are using the same tools to improve their own air quality. Ozone smog is an unfortunate fact of life in the summer time. From the back deck of my home, I can watch it slowly envelope New Haven in the heat of the day. I can also feel it in my lungs and upper respiratory tract as I bike home from work in the evenings. On the worst air quality days, I can expect to have my sinuses clogged with discolored gunk and to have a phantom cough until nightfall. The numerous medium and heavy trucks that pass through my neighborhood everyday to service the port facility and nearby industrial areas use diesel fuel, a significant contributor to smog pollution. The proposed adoption of California's MHD vehicle emission standards would greatly reduce the amount of constituent smog precursors generated by these vehicles. Additionally, they would put Connecticut back on track to meeting current federal air quality standards and state required climate mitigation targets. Thank you for your consideration of my comments on this proposed regulation. I urge you adopt California's MHD vehicle emission standards to improve air quality and public health outcomes for residents in environmental justice communities.

Comment ID: 85**First Name:** daniel**Last Name:** maroney**Commenter Email:** maron148@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** homeowner**Commenter Title:** mr.**Posted Date:** 08/09/23 04:51:37 AM**Comment:**

Name: maroney, daniel Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is preposterous from many angles. Most people are barely scratching by financially and could never afford the price of ev's. Many many experts say that our grid can't handle this excess load. Again many experts have said the weight of these vehicles will cause more road damage and also stress our brittle bridges which is where this money should be directed. These evs are prone to fires

and almost impossible to extinguish which means more tax dollars for work for fire depts. I implore you to listen to all sides and all experts not just the ones who vote in your block. I could never afford one and where i live there is no busline and no sidewalks. To many peoples surprise i live in the suburbs and i really struggle financially, putting this added burden on me will force me into tent city. How will this work for people in high rises and big apartment buildings. Why does our government continue to fail us just look at the damage the internet has done and just look at the laws being changed to allow criminals the freedom to bash and kick peoples heads in daily. This technology will destroy our country. I suggest you bring back the blue laws and don't allow stores open on sunday and put resources into hybrid cars.

Comment ID: 86

First Name: Judith

Last Name: Leeser

Commenter Email: Judithleeser@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 08:18:04 AM

Comment:

Name: Leeser, Judith Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 How can we stop this if the Democrats are in power? They don't care how the average person thinks. I vot Republican in every election. It doe no good.

Comment ID: 87

First Name: Frank A.

Last Name: Brigano

Commenter Email: fbrigano@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 10:14:46 AM

Comment:

Name: Brigano, Frank A. Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to this proposed legislation to moving to all electric vehicles. Reasons - Our son lives in Illinois. It would be near impossible with the current state of the EV technology to drive to his home within a reasonable time period, Second, the life and recycling of the lithium batteries is a problem and maybe even a greater impact on our environment than gas operated vehicles. I would like to see us move to Hydrogen vehicles or other environmentally friendly technologies that will maintain the same standards of vehicle operation we have today. Moving to EV may be stifling to technologies under development. Let's look for other means to prevent CO2 emissions besides EV. Thank you.

Comment ID: 88

First Name: Karen

Last Name: Svetz

Commenter Email: svetzka@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 10:29:51 AM

Comment:

Name: Svetz, Karen Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am in favor of the proposed regulation!

Comment ID: 89

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Murphy

Commenter Email: rjmrrt06@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 11:11:46 AM**Comment:**

Name: Murphy, Richard Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The state of Connecticut legislation should not ban the sales of new gas-powered passenger vehicles in just 12 years' time. I have significant concerns about the impact this proposed ban supported by the legislature's majority party Democrats, including their impact on businesses (and their customers) as well as the finances most Connecticut residents who are already grappling with costs associated with living in one of the nation's most energy-expensive states. Please reject this proposed ban.

Comment ID: 90**First Name:** Chris**Last Name:** Fay**Commenter Email:** Chrisfayb@charter.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 11:59:43 AM**Comment:**

Name: Fay, Chris Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I fully support the proposal to ban the sale of gas powered vehicles on the date proposed. Having a set date will incentivize the industries involved to modernize, upgrade, and find the solutions to meet the demand. Also, as more and more electric vehicles are manufactured and sold the technology will improve and the prices should come down. The used car market would then start seeing more and more electric vehicles show up make them more available to the secondary market. The longer we go without a set date will allow those industries to drag out the deployment of electric vehicles throughout the state.

Comment ID: 91**First Name:** Christopher**Last Name:** Temple**Commenter Email:** cktemple@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 12:00:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Temple, Christopher Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Foolish! Stop rushing into this program. The country already has an electrical infrastructure problem, requiring ?everyone? to switch to electric cars without a significant upgrade in the power grid is a short sighted plan. Not to mention people have the right to CHOOSE, don?t force people to only have one option, thats being a dictatorship!!

Comment ID: 92**First Name:** Rachael**Last Name:** McCord**Commenter Email:** Rachlwhit7@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: McCord, Rachael Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concerns regarding the proposed Forced Clean Energy Cars Bill currently under consideration. While I appreciate the intentions behind this bill, I believe there are several crucial aspects that need to be addressed before such a significant transition is implemented. Firstly, the bill aims to promote clean energy cars, but it seems to overlook the essential infrastructure required to support the increased demand on our electric resources. Our current electricity generation heavily relies on natural gas, and without a comprehensive plan to transition our energy sources to cleaner alternatives, we risk overwhelming our electric grid, potentially negating the environmental benefits we aim to achieve. Additionally, the proposed bill seeks to reduce local drilling activities, which is a commendable goal. However, the reality is that the absence of domestic drilling could lead to an increased dependence on imported fossil fuels, resulting in additional emissions due to transportation from overseas. This contradictory situation raises concerns about the overall environmental impact and efficacy of the bill. Another aspect that cannot be ignored is the environmental toll of mining the resources required for the batteries in electric cars. Often, these resources are extracted under conditions that exploit both natural resources and vulnerable communities. It is disheartening to think that our pursuit of cleaner transportation might inadvertently contribute to environmental degradation and the exploitation of children engaged in mining activities. Considering these concerns, I would like to advocate for a more holistic and effective approach to sustainable transportation. Rather than focusing solely on clean energy cars, I believe a better solution lies in the development of robust and accessible public transportation systems. Adequate public transportation not only reduces the reliance on personal vehicles but also encourages a more environmentally friendly and socially equitable mode of commuting. I urge you to carefully reconsider the implications of the Forced Clean Energy Cars Bill and to prioritize comprehensive planning, investment in clean energy infrastructure, and sustainable alternatives such as public transportation. By adopting a well-rounded approach, we can make meaningful progress toward a greener future without unintentionally causing harm or placing undue burdens on our communities. Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that your decisions will reflect the best interests of our state and its citizens. Sincerely, [Your Signature] [Your Printed Name] Enclosure: [If applicable, you can mention any supporting documents you might include with the letter]

Comment ID: 93

First Name: Beth

Last Name: Fraychak

Commenter Email: Befray@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 12:08:20 PM

Comment:

Name: Fraychak , Beth Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I feel that the government in Ct. is over stepping their bounds. It should be my right to choose what kind of vehicle I purchase. Many people cannot afford a place to live, let alone an overpriced electric car. Has anyone thought about how people are going to charge their car? It costs an additional \$2000 dollars for the electric cable. What are people supposed to do if they part their car on the street, run the cable across the sidewalk to their house? The state has not thought this out. Well, we know Ned Lamont & Fairfield County are millionaires. How many who are proposing this make over \$300,000 a year? You are trying to take away my freedoms!

Comment ID: 94

First Name: Jeffrey

Last Name: Mead

Commenter Email: meadjeff@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 12:08:24 PM

Comment:

Name: Mead, Jeffrey Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Thank you for proposing legislation to begin

curbing emissions from vehicles in the state. Maybe the impact won't immediately create change, but hopefully as more states begin to make changes that need to be done, future generations will benefit. It will no doubt be uncomfortable and inconvenient for these proposed changes to be adopted, but in due time as the conversion is made, we will all be happy this proposal was made.

Comment ID: 95

First Name: Noelle

Last Name: McKenna

Commenter Email: noelle215@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 12:14:29 PM

Comment:

Name: McKenna, Noelle Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 With the astronomical electrical costs in this state, this is ridiculous and begs the question of who is in Eversource's pocket. It seems like a fantasy to even believe the electrical grid could handle this or that charging stations would be at the level needed. This is a great way to get consumers to buy cars in other states. Force electric rates to a reasonable rate. These two factors will drive people out of the state

Comment ID: 96

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Mankowski

Commenter Email: pmankowski@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 12:14:51 PM

Comment:

Name: Mankowski, Peter Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not agree with this proposal, I do not want to be forced to buy an electric vehicle.

Comment ID: 97

First Name: Adrien

Last Name: Lagassie

Commenter Email: AdrienLagassie@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 12:42:50 PM

Comment:

Name: Lagassie, Adrien Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I believe that banning all gasoline vehicles peoples rights to happiness and the Freedom of travel. I could not afford a electric vehicle even with the "rebates" from the state and federal Governments. Please do not pass this legislation under any circumstance.

Comment ID: 98

First Name: George

Last Name: Merusi

Commenter Email: gmerusi75@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Global Director

Posted Date: 08/09/23 12:54:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Merusi, George Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 With the immense electricity draw of millions of new EVs pending and the seasonal power outages due to storms in CT, what is the plan to ensure access to power for EVs? I have a son with TSC and Epilepsy. I have also experience twice in 8 years power outages of more than 3-5 days. How would the state ensure I can get my son his medication and treatment during such times? Also, if EVs are manadated we're creating a monopoly on fueling/powering those vehicles which could lead to price gouging. We should leave a free and open market for both ICE and EVs to coexist.

Comment ID: 99

First Name: Kenneth

Last Name: Kopsco

Commenter Email: kckopsco@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 12:56:41 PM

Comment:

Name: Kopsco, Kenneth Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Decisions to purchase personal transportation, be it a car, boat motorcycle, etc., should be left up solely to the individual who can best determine their needs based on market conditions. This is not an area for the state to issue mandates as people are fully capable of making this decision. This is an over-reach by the government and the bill should strenuously opposed.

Comment ID: 100

First Name: Sharon

Last Name: Lynch

Commenter Email: slynch@gwu.edu

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 12:59:04 PM

Comment:

Name: Lynch, Sharon Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have no problem with banning fossil fuels in vehicles and setting that as a goal. In fact, CT's electric costs are among the highest in the country. We also have to pay for oil for heating. As our representative, I will soon ask you to share with me your thoughts on the electric charges, and suggest to you some ways to reduce the costs to the citizens of Stonington through alternative solar. In the NYT yesterday, they posted the cost of an "fill-up" for an electric car in CT, compared to other states. The costs in CT were among the lowest in the nation. I am assuming that is because Eversource and UI are so far behind the connectivity curve that Eversource is not capturing costs for the meager solar assets that it allows. This is complicated stuff, and I appreciate very much that we have the opportunity to voice our opinions. Thank you.
 Sharon Lynch

Comment ID: 101

First Name: Matthew

Last Name: BEAUDOIN

Commenter Email: MATT@MYSTICKNETWORK.COM

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 01:07:59 PM

Comment:

Name: BEAUDOIN, Matthew Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Removing internal combustion transport by 2035 is a poorly thought out decision. My primary vehicle is a 2013 Nissan Leaf (electric), and I am fully self sufficient through solar panels and storage batteries. Because of that, I know the limitations in the real world. Speaking as an electric car owner: My electric car, the 2013 Nissan Leaf, is one of the few models to ever achieve a true environmentally positive rating. That comes at the expense of range. It is reliable to about 60 miles. That range is perfect for commuting and errands, but fails for that one or two trips per week that exceed that range. For that reason, my backup vehicle is a 2009 Volvo. That vehicle uses around 1/2 a dozen tanks of fuel per year, but provides the service necessary to visit aged family members and conduct errands. Splitting our families driving between the hyper efficient Leaf and the space efficient Volvo let us have a vehicle fleet for our home that is 1/4 the price of the energy hog oversized electric vehicles currently being incentivized nationally. This vehicle mix is ideal, but doesn't comport with the goals of the auto and mining industries. Speaking as a residential solar panel owner: As a resident participating in the 'Virtual Power Plant' program with our solar panels, I have seen that we are in a power supply emergency nearly every day. Even today, August 9th, it is only 79 degrees out, but the virtual power plant is using 804 'fleet homes' to provide 1.5 mega watts of power at 12:53pm. I am in favor of migration to more economic vehicles for personal transportation, but the movement towards oversized electric cars, and pushing electric cars at a rate faster than the generation for those vehicles can be brought online is a fools errand. The EU recently backed away from the same idea of going all electric as their brown out situations and resistance to bringing on more electric generation has crippled their economic future. Connecticut should learn from those mistakes and continue the slow migration from heavy, fuel inefficient transportation into more efficient and economic means. The wish to migrate from fossil fuel burning to other resources is a great goal, but that goal can only be reached if the grid is first developed into a scale that can support a 50-75% additional load. I spoke with Dannell Malloy before his first term in office on this matter. We don't have the generation or transmission infrastructure to support the migration. By continuing to incentivize local power generation, it will naturally encourage a migration from combustion to battery power sources. That avenue is the better pursuit than to replay the folly that nations around the world have reversed course on. I encourage our legislators to continue encouraging local and personal level power generation, I encourage the state to provide resources to distribute that power through avenues like local generation coops and large arrays, but I stand firmly against putting an arbitrary line of 2035 banning of combustion engines as something even nations like Germany realized was not possible to do. Submitted respectfully, Matthew Beaudoin

Comment ID: 102

First Name: janice

Last Name: orsini

Commenter Email: sweetjan16@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 01:13:45 PM

Comment:

Name: orsini, janice Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am in favor of advanced clean cars II

Comment ID: 103

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Richardson

Commenter Email: skipinnm@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 01:20:56 PM

Comment:

Name: Richardson , Robert Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental

Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While I am all for energy efficiency, this is too aggressive. Like other States our energy grid will not be able to handle the load, we would become like

California with rolling blackout. Additionally there are not enough charging stations in the state to accommodate the increase in Electric Autos.

Comment ID: 104

First Name: Joseph

Last Name: Aiello

Commenter Email: bobicone@me.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 01:23:58 PM

Comment:

Name: Aiello, Joseph Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I OPPOSE and legislation banning the sale of gas cars and trucks. This will have devastating effects on the economy of Connecticut and further burden the already struggling families who are paying your salaries.

Comment ID: 105

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Kassirer

Commenter Email: suejkassirer@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 01:42:25 PM

Comment:

Name: Kassirer, Susan Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing in support of the CT Clean Air Act (Public Act 22-25), which has been outlined to me by my representative, Mitch Bolinsky in an email message. I do not agree with my representative, who is against this act and says he believes "that transitions are best handled in stages, and only accelerated to the point of emergency action in terms of the rush to develop solutions." With all due respect to my Representative, this is an emergency, and long past being so. We have no time for stages. Ideally we would ban the sale of gas-powered cars and trucks much sooner than 2035. But more importantly perhaps, the State of CT should invest in more public transportation. This is what would really make a difference. It is not in any way sustainable for each person or family to be traveling in a single-owner vehicle. Those days are over. Invest in buses and trains and in addition get the large trucks off the highways in doing so. Train travel makes much more sense for large truck shipments that are currently clogging our highways and contributing to the climate change crisis we now find ourselves in. We have created a mess for future generations, and it is our job to stop being short-sited and take responsibility by doing the right thing. In summary, I want to thank the State of CT for putting forward this proposed regulation and again state that I am in favor of it.

Comment ID: 106

First Name: Bruce

Last Name: Thornton

Commenter Email: crimfog@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 01:43:38 PM

Comment:

Name: Thornton, Bruce Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposal is completely foolhardy. Being on a fixed income I can barely afford to keep my gasoline powered auto in usable and reliable condition. wWith gas prices already climbing again this becomings increasingly difficult. Aside from the purchase price of an alternative energy vehicle, the moral implications of child labor and poisonous leaching fields used to get the rare earth metals

to make the batteries, last winter i was not able to pay my entire electric bill WITHOUT having to charge a vehicle. I think that for a huge variety of negative reasons that this is a horrible idea forcing many into near or possibly complete bankruptcy.

Comment ID: 107

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Bjorknas

Commenter Email: peba@idetek.se

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 02:01:44 PM

Comment:

Name: Bjorknas, Peter Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think this initiative is good and I support it. I think we need to get rid of gas cars ASAP.

Comment ID: 108

First Name: Mike

Last Name: McCann

Commenter Email: mike@emccann.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 02:06:28 PM

Comment:

Name: McCann, Mike Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Moving to all-electric cars by 2035 in Connecticut may not be the best option due to several reasons, including: Infrastructure: Connecticut's current infrastructure is not ready to support a complete shift to electric cars. There are not enough charging stations available, and the existing ones are often not in convenient locations 1 . Cost: Electric cars are still more expensive than traditional gas-powered cars, and the cost of charging stations and other infrastructure is also high. This can make it difficult for young first-time car buyers to afford an electric car 4 . Availability: While major automakers are increasing EV production, electric vehicles' share of all new U.S. car sales rose sharply over the past two years, to 5 . However, there may still be limited availability of electric cars in Connecticut, making it difficult for young first-time car buyers to find and purchase an electric car 4 . Tax Credit: While the government is offering a hefty tax credit to buyers of electric vehicles, taking advantage of it is not straightforward 6 . This can make it difficult for young first-time car buyers to take advantage of the tax credit and afford an electric car. Moving to all-electric cars by 2035 in Connecticut may not be the best option due to infrastructure, cost, availability, and tax credit issues. This can have a significant impact on young first-time car buyers who may struggle to afford an electric car or find one available for purchase.

Comment ID: 109

First Name: David

Last Name: Estey

Commenter Email: esteyinthegrove@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Action Equipment Rental

Commenter Title: Sole Member

Posted Date: 08/09/23 02:56:45 PM

Comment:

Name: Estey, David Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I just would like to know why we are not talking about hybrid vehicles? making such a change would mean billions in infrastructure replacement, roads bridges, parking garages necessary to accommodate for the weight of these vehicles not to mention the lack of charging

stations. Why are we following CA anyway we are CT. As a business owner I would leave this state entirely as would other business due to the burden you would be putting on us all in the form of taxes to pay for such a poor idea.

Comment ID: 110

First Name: Samuel

Last Name: Sims

Commenter Email: samcsims@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Young Democrats of New London County

Commenter Title: Executive Secretary

Posted Date: 08/09/23 03:22:13 PM

Comment:

Name: Sims, Samuel Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am 100% in support of a ban on the sale of gas-powered passenger vehicles.

Comment ID: 111

First Name: Nicole

Last Name: Torres

Commenter Email: morbi2@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 03:28:19 PM

Comment:

Name: Torres, Nicole Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not agree with ban for new gas cars. I believe the owner should have the right to choose. We also do not have enough public charging areas for this to be reasonable. However, incentives such as rebates to buy alternative to gas car would be more reasonable and acceptable.

Comment ID: 112

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Kelly

Commenter Email: pkelly@kell-strom.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Dismayed Citizen of Connecticut

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 03:39:29 PM

Comment:

Name: Kelly, Peter Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is absolutely insane that you want to ban gas powered vehicles. Government overreach is in full effect this is not your decision to make. Electric cars will fail and let's see what our National Guard does when power is down, and they can't charge their equipment and battery powered aircraft and electric trucks. This progressive forces behind this nonsense need to be stopped and hopefully the public wakes up and finds politicians that are like minded and vote out the progressive party and their left-wing agenda.

Comment ID: 113

First Name: dina

Last Name: dufresne

Commenter Email: ddufresne@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: dufresne, dina Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The sooner we can eliminate gas powered vehicles the better. Climate change is here and we're already behind in addressing this issue.

Comment ID: 114**First Name:** Scott**Last Name:** Woomer**Commenter Email:** swoomer@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 03:51:26 PM**Comment:**

Name: Woomer, Scott Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Not in favor of banning new gas or diesel car and truck sales in CT. I assume that the sale of used gas or diesel cars and trucks will not be banned. I am in favor of providing people a choice of vehicles to purchase including gas, diesel or electric and let them decide. I do not believe there is sufficient infrastructure in CT to support electric vehicles. To many wealthy people in CT do not care how these policy decisions effect those less fortunate.

Comment ID: 115**First Name:** Herman**Last Name:** Vogel**Commenter Email:** vogelhn@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Self**Commenter Title:** Engineering Citizen**Posted Date:** 08/09/23 03:51:32 PM**Comment:**

Name: Vogel, Herman Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While I'm for clean air and EVs, I'm against this Clean Air Act. Our state as well as our nation isn't ready to commit to drastic quick measures eliminating ICE vehicles before a complete infrastructure for EV charging is available. Remember that there is no zero emissions vehicle out there. Even EVs pass off their emissions to electric power stations. What we really need for a green CT and world are clean nuclear power plants. That should be our first goal!

Comment ID: 116**First Name:** Marjorie**Last Name:** Meekhoff**Commenter Email:** mbm@atlanticbb.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 03:54:45 PM**Comment:**

Name: Meekhoff, Marjorie Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't want the government telling me that I must drive an electric car.

Comment ID: 117**First Name:** Toni**Last Name:** Fortuna

Commenter Email: t-fortuna@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: William Raveis

Commenter Title: Sales

Posted Date: 08/09/23 04:12:31 PM

Comment:

Name: Fortuna , Toni Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Strongly oppose the elimination of selling gas cars.

Comment ID: 118

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Golden

Commenter Email: bboat53@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 04:37:37 PM

Comment:

Name: Golden, Richard Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is yet one more "sounds good" but not well thought out plan. The Electrical Grid cannot support the loads it has now, either in supply or carrying capacity. Adding litterally 10's of thousands of 15-40amp loads will not work. The worlds supply of lithium is not sufficient to build all the batteries required and uses strip mining to obtain it. (<https://www.reuters.com/technology/world-faces-shortage-lithium-electric-vehicle-batteries-2022-01-21/>) So we can't charge them, and we cannot build them. They will be cost prohibitive. I can't tow my boat, or make a round trip to Penn State in a single day in one...and I do that at least once a year. Finally I don't want an EV...I don't want the government dictating what I can and cannot buy, I didn't serve 25 years in the Navy to be dictated to about a car that will not fix the problem anyway

Comment ID: 119

First Name: Donna

Last Name: Cook

Commenter Email: cookdonna29@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 04:54:02 PM

Comment:

Name: Cook, Donna Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 You have no right to tell us what we can and cannot buy. Gas cars do not generate any more pollutants than the pollution and detrimental health issues generated from mining the elements needed to create the batteries necessary for the electric cars. Futhermore, there is no disposal proposals on used or expired batteries and putting them in a landfill will cause detrimental environmental issues for the air/water/dirt. So until you show a full circle of environmental benefits for the use of electric cars, you have no justification for telling us that we can no longer use gas powered vehicles.

Comment ID: 120

First Name: Tracey

Last Name: Cr

Commenter Email: Traceyanna30@icloud.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 04:57:48 PM

Comment:

Name: Cr, Tracey Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Although I understand this proposal I do not think it's practical for most people and by the year 2035. Things to consider include if someone purchases a new electric vehicle they will have to pay higher taxes because it's a newer vehicle and assessed at a higher value. Electric prices in CT are already very high. Last Winter my electric bill was twice the amount it was the year before. The fires that occur with some electric vehicles are concerning. Also, having the elderly going to charging stations for long periods of time especially in the Winter seems inconsiderate. I do not agree with this.

Comment ID: 121

First Name: Josef

Last Name: Rosenfeld

Commenter Email: healthflavors@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Rosenfeld, Josef Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a foolish reaction that will cause needless and countless hardships across a state whose utilities have barely the capacity to serve the demand they currently have.

Comment ID: 122

First Name: Margaret

Last Name: Beutler

Commenter Email: meagain3712@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 05:18:05 PM

Comment:

Name: Beutler, Margaret Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I Strongly object to the regulation being formed to eliminate gas autos and trucks in the state of Connecticut. I do not agree with banning of sales of new gas powered autos...it is impractical to possibly absorb this giant of a policy to the already strained tax payer.

Comment ID: 123

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Conroy

Commenter Email: mikeconroy@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 05:33:12 PM

Comment:

Name: Conroy, Michael Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Make no mistake - banning new ICE cars is not "forward thinking". It is irresponsible and ill-conceived. I drive a Tesla. My wife drives a hybrid. Not only did we pay a premium for these vehicles, but sadly, we pay a fortune in property taxes for them (maybe do something about that, huh?). Not everyone can do this. This would be a form of economic discrimination for the sake of... what? The market has shown there is an appetite for electric vehicles, but it's also a little premature to imagine they are the correct fit for everybody. Literally everybody - which is what this legislation proposes. The energy density of gasoline and the ubiquity of places to procure it still far outweighs the current electric infrastructure. If EVs are the right solution for personal transportation, the market will naturally sort that out. Curiosity, envy, and reduced maintenance expenses will naturally drive consumers to explore these options - as they did with us. For us, it's a

good fit. The Tesla network is expansive and fast, though still slower than hitting the pump. Non-Tesla vehicles take FOREVER to charge other than very high end vehicles like Porsche which have their own far less expansive charging network. Please stop trying to make CT into CA.

Comment ID: 124

First Name: David

Last Name: Fleezer

Commenter Email: Davidwilliam208@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 05:34:55 PM

Comment:

Name: Fleezer, David Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm against the idea of this regulation ev are still very dangerous and extremely expensive to aquire long charging times and way limited in how far you can travel its a nightmare just thinking about taking your family on a vacation...I see so much bad things people stranded on the road long lines at any charging stations

Comment ID: 125

First Name: Kristen

Last Name: Murray

Commenter Email: Kmurray1645@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 05:38:54 PM

Comment:

Name: Murray , Kristen Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not do this! I already pay an unacceptable amount of money for electricity for my house and now you will require me to get an electric vehicle? I can guarantee by 2035 electricity in the state and all the others will not go down in price. Even if it stays the way it is people can not afford it! Stop with your own agendas and think about the people you are working for. Yes the people that voted you in, the little people. Most people live paycheck to paycheck and that won't be changing. Do your job for the people of connecticut and do NOT vote for this. Also I would like to see the studies on this to show that it will help with climate change because I have yet to see them. Also let's not forget the blackouts and such that will most likely happen because I doubt the state will be ready for that kind of draw on the supply. Stop with this nonsense and focus on the things that are necessary for the people of the state.

Comment ID: 126

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Ruggiero

Commenter Email: ruggiero.richard@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Ruggiero, Richard Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposed Advanced Clean Cars II bill is another example of ill advised Progressive legislation that does not fully address the problem of transportation in Connecticut. There should be a fully functional infrastructure in place before abolishing gas powered automobiles. This lack of planning is typical of poor progressive leadership, that copies a progressive California Democratic party. The bill also fails to address advances in new types of internal combustion engines and fuels that could be available (ie. Hydrogen).

Comment ID: 127**First Name:** DJ**Last Name:** Trump supporters**Commenter Email:** conifer.bboxes.02@icloud.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 06:07:12 PM**Comment:**

Name: Trump supporters , DJ Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The state has zero rights to tell Americans what we can and cannot drive! Tell those racketeering bastards to stop treading on us. WE ARE A FREE REPUBLIC. We have gas cars because they are not going to EXPLODE on us, battery powered cars ARE NOT SAFE, OR better for the environment that's a government racketeering HOAX! I'll drive and buy whatever type of car I want because this IS still A FREE COUNTRY!! I WILL DRIVE MY GAS POWERED CAR NO MATTER WHAT creepy MONEY LAUNDERING RACKETEERING state of CT workers do! WE WILL FIGHT BACK AGAINST THE DEMONRAT NUTCASES. WE ARE ORGANIZED NOW. Great to reach out but you already know what we want, FREEDOM FROM THESE money laundering DEMOCRATS! They want to take our WATER HEATERS? OUR AIR CONDITIONERS, ARE YOU PAYING Attention? THE POS BIDEN and his climate FREAKS? I want to see Joe Bidens hot water heater and air conditioner ripped out of his Delaware house and ALL GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, ALL ELECTED OFFICIAL HOMES RIPPED OUT and televised, INCLUDING YOURS, BEFORE ONE AMERICANS HOT WATER HEATER OR AIR CONDITIONER IS TOUCHED!!! THE BACKLASH WILL BE SEVERE FOR ANY OF THIS BULLSHIT. Signed a pissed off and fed up Conservative

Comment ID: 128**First Name:** Gary**Last Name:** Sternhardt**Commenter Email:** gsternhardt@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 06:10:20 PM**Comment:**

Name: Sternhardt, Gary Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposal to ban the sale of gas powered vehicles is beyond moronic. Many world renowned scientists dismiss climate change. The people peddling this hoax have been saying the world will end for 25 years. There are thousands of pictures including, the Statue of Liberty, the prove ocean levels are not rising so they are repackaging "global warming" as "climate change". Electric vehicles are far less environmental friendly to produce, require minerals not available in America, and need to be charged. Where do the greenies think the power comes from to recharge these vehicles? What happens during power outages? In the last ten years there have been several outages that lasted longer than a week.

Comment ID: 129**First Name:** Conrad**Last Name:** Clewell**Commenter Email:** clewell.conrad@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Walmart**Commenter Title:** Digital Personal Shopper**Posted Date:** 08/09/23 06:10:50 PM**Comment:**

Name: Clewell, Conrad Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a very short-sighted regulation proposal.

The cost of owning and operating an electric vehicle would be a double whammy hit to the finances of those of us who live in rural areas or work manual jobs. Electric vehicles are much more expensive to purchase than gas powered vehicles. The electric rates in this state are also some of the highest in the country. This combination of having to pay off an unnecessarily heavy car loan while trying to keep it charged would be an extremely heavy burden on the wallets of many residents in the state. If the proposed regulations are put in place, Connecticut would likely see a mass out migration of middle-class families who need cars to perform their jobs but can't afford the cost of owning an electric vehicle in this state. The only residents left in the state would be those who can afford electric vehicles or people who live in areas with easy access to public transportation. That would leave many scrambling to leave the state over the next 12 years to states that allow residents to choose the type of vehicles they want to own and operate.

Comment ID: 130

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Mongillo

Commenter Email: Jennlmongillo@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 06:12:38 PM

Comment:

Name: Mongillo, Jennifer Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While I am all for supporting environmentally friendly advances, I do not feel that the electric vehicle technology is where we expect or need it to be. The cost of electric vehicles is astronomical, especially if you need a large family friendly vehicle. The upfront cost, plus the need to install a home charging unit, are cost prohibitive to families that are already struggling to make ends meet. The batteries for these vehicles are also extremely expensive to replace. In the United States of America, it is the not governments right or responsibility to regulate what type of vehicle the citizens can purchase and drive Incentives can continue to be offered. However, there should be no ban on gasoline vehicles.

Comment ID: 131

First Name: Ellen

Last Name: Morelock

Commenter Email: emmorelock@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 06:12:42 PM

Comment:

Name: Morelock, Ellen Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't understand this at all. To ban the sales of gas-powered vehicles makes no sense if CT wants to continue to attract people and businesses. People cannot afford new cars and are holding on to them as long as possible. In 2016 I finally traded in my 1990 Accord as the transmission went. I hope to have this 2016 car until 2042, and I do NOT want an EV. In a primarily winter climate, EVs do not hold a charge for very long. How will we heat our EVs in winter? Most renters do not have garages, and a heated garage will be necessary to start an EV if the temperature is below 44 F.

Comment ID: 132

First Name: Carol

Last Name: Brusseau

Commenter Email: brusscarol@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 06:12:56 PM

Comment:

Name: Brusseau, Carol Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am concerned about an aggressive approach to electric vehicles. Many people cannot afford electric vehicles and the infrastructure is not in place to support electric vehicles. And our electric system is not robust enough to support so many electric vehicles being charged. Plus there are problems with vehicles that need to be investigated (like battery life, battery replacement expense, and recently some cars catching on fire). I think it would make more sense to study what is necessary to support this idea and then develop a reasonable plan to support it so that the public is not left out on a limb.

Comment ID: 133

First Name: Barbara

Last Name: Saska

Commenter Email: Bjsaska@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 06:14:26 PM

Comment:

Name: Saska, Barbara Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hi John, How about dropping State car tax instead of a ban. Barbara. Saska

Comment ID: 134

First Name: William

Last Name: Malgieri

Commenter Email: bmalgieri@mac.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 06:15:22 PM

Comment:

Name: Malgieri, William Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This legislation is an example of misguided, pie in the sky, groupthink political theater. The fact that, "This legislation enables Connecticut to follow California's program" should give anyone with a hint of sense pause. CA is failing their residents on almost every front, they are losing their tax base in record numbers and are suffering a ballooning budget deficit. And this is who CT wants to follow?!? OMG! What hard proof is there that EV's are more environmentally friendly? Sure it runs a lower C footprint but along with C there is sulfur dioxide, oxides of nitrogen and particulates to produce the electricity. Not to mention the destruction of the environment to mine cobalt, lithium and other minerals. The human rights abuses in the African cobalt industry are horrific. Consider, major auto manufactures have lost billions, even with fat gov't incentives, many countries have abandoned their aggressive net zero policies, and large energy producers are moving away from renewable energy projects due to massive losses and unreliable results. Despite all of the political Green Washing, China who will supply much of the EV components, has authorized 50GW of coal power in 2023. They are building 6 X's more coal plants than other countries. We will not reduce the carbon footprint we will only relocate it. CT is a very long way off from having the proper infrastructure and the cost to implement will be astronomical. I would expect CT will need to implement new taxes and allow utilities to increase their rates significantly to facilitate this grand plan. The notion that the people should be made to suffer economically to placate a delusion that banning ICE cars in the NE is going to change the trajectory of the climate is beyond irresponsible. The Mayan leaders thought they could alter the climate and their plan involved human sacrifice. CT's plan is not as bloody but it's the same concept only we will all be sacrificed on the alter of the Climate God. Logically, if we can change the climate we should devote our resources to develop truly effective technology and mitigation efforts now and deal with the climate when we are better equipped and it won't bankrupt out society. This legislation that is being proposed by politicians who have ZERO accountability has all of the earmarks to be an economic and logistical nightmare for the citizens. With that, I would propose that rather than be the little guy trying to keep up with the big boys on the block CT take a leadership role and propose a hybrid requirement rather than a complete ban on ICEs. Hybrids would be a compromise that can cover a lot of bases. Less need for infrastructure, more economical, less resource intensive, more reliable. The way things are going with this ideological climate

fanaticism I fear our fate is running right behind that of the Mayans so I beg CT not be a mindless follower and think about the people who live in the state. I'm less concerned because I have resources and can easily relocate, others are not as lucky. Best Regards, Bill

Comment ID: 135

First Name: Janet

Last Name: LaForgia

Commenter Email: laforgiaj@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Retired

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 06:25:47 PM

Comment:

Name: LaForgia, Janet Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I vehemently oppose to having any level of government getting involved with the common citizen. I like my Honda that is 12 years old and will continue to drive it as long as it runs. Stay out of my life government.

Comment ID: 136

First Name: Doreen

Last Name: Hewston

Commenter Email: Audetd66@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 06:29:42 PM

Comment:

Name: Hewston , Doreen Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not support regulations that ban gas powered vehicles period. The electric grid cannot take the additional load there are inadequate numbers of charging facilities- the electric rate in the state of CT is ridiculous and this would significantly effect the affordability of living in this already highly regulated and taxed state

Comment ID: 137

First Name: Denise

Last Name: Roberts

Commenter Email: dbr235@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 07:08:45 PM

Comment:

Name: Roberts, Denise Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is the type of legislation we need to SAVE OUR PLANET. The oil industry needs to go to the back of the line. We need electric, solar, or natural gas to power our cars and trucks. We need more trains, and an emphasis on mass transit.

Comment ID: 138

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Medina

Commenter Email: rickgmedina@me.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 07:16:35 PM

Comment:

Name: Medina, Richard Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We know you don't care about the people and how this will effect the poor working class of Connecticut. You want to us to believe that electric cars are clean but the truth is that they are not. Mining for battery materials is a dirty business and it is done by exploiting the poorest people in the world and through slave labor. Stop with all the virtue signaling and leave us alone.

Comment ID: 139

First Name: Matt

Last Name: Catalano

Commenter Email: Mcatalano3@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Catalano, Matt Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is not necessary! There is plenty of clean energy resources to protect our environment. Please don't destroy our environment w a bunch of dead batteries.

Comment ID: 140

First Name: Georgia

Last Name: Falk

Commenter Email: wffalk@msn.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 07:44:33 PM

Comment:

Name: Falk, Georgia Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric energy is not as "clean" as you think it is. What do we do with worn out batteries? Chromium is being mined in Africa, BY China, causing environmental damage. How much will it cost to "fill up" at a recharging station? What are the generating plants who give us electric power to run these vehicles, using for fuel to generate? We are definitely not ready for electric vehicles. This whole concept of Green Energy in 2035 is a pie in the sky theory, generated by left wing Democrats who don't have a clue.

Comment ID: 141

First Name: andrew

Last Name: iorio

Commenter Email: mister_i_1999@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 08:01:16 PM

Comment:

Name: iorio, andrew Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I agree with banning gas and diesel new car sales. I assume hybrids are still sold. The technology is not available yet for Tractor trailer trucks to be viable as pure electrics. The battery drainage is to steep for commercial viability. so I am not in favor of restricting gas trucks yet.

Comment ID: 142

First Name: Jared

Last Name: Siraco

Commenter Email: jared.siraco@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 08:06:44 PM

Comment:

Name: Siraco, Jared Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support the banning gas powered vehicles for both commuter and commercial. I think commercial should be banned starting 2028 with a steep \$2,000 fee per vehicle per occurrence assessed for non compliance. Residents should be allowed until 2030 and an annual fee for gas should be assessed starting in 2030. \$100 annually for 2030-2035. Increase fee for residents using a gas vehicle by \$100 annually to 2045. All funds raised should be locked for use on upgrading renewable electric infrastructure or high speed rail from Hartford/New Haven to NYC or Boston

Comment ID: 143

First Name: John

Last Name: Turnier

Commenter Email: drjohn_us@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 08:10:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Turnier, John Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Significant surcharges on new gas-powered cars after 2035 might be a better inducement than an outright ban

Comment ID: 144

First Name: Domenic

Last Name: Forcella

Commenter Email: twblus@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: tax payer

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 08:13:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Forcella, Domenic Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 when are EVs going to pay for using the roads?

Comment ID: 145

First Name: Dan

Last Name: Overholt

Commenter Email: danielo@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 08:22:16 PM

Comment:

Name: Overholt, Dan Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I highly doubt that the automotive industry will be ready to fully convert to producing electric vehicles by 2035, considering that many automakers are struggling to produce more than a handful of EVs now. Most EVs that are currently being produced are often luxury vehicles that are out of the price range for the average Connecticut resident. Even if this transition was somehow possible, the public charging infrastructure in Connecticut for these vehicles will probably not be fully available. While this is a noble goal, it's ultimately one that will likely end up taking years longer than promised.

Comment ID: 146**First Name:** Alan**Last Name:** Peck**Commenter Email:** alanhpeck@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 08:44:01 PM**Comment:**

Name: Peck, Alan Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposition is unrealistic in nature, and completely arbitrary. Stop playing politics, and generate a stepped approach with a realistic timeline. All you have to do is add tax disincentives and this issue will take care of itself.

Comment ID: 147**First Name:** Jeff**Last Name:** Roginielewicz**Commenter Email:** jprog7@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 08:49:16 PM**Comment:**

Name: Roginielewicz, Jeff Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I just want to say that this push to stop the sale of ICE vehicles by 2035 is idiotic. Our grid won't support it and we need to source these raw materials from slave labor in the Congo. This is nothing more than CT's idiotic follow California lack of logic where we merely outsource our emissions to a natural gas or coal power plant. Are there any feasibility studies or is this just another way to control the population by forcing them to buy soulless appliances to drive. Stop forcing my purchasing decisions or I will leave this state and take my tax dollars with me.

Comment ID: 148**First Name:** Robert**Last Name:** Vogel**Commenter Email:** vogelrl@gmx.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** retired**Commenter Title:** Mr.**Posted Date:** 08/09/23 08:51:03 PM**Comment:**

Name: Vogel, Robert Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Republicans are well-paid by the fossil fuel industry to support climate denial. They don't want you to trust your own eyes: fires, heat, smoke, storms, drought, loss of biodiversity, melting glaciers, loss of arctic ice, rising sea levels. The kids will face a hostile planet. Republicans are not ?pro-life?, they are pro-money. <https://www.monbiot.com/2023/08/08/running-amoc/>
<https://gopiswrong.net/environment.htm>

Comment ID: 149**First Name:** paul**Last Name:** pruchnik**Commenter Email:** paulrp@earthlink.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/09/23 09:04:34 PM

Comment:

Name: pruchnik, paul Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please ban gasoline vehicles as soon as possible

Comment ID: 150

First Name: maria

Last Name: edelson

Commenter Email: maria.edelson@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 09:35:18 PM

Comment:

Name: edelson, maria Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am 100% against Advanced Clean Cars II. We as a country and in CT will not prepared for this in 2035. The financial impact for many individuals and family will be a tremendous hardship. Although 2035 sounds 'far away' it will be here quickly and we will not have the electric grid to support this nor will families be able to afford the transition when it comes time to buy a new electric car. STOP THIS REGULATION

Comment ID: 151

First Name: Amy

Last Name: Williams

Commenter Email: amyclairewilliams@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 09:41:50 PM

Comment:

Name: Williams, Amy Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My concerns with adopting these regulations are the unintended consequences of the proposed bans and the impact they will have on residents and businesses, as well as the financial implications these policies would have on those who are already grappling with costs associated with living in one of the nation's most energy-expensive states. A 2035 ban on the sales of all gas-powered passenger vehicles is just 12-years away.... I've seen no evidence that Connecticut will be ready to accommodate this aggressive timeline. A simple promise that our already-vulnerable electrical grid?and ratepayers?will be ready to absorb this seismic policy change is pure ideological fantasy.

Comment ID: 152

First Name: Caroll

Last Name: Cyr

Commenter Email: cjsc@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/09/23 10:14:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Cyr, Caroll Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't think this bill is in the best interest of the state of CT or any other state. The complication would put weight the benefits of such a decision. 2035 seems like a long way away but will come very quickly. I think this decision will cripple our economy both private and corporate. I would humbly request that this bill be voted against. Caroll Cyr

Comment ID: 153

First Name: Gary

Last Name: Smith

Commenter Email: Smithgarylee@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Gary L. Smith. LLC

Commenter Title: Founder

Posted Date: 08/09/23 10:56:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Smith, Gary Submission Date: 8/9/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The State of Connecticut should not support the ban on gas vehicles starting in 2035 for many reasons. The major reasons that are of concern to me are: 1. The price of electric vehicles is too high and the batteries have proven to be unsafe. 2. We do not have the electrical infrastructure to support charging electric vehicles 3. Studies have shown that electric vehicles cost more to operate than gas vehicles. 4. The environmental concerns with the production of lithium batteries have a greater impact on the carbon footprint than staying with gas vehicles. 5. China and India are the highest carbon contributors in the world. The United States contributes less than 5% of the carbon footprint.

Comment ID: 154

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Schaper

Commenter Email: Rgilschaper@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 12:19:06 AM

Comment:

Name: Schaper, Robert Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Thank you for finally doing something to combat climate change. We should have been making changes like this decades ago.

Comment ID: 155

First Name:

Last Name:

Commenter Email:

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 06:35:56 AM

Comment:

Name: , Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject:
Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Regarding ban on sales of gas autos. Very bad idea. We have family members in 5 states. Some elderly. How do we get to them when they are in need? We cannot depend on the government to protect our borders, should we now ask the government to give us ride to see our family members?

Comment ID: 156

First Name: Patricia

Last Name: Norman

Commenter Email: TricsterN@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 06:38:24 AM

Comment:

Name: Norman, Patricia Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 the document was unclear re: what zero-

emissions vehicles will be allowed. Does this banning of gas powered vehicles mean that all new sales will be electric? Has there been any research re: the safe disposal and long-term impacts of the batteries from said electric vehicles? Will they, too, be added to landfills? Buried as we have done with nuclear waste? The fires from these vehicles takes easily 10x more water and resources to extinguish than gas or diesel-powered vehicles; they burn hotter and unless there is a threat to the area structures, people, etc. they may be observed rather than extinguished. Question regarding the need for charging stations be they private or commercial and the impact those will have. In the instance of severe weather and widespread and extensive power outages (even consider the macroburst that hit the area a few years ago), how will individuals be able to utilize a vehicle that relies on the power grid? Can the grid handle it? What will the costs be to improve it when even in summer heatwaves, citizens are asked to not utilize air conditioning, etc. during specific times of the day, if possible, to lessen the impact on the existing grid? Why, instead of adopting the California codes, doesn't Connecticut invest in the production of hydrogen vehicles? No emissions, byproduct is water.... something to think about. Let's be on the forefront of an industry for a change.

Comment ID: 157

First Name: JULIE

Last Name: Flood

Commenter Email: julie@farmersandcooks.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: 06777

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 06:40:19 AM

Comment:

Name: Flood, JULIE Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Advanced "Clean Cars II" sure it sound incredible but this plan to push electric is not ideal. The Batteries being used in these electric vehicles have there own set of problems and environment risks. We need to do more research and do better then just relying on the electrical grid to fix our problems - slow this down and make these companies to all the necessary safety studies and regs. This is not the answer. <https://emfacademy.com/emf-radiation-in-cars/>

Comment ID: 158

First Name: Patricia

Last Name: McCusker

Commenter Email: inwood52877@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 06:57:43 AM

Comment:

Name: McCusker, Patricia Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Before adding more regulations, kindly provide reliable and verified information regarding these known issues: Car fire! Affordability to the middle class (without adding taxpayer assistance) Cost to install & maintain charging stations. Who will bear the cost? Availability & reliability of these charging stations? How many miles will the battery provide? Time it will take to recharge? Cost to replace the battery pack? Where will these cars & batteries end up at the end of their life?

Comment ID: 159

First Name: Margaret

Last Name: Ziolkowski

Commenter Email: ziol13@sbeglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 07:06:07 AM

Comment:

Name: Ziolkowski, Margaret Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a ridiculous proposal! Our energy grid can't handle this. It can barely handle the draw of energy on it now! Also, EV's are extremely expensive to average American's, hard to insure and are not as reliable a gas powered! Why does CT copycat everything California does? Look at what California has turned into? Think for yourself for once CT!

Comment ID: 160

First Name: Dana

Last Name: Place

Commenter Email: danasplace3@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 07:20:30 AM

Comment:

Name: Place, Dana Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am totally against the idea.

Comment ID: 161

First Name: Elbert

Last Name: Smith

Commenter Email: al.esmith@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: retired

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 07:45:03 AM

Comment:

Name: Smith, Elbert Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am concerned with the proposed law to end the sale of gas-powered cars by 2035. How can we be assured there will be adequate and convenient charging stations across CT? Where is the guarantee these vehicles will have more than a 300-400 mile range on a charge? What is the cost of a charge per mile vs gas powered car per mile?

Comment ID: 162

First Name: Cathy

Last Name: Wesoly

Commenter Email: Cwesoly@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: RN

Posted Date: 08/10/23 07:50:59 AM

Comment:

Name: Wesoly, Cathy Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like you to know that I am not in favor of legislation mandating the sale of electric vehicles ever! In 2035, 12 years from now and this is slated to go through. I will be 80 years old and not able to afford to purchase one of these vehicles. We will be lucky if we have Social Security in 12 years the way this country is going please make it optional, if anything. Also look into the utilities legislation. The cost of electricity is forever going up, who will be able to afford to charge a vehicle from their home. There will not be enough chargers at this rate, and with rolling blackouts like we're having now there won't be enough electricity to charge these vehicles. You can't recycle these batteries and if a car catches on fire, you can't even put them out. What is the point?

Comment ID: 163

First Name: Chris

Last Name: Darco

Commenter Email: chris.darco@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Person

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:01:15 AM

Comment:

Name: Darco, Chris Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Eliminating gas vehicles in the state of CT would be a catastrophe for all low and middle income people. People who live in CT cities, will not have easy access, if at all, to charging stations. Also, the cost of electricity in CT is outrageous, and forcing everyone to go electric will only cause electricity rates to increase substantially, again impacting low and middle income people. Not to mention the actual HIGH cost of electric vehicles. Please do NOT proceed with this legislation as it will greatly impact low and middle income people in an extremely negative way. Please think of ALL the people of CT and their financial well being. Thank you, Chris DARco

Comment ID: 164

First Name: John

Last Name: Clancy

Commenter Email: jtmpclancy@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Clancy, John Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It seems to be premature to ban gasoline or diesel powered vehicles because the infrastructure to support all electric vehicles is lacking. It is unrealistic to expect people to have to wait 1/2 to 1 hour in the midst of a journey to charge their vehicles. It is also unrealistic to support all electric vehicles until charging stations become as plentiful or more so than gasoline stations are now. Also our current electric grid has trouble supporting the demand for electricity for our regular uses so how can it possibly support the added demand by electric vehicles? Thank you for listening.

Comment ID: 165

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Morganti

Commenter Email: chrisjanm@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: NA

Commenter Title: NA

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:07:39 AM

Comment:

Name: Morganti, Christopher Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Sec. 22a-174-36d. Low Emission Vehicle IV Program and Advanced Clean Cars II. I wish to comment on the above proposed change in CT regulations. I believe this is serious government overreach. California standards should not be CT standards. I hope and pray that our CT elected leaders will not endorse this proposed change. Forcing this type of regulation will cause a wholesale change in state representation in future elections. Thank you.

Comment ID: 166

First Name: Dorothy

Last Name: Prata

Commenter Email: dprata@hprata.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:12:07 AM

Comment:

Name: Prata, Dorothy Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think banning sales of new gas powered vehicles is a great idea and the timeline more than reasonable. There has been a lot of innovation in the non-fossil fuel powered market that is bringing the prices down. I think what I would also like to see is tolls (which are essentially a usage fee) that could bring in revenue from outside of the state. The funds raised could be put towards roads and infrastructure, including helping service stations convert.

Comment ID: 167

First Name: Maria

Last Name: Evans

Commenter Email: mmjjevans@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Resident

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:13:29 AM

Comment:

Name: Evans, Maria Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No. Simply no to any mandate that eliminates gas and diesel vehicles. The environmental impacts in the Congo along with child slave labor is appalling. To deny it is irresponsible. Our electric grid is outdated and in desperate need of upgrades. Every winter Eversource has the possibility of rolling black outs. The grid can't handle a long cold stretch that would require more electricity. This is all verifiable through Eversource. Those who support this are living under the illusion that electric is better. The financial impacts on families would be devastating. Connecticut families continue to struggle to feed their family. The need for heat assistance during the winter months continues to rise year after year. Only the well-to-do could afford this change. The rest of us will be walking. This proposal is an attempt to test the waters, what will Connecticut residents tolerate? how far can we push this? I am here to tell you it won't be tolerated.

Comment ID: 168

First Name: William and Regina

Last Name: Kowenhoven

Commenter Email: Kowenhoven@atlanticbb.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Kowenhoven, William and Regina Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Who will be able to afford EV? They are currently very high priced. The electricity to charge the batteries comes from fossil fuel. So what advantage are these vehicles?? Is China converting wholeheartedly to EV's? The parts and insurance further increase the cost of ownership. Only the wealthy will be able to afford EV's. Your committee needs to thoroughly investigate all of these issues.

Comment ID: 169

First Name: Edith

Last Name: Platt

Commenter Email: eviesculpts@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Thomaston Housing Authority

Commenter Title: Director

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:25:56 AM

Comment:

Name: Platt, Edith Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I disagree with forcing electric vehicles on everyone. To make the batteries it takes the worst type of mining for the environment. There is no way to dispose of the batteries that is good for the environment. I don't believe that the electric grids can handle the usage this would require. If there is a heat crisis or freezing cold how will everyone be able to heat or cool their homes? Do they have to make the choice of going to work or heating/cooling their homes? Think before doing!!!!

Comment ID: 170

First Name: ANTHONY

Last Name: Cantele

Commenter Email: tocant@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: American Independent

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Cantele, ANTHONY Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I vehemently oppose the Advanced Clean Cars II regulations. They are typical of regulations proposed by unelected bureaucrats that will crush CT's economy and is impractical to electrical support systems. Are taxpayers paying for charging systems in every home in the State? These regulations will continue the march toward socialist systems being taught in our public & private schools that destroy individual rights and move us away from our capitalist system. I favor putting electric vehicles into the open, unsubsidized marketplace and allowing that to determine what we drive - not the DEEP!

Comment ID: 171

First Name: Fred

Last Name: Knurly

Commenter Email: RigUSA@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:59:07 AM

Comment:

Name: Knurly, Fred Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I believe the current requirements are strict enough. I will always need a full size SUV or pick up the burns gas for my business.

Comment ID: 172

First Name: Stephen

Last Name: Wasseluk

Commenter Email: swasseluk@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: 06013

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:59:13 AM

Comment:

Name: Wasseluk, Stephen Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Totally against this proposal ... seems to me like Socialism and another reason to leave Connecticut...

Comment ID: 173

First Name: Dino

Last Name: DePellegrini

Commenter Email: depelle43@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 09:09:51 AM**Comment:**

Name: DePellegrini, Dino Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposed regulation is absurd. The CT electrical grid will NOT be ready to support 100% electric vehicles purchased by 2035. The cost of electricity in CT is already outrageous and implementing this regulation will result in even higher electricity costs.

Comment ID: 174**First Name:** James**Last Name:** Hedtke**Commenter Email:** jhedtke@curtisswright.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 10:07:45 AM**Comment:**

Name: Hedtke, James Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am completely against setting a time line for electric vehicles in Connecticut. There is no infrastructure to support electric vehicles. We don't have the raw materials to produce all of the batteries necessary to power these vehicles.

Comment ID: 175**First Name:** Christine**Last Name:** O'Neill**Commenter Email:** christinedoneill@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Individual**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 10:14:13 AM**Comment:**

Name: O'Neill, Christine Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We must ban gasoline cars as soon as possible to mitigate the climate crisis. The concerns surrounding range anxiety and lack of infrastructure are overblown - the average length of a commute in CT falls below the national average, 26 minutes. That is well within the range of a vehicle that is charged at home. Yes, we still need to ramp up investment in infrastructure, but can we phase that in with a hybrid requirement along the way? Please do not fall victim to the lobbying of the multi billion dollar automotive industry; we need electric cars on our roads as soon as possible, and we need to reduce the cost so that they are affordable for all. I think the exemptions listed in the proposed legislation are appropriate, though I have some fear of loopholes.

Comment ID: 176**First Name:** Heather**Last Name:** Danaher**Commenter Email:** nvrkno@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** none**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 10:21:54 AM**Comment:**

Name: Danaher, Heather Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 How exactly will we supply electricity to charge all of these vehicles especially during peak demand hours? With over 60% of our current electricity being produced by fossil fuels will the ban of internal combustion engines produce a significant reduction in greenhouse gases? This

combined with a significant electricity distribution problem, this legislation is not in the public's best interest. Connecticut could consider making all government owned vehicles including school buses electric before forcing the public to buy new electric vehicles that we may not be able to drive for lack of electricity. California passes a lot of questionable legislation. I hope our Legislators can think for themselves. Please do not support this legislation.

Comment ID: 177

First Name: Lyra

Last Name: Fiske

Commenter Email: lyrafsk@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 10:39:05 AM

Comment:

Name: Fiske, Lyra Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have a minority opinion in this part of CT: I am FOR this proposal. We have 12 years to get our act together in combatting climate change and reversing damage to the environment. Transitioning from internal combustion engines to EVs is something we should have started a long time ago. If it were up to me, I would take it a step further to see if recalls can be done and existing vehicles with ICEs could be converted to being EVs.

Comment ID: 178

First Name: Edmond

Last Name: Mone

Commenter Email: emone@thomastonct.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Municipality

Commenter Title: First Selectman

Posted Date: 08/10/23 10:45:24 AM

Comment:

Name: Mone, Edmond Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have great concern regarding the prohibition of gasoline powered cars being sold new after 2035 as well as delivery trucks. My concern is twofold. It is assumed that the public can afford to purchase electric vehicles. These vehicles generally cost more to purchase than a comparable gas powered vehicle, thereby potentially placing them out of reach to the general public. The even larger issue is the ability of grid to provide the necessary electric power that will be required to fuel these vehicles. The grid is currently over tasked now in the summer months to keep pace with demand. The ability to bring hydro-power from Canada has been difficult to achieve at best. I question the ability of off shore wind turbines and solar to fill the increased need that an all electric fleet will create. While your goals may be considered admirable, reality says otherwise.

Comment ID: 179

First Name: Pamela J

Last Name: Root

Commenter Email: pammyroot@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Community Systems, Inc.

Commenter Title: Administrative Assistant

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Root, Pamela J Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I object to the mandatory regulation due to go into effect in 2035. I am a divorced senior citizen still working because I can't afford to retire in my home state. I used my car to go to and from work and purchased it in 2015 after having my previous car for 18 years. I cannot afford to purchase an electric vehicle nor can I afford the charging station to be installed at my home. My current electric

bill is anywhere between \$275.00 - \$350.00 each month now. Where we live we have had continuous power outages throughout my 48 years of living here. It is not that I am against clean energy but I really don't think the powers that be have thoroughly thought of the impact it will have on people like me. In addition, what is happening to the freedom our veterans have fought so hard for us to keep?? In the United States of America, we should have the freedom to choose what kind of car we drive or don't drive. I slowly see where all of the freedoms are being eroded away from us. This is not America! Maintain our freedom! We have a beautiful state let us remember that we are leaders in CT not followers!

Comment ID: 180

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Boucher

Commenter Email: susanmbavon@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 10:54:47 AM

Comment:

Name: Boucher, Susan Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is absurd and controlling every aspect of our lives has to end. Electric vehicles should be a choice. I have heard more horror stories from actual owners of these electric vehicles. What about the batteries that burn up and also stay in the landfill forever. I vote NO NO NO

Comment ID: 181

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Steinman

Commenter Email: jennifermorin_5@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 10:55:30 AM

Comment:

Name: Steinman, Jennifer Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 You cannot force or mandate people to buy electric cars. There needs to be a long term study on the disposal of the batteries and panels. They will be a larger pollutant to our soils and water supply than emissions into the air by gas powered vehicles.

Comment ID: 182

First Name: Carol

Last Name: Longo

Commenter Email: clpl0958@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 10:56:42 AM

Comment:

Name: Longo, Carol Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I believe this is a poor idea. I have concerns that this would impact us all financially! We are all suffering the consequences of this administration the past couple years. The cost is going up on everything for us, yet money is wasted on countries that hate us, instead of helping us here in the U.S. Connecticut is one of the most expensive states for us retired elderly to live in as it is. Electricity is expensive as it is and we should have a choice as to what type of car we drive. I thought America was a free country that we citizens can make our own choices??

Comment ID: 183

First Name: Joseph

Last Name: Maglio

Commenter Email: j.maglio@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 11:00:26 AM

Comment:

Name: Maglio, Joseph Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think the state will eventually drive most of its hard working tax payers away with this ridiculous law. Have they considered the hardships to all its residents and company owners? Not to mention, this states power grid is not ready for electric vehicles. How about serious incentives to car pool or to buy smaller hybrid gasoline / electric cars to start? Who dreams up with these ridiculous ideas?

Comment ID: 184

First Name: Paul

Last Name: Etzel

Commenter Email: nvrkno@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Etzel, Paul Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Forcing Connecticut Residents to purchase electric vehicles poses challenges not yet considered. First Responders need training and resources to deal with these vehicles. Cutting an occupant out of an EV after a collision is very dangerous to both the occupant and the Volunteer Fire Department. Even though both gas powered and Electric cars can catch fire after a collision, the current advise to fire departments is to let the EV burn. Conventional fire suppressant equipment is ineffective and the volume of water it takes to put out an EV fire is not always available. One would have thought this would have been considered before letting EV's on the road, let alone setting a deadline by which we all need to buy one. Until better safety equipment is developed and installed Connecticut should not pass this legislation.

Comment ID: 185

First Name: Bernadette

Last Name: Dostaler

Commenter Email: bdostaler5@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 11:39:17 AM

Comment:

Name: Dostaler, Bernadette Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Office of the Secretary of State, I am writing to express my disagreement with the proposed regulation(s) to ban gas powered cars in CT. While I support efforts to decrease pollution I do not think electric vehicles is the way to go as stated here: (1) electric vehicles are too expensive for the average person and retirees (of which I am one), (2) electric vehicles are extremely expensive to repair and the financial burden of owning one is crushing, (3) electric vehicles are very heavy and are incredibly dangerous in car crashes. I shudder to think what traffic fatalities will be like, the number of accidents and injuries is already terrible, (4) it is impractical to own an electric vehicle -- it takes too long to charge, and while I know there is a push to build more charging stations there isn't any guarantee as to where one will be available, and there is still the problem that it takes too long to charge, (5) electricity is extremely expensive in CT, charging car batteries at home will be very expensive, (6) the structure of electric vehicles is concerning, the batteries use rare earth minerals which are expensive and difficult to mine -- and also only found in limited areas on earth, the current idea to try to mine beneath the ocean floor for rare minerals is crazy - now we will destroy another environment that is already stressed, (7) the disposal of electric batteries is an environmental hazard. All in all, a

better way than electric cars needs to be utilized to power vehicles. Is it possible to further reduce the actual amount of fossil fuels used in gas mixtures for vehicles/continue to increase mpg? What are other sources of fuel besides electricity? Many have jumped on the electric car band wagon without really understanding the consequences. Putting the huge financial burden, and immense inconvenience of owning an electric car, on citizens , especially those who are not super rich, is a terrible idea. The proposed regulations are also a huge overreach of government. The state should not be telling me what sort of car to buy. (I am not an anti-government person but the proposed regulations are terrible.) I hope the state will come to its senses and stop this huge mistake immediately. Thank you, Bernadette Dostaler

Comment ID: 186

First Name: Ned

Last Name: Simpson

Commenter Email: neds2124@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 11:40:42 AM

Comment:

Name: Simpson, Ned Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 IT's great to see CT stepping up to the need to move to EV. Other states and other countries are committed to this step too. I hope that DEEP has looked to conform CT regulation with other states regulations

Comment ID: 187

First Name: Kara

Last Name: Vizard

Commenter Email: kara.vizardlpn@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: CT Nurses Association

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 11:42:01 AM

Comment:

Name: Vizard, Kara Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric cars are not feasible for every family. There are not enough affordable options for the normal middle class family to chose from. Our family has 3 small children and we need to have a larger vehicle to fit 3 car seats. There is no market for electric cars in this size and what is currently available is completely out of our budget. Our electric rates have doubled, our property taxes have doubled, our grocery costs have doubled, our childcare costs have increased with no end in site to the increases. With all of that compounding we couldn't make a \$60,000 electric vehicle work in our budget in a million years. There has not been much progress in electric vehicle creation and production in the past 10 years so I don't see much more progress being made in the next 10 years by 2035 without a solid plan in place for this. It is concerning that the government feels that they can regulate something as personal as what vehicle a person choses to drive.

Comment ID: 188

First Name: drew

Last Name: zottola

Commenter Email: tavolo5556@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: zottola, drew Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am not for this

Comment ID: 189**First Name:** Joe**Last Name:** Bosco**Commenter Email:** mrbjr104@lycos.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 11:58:44 AM**Comment:**

Name: Bosco, Joe Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please keep up resistance to E vehicle regulations by the Government. If E vehicles are so attractive and practical then market forces will determine if gas vehicles will disappear. I am sick and tired of government officials telling me what is "good" for me.

Comment ID: 190**First Name:** Jon**Last Name:** Orris**Commenter Email:** jorris39@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 12:14:35 PM**Comment:**

Name: Orris, Jon Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is an absolutely insane and irresponsible initiative at this point in time. The infrastructure to support electric vehicles is probably decades away from functioning at a level capable of supporting a huge e-car population. What about the already taxed electric supply in CT? I propose doing things in a logical step-wise process. Develop and actually build the infrastructure needed and assure you have the electricity available at a manageable cost then proceed with legislation. Also, such a mandate will be essentially pointless in the effort to curb global warming and will kill future business and manufacturing growth in CT if not implemented on a much broader regional, multi-state basis.

Comment ID: 191**First Name:** Norman**Last Name:** Bulakites**Commenter Email:** nbulakitesjr@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 12:23:50 PM**Comment:**

Name: Bulakites, Norman Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please start voting like a Republican and vote to eliminate unnecessary taxes on cars trucks and fuel. All this is going to do is make the cost of living in this state higher. We are getting to the point you are either on welfare or extremely rich

Comment ID: 192**First Name:** David**Last Name:** Cassidy**Commenter Email:** davcas1@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 01:05:57 PM**Comment:**

Name: Cassidy, David Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Allow the people to dictate the market for automobiles and not the government. Electric cars are worse for the environment than any gas or diesel powered vehicle. From lithium-ion batteries to the electric grid, forcing electric cars on Connecticut consumers is ill advised, blindly guided, and more polluting. Lithium has to be extracted from the Earth ? the waste here alone mitigates any possible benefits. How do you dispose of or recycle the batteries? The electric power grid can?t handle a hot summer day with a/c?s running how do you expect to handle 10?s of thousands new electric cars? Do we plan on producing more electricity by burning coal? Natural gas? Building another nuclear power plant? The short sidedness of this proposal screams a lack of intelligence or a lock stepped fixation on so called ?climate change?. Don?t proceed with this proposal and allow the citizens to manage the free market. The government has no business trying to.

Comment ID: 193

First Name: Pete

Last Name: Volkmar

Commenter Email: pvolkmar@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 01:15:08 PM

Comment:

Name: Volkmar, Pete Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a terrible idea, not based on fully accepted science! Please do not vote for it! We are NOT California. If the idea is to harm everyday Connecticut residents, this will do it better than anything you have enacted in the last 100-years. Please don't do it!

Comment ID: 194

First Name: Edgar

Last Name: Jalbert

Commenter Email: edjal@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 01:23:10 PM

Comment:

Name: Jalbert, Edgar Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Do not ban Gasoline powered cars by 2035. to many other things to take into consideration, battery Mfg.in China. our power grid ect.

Comment ID: 195

First Name: Antoinette

Last Name: Lenkowski

Commenter Email: Natlenko@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Retired

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 01:47:41 PM

Comment:

Name: Lenkowski , Antoinette Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I?m in total agreement with you. DEEP is short sighted in these matters. We seen no evidence that the power companies can keep up with the demands this kind of legislation would demand. As is is the power companies struggle to keep up with what they provide, let alone provide the kind of power needed to power all vehicle, including truck that haul tons. We have resources that would provide energy for our country and we find reasons not to use them. Now we are finding information that is proving solar an even worse source of pollution to our nation. Let us make wise decision for all.

Do we want to plummet our nation into oblivion. Great that some want to use electric cars, not all believe in them, so don't make me be forced to. Don't we live in the land of the free? seems to be a fallacy these days. Don't have a power outage after 2035. What would we do?

Comment ID: 196

First Name: guthrie

Last Name: dinda

Commenter Email: busybeewood@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 02:08:37 PM

Comment:

Name: dinda, guthrie Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 CT does not need to follow California in becoming an impossible to afford! Making these insane rules will push even more people out of this state. Let the market drive transportation, ICE will be here for the long term.

Comment ID: 197

First Name: Bob

Last Name: Maziuk

Commenter Email: BobMaziuk@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Homeowner

Commenter Title: Owner

Posted Date: 08/10/23 02:32:18 PM

Comment:

Name: Maziuk, Bob Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The Ban of gas powered cars is premature and an over reaching. This should not be made law, especially since the infrastructure is not yet in place to support this. It will also create another monopoly for the already out of control electric power industry and leave residents without an alternative option when the electric company raises its rates, which PURA doesn't seem to have any control over.

Comment ID: 199

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Smith

Commenter Email: MSmith0708@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 02:32:34 PM

Comment:

Name: Smith, Michael Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The state of CT is not California, nor will it ever be. To adopt a regulation that would eliminate the sale of new gas powered passenger cars by 2035 is foolish at best, and that's the nice way to put it. Electric vehicles are not only impractical for normal day to day life for the average person but are more environmentally destructive than a vehicle powered by gas, where do you propose we dispose of all the batteries that will be worn out after 3 years? Furthermore, the majority of electricity in CT is generated by natural gas, a fossil fuel, so you're only shifting the green house gas emission from the car to the power generator. The cost of said energy is already ridiculously high, and only going to increase. To require families to submit to this kind of bad legislation is to drive them into the poor house, the cost of the car, replacement every 3-4 years, and the cost to charge it. I submit that the DEEP and state of CT Switch all vehicles to electric immediately and re-evaluate this ridiculous idea after a 2 year period. But my guess is nobody wants to be stuck on 95 in a snow storm watching their battery deplete, because the plow truck cant get to them because its battery wont work in the

cold. Does anyone remember the fire on the state owned electric bus? You know the one that prompted them to switch the fleet back to diesel? If this doesn't scream bad idea I don't know what does.

Comment ID: 200

First Name: thomas

Last Name: lane

Commenter Email: tomlane39@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: CLassic Car Clubs

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 02:39:14 PM

Comment:

Name: lane, thomas Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I Disagree with this regulation. There are too many unknowns at this point in time. Are there any savings (dollars and pollution) to owners and/or state? Battery technology is not good enough. How do I make long distance trips to relatives? Will infrastructure (Charging stations) be adequate? What will costs and time be for charging? Cars will be so complicated that very few people will be able to service them.

Comment ID: 201

First Name: Sean

Last Name: Hannan

Commenter Email: Nicklovesjesus04@protonmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 02:43:12 PM

Comment:

Name: Hannan, Sean Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't want World Economic Forum communist-style laws/regulations that prohibit a specific kind of vehicle or vehicle part. "Climate change" is a lie, and the ideological "scientists" are not looking for truth. These "scientists" have changed their lies time and time again. The fact is, when you "get it wrong" so many times and tell us lies like "we will be dead in 10 years" all the time and nothing happens, and you never start telling anyone you have been wrong on countless things in the past and to take their findings with massive grains of salt, then you have no credibility. We were told that we would have an ice age, acid rain, global warming, deadly holes in the ozone, warming and cooling at the same time, mass death from no food, no more ice caps, mass death, and none of that happened, and sometimes the opposite has occurred. Recently, a Nobel Prize winner for physics named Dr. John Clauser claimed that there is no climate crisis, and then he was canceled to speak at a conference, and that shows they don't want opposition. Climate change activists never want opposition to their communist Trojan horse. Remember, China doesn't care about the climate because they are already communists. The last thing is that this is about socialist control, they want us to only use government public transit because owning cars, especially ones without batteries made with slave labor in China with material mined in less than "green" conditions, gives us independence from the government for travel. WEF did say that we would own nothing and be happy, so let's not do that.

Comment ID: 202

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Stephens

Commenter Email: richstephens4@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: fl687597-c195-4162-b49a-37b702e3352d

Posted Date: 08/10/23 02:45:58 PM

Comment:

Name: Stephens, Richard Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am totally opposed to a ban on gas powered cars and / or trucks .

Comment ID: 203

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Giannettino

Commenter Email: rmgsshooters@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Mr

Posted Date: 08/10/23 02:55:14 PM

Comment:

Name: Giannettino, Richard Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is absurd. This will put hundreds of thousands (maybe millions) of people out of work! the welfare costs will be astronomical. To what are you planning on converting? Electric cars? There isn't enough electricity now to meet current (no pun intended) needs. Let's get real, shall we?

Comment ID: 204

First Name: Anna

Last Name: greco

Commenter Email: sunrisehc01@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 02:57:17 PM

Comment:

Name: greco, Anna Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 What the government is proposing is impractical and training to control, every part of our lives.

Comment ID: 205

First Name: Edward

Last Name: Banach

Commenter Email: ejjba@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:04:55 PM

Comment:

Name: Banach, Edward Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am Totally against this bill to stop selling gas powered cars and trucks by 2035. Electric vehicles are full of problems with no answers for. How are you going to charge all these cars when we don't have enough electricity. what do you do with the batteries when they go bad.No one has an answer for this. Also these vehicles don't work as well in cold weather. This is a bad idea that will just get worse. Edward Banach

Comment ID: 206

First Name: Joseph

Last Name: Laggis

Commenter Email: Joseph.A.Laggis.Jr@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None

Commenter Title: Resident

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:16:08 PM

Comment:

Name: Laggis, Joseph Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My name is Joe Laggis, and I have been a resident of Naugatuck for the last ~35 years. I am writing this note to voice my strong opposition to the proposed regulation Sec. 22a-174-36d. Low Emission Vehicle IV Program and Advanced Clean Cars II. Outlawing gas powered vehicles is not in the best interest of Connecticut residents. I am not a proponent of modeling laws after a state like California which is in total disarray. Typically, I would not involve myself in state political issues, but I don't want to stand by and watch our state deteriorate in front of me. These sorts of matters will only drive long-tenured Connecticut residents out of our state. Please help stop this.

Comment ID: 207

First Name: Brian

Last Name: Nardi

Commenter Email: drbrian@nardifamilychiropractic.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:18:10 PM

Comment:

Name: Nardi, Brian Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a terrible idea as it restricts consumer choice. Allow consumers to chose with their wallets. If EV's are that much better, cost effective, and environmentally friendly, the market will bear that out. Stop forcing an agenda on the people and us decide for ourselves.

Comment ID: 208

First Name: Chris

Last Name: Fike

Commenter Email: cfike@mac.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:20:49 PM

Comment:

Name: Fike, Chris Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I cannot oppose this idea any more than I do. If electric vehicles were such a good idea, why do you need to force people to choose them? I'm opted into the energy program where eversource will change my thermostat if they need more power? How much more stress will this put on any already strained power grid? We are not swimming in the necessary resources needed to build the batteries, how are we going to go from producing ~5% of electric vehicles to 100%? Also, unless other states enact the same policies, you're just pushing people to by vehicles in other states. That's what I'll be doing. None of this comment will do a damn thing because those in Hartford don't care about the population anymore.

Comment ID: 209

First Name: Fredrik

Last Name: Scimone

Commenter Email: fjscim1@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:29:55 PM

Comment:

Name: Scimone, Fredrik Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against this proposal simply because it is

based on California regulations. Put together your own proposal based on what is best for Connecticut not California. I say no.

Comment ID: 210

First Name: Jacqueline

Last Name: King

Commenter Email: jackieking3050@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:30:38 PM

Comment:

Name: King, Jacqueline Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have no confidence in electric engines of any kind. Not to mention the expense that will make it impossible to buy one. Is this the best that the administration can do, to make up for their mistake of bringing about the gas prices we're paying today? My husband and I are both on Social Security and we are both in our 70's and are now disabled. I'm sure that those who will either have gas fueled cars or more than enough funds to afford an electric car, don't have any concern for people like us. America was once the greatest country to live in but that has diminished so quickly under this administration. What happened to we the people, by the people, for the people? All we see is take it or leave it. I was never told that there was a vote taken for these electric cars. Just take it or leave it, like everything else they do.

Comment ID: 211

First Name: Jonathan

Last Name: Perry

Commenter Email: jay.perry@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:34:46 PM

Comment:

Name: Perry, Jonathan Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 1.) Generating all of the required electricity will be dirty along with the issue of remote generation and transmission which is not efficient. 2.) We can't put charging stations at every parking spot - along city streets etc. 3.) Traffic jams will become bigger problems with people that have dead batteries. 4.) Safety at charging stations is an issue. 5.) Battery minerals come from outside of the US and from child labor in many cases. 6.) Battery mineral mining and transportation are not green activities. 7.) Batteries will be cost prohibitive to replace for many people. 8.) We live in New England where we have very cold winters. This will degrade battery performance. 9.) Lower income people will only be able to afford a used car/battery so their driving range will be greatly reduced. 10.) If there's an extended power outage there will be no way to charge the car battery and this could cause safety concerns. I'm sure that you remember our October snowstorm and hurricane Irene. They caused power outages for 10 days each for me. If I had an electric car there'd have been no way for me to charge it or get out to work or the grocery store etc. Thanks for your time, Jonathan Perry

Comment ID: 212

First Name: Michael

Last Name: DeFrancesco

Commenter Email: deframj@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:34:58 PM

Attachments:

ISO_NE_08_10_2023.pdf

Comment:

Name: DeFrancesco, Michael Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 A 2035 ban on the sales of all gas-powered passenger vehicles is not only unrealistic, it is uninformed. *Renewable fuels only provide 5% of electricity in New England. Wind and solar combined provide less than 2% of our electrical needs. Even if half the cars on the road today were electric vehicles, the demand on the power grid would be astronomical and outrageously expensive to build and maintain. * <https://www.iso-ne.com>

Comment ID: 213

First Name: David

Last Name: Ioime

Commenter Email: ioime@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:35:32 PM

Comment:

Name: Ioime, David Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 EACH of these new regulations should have a detailed viability and economic analysis performed before proposing them. Connecticut is already barely affordable to many residents and businesses, and these regulations appear to likely make much worse the cost of living and doing business in CT.

Comment ID: 214

First Name: joyce

Last Name: Koslowski

Commenter Email: joycek195@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:38:06 PM

Comment:

Name: Koslowski, joyce Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 What happened to freedom of choice? Electric cars are to expensive. They've been known to catch on fire. You need at least six hours to charge them if you can find a charging station. Even the battery dies where do you dispose of it. How much do new batteries cost? Government doesn't think things through. There great at creating problems, and have no solutions

Comment ID: 215

First Name: Tory

Last Name: Lamore

Commenter Email: toryrich@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:48:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Lamore, Tory Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut does not have the electrical capacity to add ev's to the mix. Don't we get a good portion of our electricity from Quebec? And what happens when the grid goes down? Is anyone working to harden the grid? This does not look well-thought out at all. This will cause more people to leave the state, further eroding CT's tax base.

Comment ID: 216

First Name: Thomas

Last Name: Ruocco

Commenter Email: tomruocco@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 03:57:51 PM

Comment:

Name: Ruocco, Thomas Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Don't ban the sale of Gas cars or trucks. This represents a major burden to folks who don't want electric cars. this whole movement of banning gas cars is a ridiculous joke. Wake up and stop harassing the public with these regulations.

Comment ID: 217

First Name: Jane

Last Name: Bate

Commenter Email: dacapo@juno.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 04:06:36 PM

Comment:

Name: Bate, Jane Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 THERE IS NO CLIMATE CRISIS! Nor was Covid-19 a crisis, BUT THE EFFECTS OF THE "VACCINES" CERTAINLY HAVE BEEN! AND THE ELECTRIC CARE FIASCO WILL WIND UP THE SAME WAY! The Dems across this once-great country need to free up our reliable energy sources, and stop squandering money we don't have on windmills, solar panels, and electric cars (which are downright hazardous and use up resources profligately)!

Comment ID: 218

First Name: Nadine

Last Name: Ernst

Commenter Email: bemdaae@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 04:20:24 PM

Comment:

Name: Ernst, Nadine Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to legislation removing gas-powered automobiles from the CT market by 2035. This flies in the face of our free-market economy. It smacks of communism or socialism, where citizens' rights and choices are severely limited by a "benevolent" government. Let the free-market economy work. Let the manufacturers of autos, motorcycles, and trucks be spurred to a variety of solutions by the demands of the consumers.

Comment ID: 219

First Name: Jeannette

Last Name: Del Vento

Commenter Email: htres.4295@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Attachments:

car batteries.pdf

Comment:

Name: Del Vento, Jeannette Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Making everyone own electric cars will not reduce pollution it will increase it. 1. The batteries are made in China with child labor in toxic working conditions & they get paid 1 cent for a days work. Relying on China for the batteries is not smart since they are our enemy & we know China wants to take over our country. However, our country has all the minerals for batteries that could be mined cleaner than the Chinese however our government is closing our mines. See the attachment that explains all of the mining minerals along with the pounds needed to produce just one battery. 2. How do you dispose of the toxic batteries that need to be replaced every 5 yrs. and cost from \$20,000 to \$80,000 depending on the model of the car. 3. Electric cars catch on fire by overheating & if car engines get wet from flooding as they did from the Hurricane that happened in Florida this year. 4. Insurance companies will charge more to insure a electric car versus a gas driven car because of the liability of catching on fire and insurance companies won't want the cars stored in garage because of a fire hazard. 5. Every house will need a charger outside their garage (can't charge cars inside the garage since they can catch on fire). What is the cost for a home charger installed? 6. Town taxes for electric car will cost more than gas driven cars since they will cost more to purchase. 7. The electric bills will increase because of home chargers 8. There is no infrastructure for electric charging stations. 9. Our power grid won't be able to support all of the electricity with the government shutting down fossil fuel & other types of energy. 11. Electric cars are heavier than gas driven cars and will put more stress of weight on our highways. 12. The firemen aren't equipped to put out electric car fires so the air is polluted with all of the fumes that are burning for hours. 13. If you need to charge your vehicle when traveling it takes from 30-45mins. waiting at a charging station. 14. The mileage distance given by the car manufactures is not accurate, you have to take into consideration, if you are using a radio, air conditioning, iPad, how many people are in the car & how much weight is in the trunk (suitcases, etc.). 15. Look at the amount of fires from electric bikes from people bringing them into their apartments with them overheated they are catching on fire. Attached is an article in the CT. Post that shows the large amount of each mineral needed to make each battery. When you look at all the facts you will see that we would be creating more pollution by having electric cars. If Connecticut has this mandate for 2035 many people will be moving out of the state to a "Red" state where people can make a choice of owning an electric car, or owning a gas driven car.

Comment ID: 220

First Name: James

Last Name: Greenwood

Commenter Email: jimeg47@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Greenwood, James Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is ridiculous to think that our electrical infrastructure will be able to sustain a large increase in usage. There is no way the vehicle technology will be optimized by then either. Just more of the same old crap from the party that has already ruined this country.

Comment ID: 221

First Name: Jon

Last Name: Case

Commenter Email: jon.case@pedifix.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Case, Jon Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support the move to outlaw gas-powered personal vehicles by 2035. This will likely require aggressive deadlines (along with economic incentives) which is what is almost always required to make progress. As far as I know auto emissions are a vital contributor to global warming. Europe is making major strides on renewable energy and the U.S. is way behind despite significant resources and even greater contribution to harming the environment.

Comment ID: 222**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Beecher**Commenter Email:** jack.beecher@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 05:11:51 PM**Comment:**

Name: Beecher, John Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I am in favor of the banning of the sale of automobiles solely powered by gasoline in Connecticut but the implementation date is too soon. I would suggest that the date be set at 1/1/2043. This should provide ample time for our citizens to adjust to the idea and for various companies to establish the infrastructure required to support alternative fuels.

Comment ID: 223**First Name:** Bryan**Last Name:** Cook**Commenter Email:** bryancaddress@att.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Cook, Bryan Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The States have no business proposing this type of law. It should be a Federal issue.

Comment ID: 224**First Name:** Robin**Last Name:** Moravsky**Commenter Email:** rcmoravsky@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 05:23:55 PM**Comment:**

Name: Moravsky, Robin Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 "I object to the regulation being formed to eliminate gas autos and trucks in the state of Connecticut. I do not agree with banning of sales of new gas powered autos...it is impractical to possibly absorb this giant of a policy to the already strained tax payer."

Comment ID: 225**First Name:** jim**Last Name:** jobbagy**Commenter Email:** JIMMYSHOOTER1@GMAIL.COM**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: jobbagy, jim Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This state is overwhelmed with taxes. To put a

mileage tax on cars is out of the question. To mandate electric cars is another socialist agenda. You want to limit carbon footprint??? Than limit government

Comment ID: 226

First Name: Gary

Last Name: Nicksa

Commenter Email: Gnicksa@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 07:46:27 PM

Comment:

Name: Nicksa, Gary Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I too would like to see less emissions with cleaner air. The intent of the mandate is in the right place. First the infrastructure should be put in place. Can our current electric grid and the electric generation capacity in New England provide for millions of electric cars and trucks? This bill is a bad idea at the current time. Working with Eversource and generation partners to create a friendly path to the electrification of CT is the first item needed. Thank you.

Comment ID: 227

First Name: Gart

Last Name: Sievers

Commenter Email: tmcasn700@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Retiree

Commenter Title: Retired Military

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:12:45 PM

Comment:

Name: Sievers, Gart Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am a member of an antique/classic automobile club and I'll be darned if I will give up gas for electric. A properly tuned gas engine is less of a problem than charging all the cars that can't go very far. The SOLUTION would be to create parking garages outside all large cities and electric public transportation to transport people within the cities. Anyone living in the city would required to use the same or any type of electric vehicle/bike or scooter. Rural areas could do the same. Ban gas vehicles in all major cities

Comment ID: 228

First Name: Eric

Last Name: Schonenberg

Commenter Email: eschonenberg7@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: none

Commenter Title: none

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:27:45 PM

Comment:

Name: Schonenberg, Eric Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is such a bad idea based on wishful thinking. All the ramifications are not thought through here. The spirit and intent are laudable, but real life will be so much more messy. So many pieces have to come together to make this happen, and not likely to come together, let alone in the time frame proposed. Let the free market do its' thing, or gently steer it, not take a sledgehammer to it. I recently read that somewhere around 42 people want to buy each EV produced right now. That seems like a good market force, with minimal government involvement. Just kill this proposal.

Comment ID: 229

First Name: Dennis

Last Name: Steiger

Commenter Email: dennisstgr@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 08:37:49 PM

Comment:

Name: Steiger, Dennis Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I believe there are serious issues that have not been considered if a ban on sale of gas powered vehicles is implemented in 2035. some of the most critical are: - The impact on the power grid capacity when a surge of working people come home and plug in their cars to charge overnight. We already really stress the grid in heat waves from high AC useage. - If the power grid is expanded how will the power be generated? If current fossil fuel is used will the emissions from generating be more or less than what is saved from gas powered cars? I seriously doubt we will have needed wind or solar capacity in time for 2035. Whats left is nuclear with its own issues. - Where will people such as apartment dwellers who don't have garages or private driveways charge their cars? Will they need to line up and sit at public charging stations for an hour or more while their cars charge? - What about a major winter storm causing extended traffic tie ups. If people run the heat to stay warm and the battery dies what can be done? It's not like someone can bring a couple gallons of gas and get things cleared up. Even with some sort of mobile charger it will take much longer to charge a battery than pour in some gas. - Although CT rarely has major evacuations, similar concerns about massive traffic tie ups. -Has a study been done comparing the operating energy cost of gas vs electric? Is there really a net benefit? Especially considering additional power generation required. - How will we deal with all the used batteries that will be generated? Has anyone looked into recycling them? While I believe the intent of the proposal is good, simply mandating a change will only trade one set of problems for another. It will take longer to debate is there really a new problem, then what to do, and then actually do something. All this will do is "kick the can down the road"

Comment ID: 230

First Name: Deborah and Stephen

Last Name: Varnum

Commenter Email: dvarnum61@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 09:33:48 PM

Comment:

Name: Varnum, Deborah and Stephen Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric cars are expensive. DEEP cannot force everyone to purchase electric vehicles. All this nonsense began when Mr. Biden became president. We all don't have deep pockets to buy electric cars and install a charge station at our homes. It is best to let the people of CT have a choice of either a gas or electric car based on what they can afford. Thank you

Comment ID: 231

First Name: Ted

Last Name: Sevigny

Commenter Email: tedsevigny@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/10/23 09:54:37 PM

Comment:

Name: Sevigny, Ted Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 vote this down

Comment ID: 232

First Name: Kristopher

Last Name: Knapp**Commenter Email:** KBrady2525@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 10:02:25 PM**Comment:**

Name: Knapp, Kristopher Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 A ban like this will make vehicles more expensive except for rich people and is unfair to the working class. If you vote yes for this I'll make sure everyone I know voted no for you at reelection. If you really care about the people of Connecticut you will vote no. People buy gas vehicles because that's what's affordable and they do not have years to wait for you to decide to come up with a way to make your electric vehicles affordable.

Comment ID: 233**First Name:** theodore**Last Name:** plocharsky**Commenter Email:** flagg.janet7@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/10/23 10:54:42 PM**Comment:**

Name: plocharsky, theodore Submission Date: 8/10/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hi my name is Ted Plocharsky, and i received an email about the legislatures wanting to ban gas cars, and stoves. I don't think its up to the legislatures or anyone running our nation to tell us citizens what to use to drive or put in our houses. I am against government intrusion, and think it should be up to the american citizens to decide what to drive or have in their houses. Thank you.

Comment ID: 234**First Name:** Jeff**Last Name:** Moores**Commenter Email:** moore4brit@msn.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 01:26:37 AM**Comment:**

Name: Moores, Jeff Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the proposed banning of the sale of gasoline powered autos at this time. It's not clear to me that we should be putting all our marbles on EV's when they haven't even gone thru a full product cycle yet. J.

Comment ID: 235**First Name:** David**Last Name:** McGivney**Commenter Email:** dxcop12950@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 05:28:59 AM**Comment:**

Name: McGivney, David Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut is already too expensive to

live in. Adding this burden on the family is a going too far. California has already shown that they don't have the resources to make this work, yet you are attempting to do the same thing. We cannot meet presently meet energy requirements today never mind the future. This whole proposal does not show a concern for unintentional consequences such as affordability of the family to buy a electric car or that they will ever want to. Stop taking our rights to buy what we want or what we can afford.

Comment ID: 236

First Name: Carolyn

Last Name: Graziano

Commenter Email: Docpt1234@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 07:19:15 AM

Comment:

Name: Graziano, Carolyn Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I vehemently oppose a ban on gas powered vehicles. Measures such as these are based on political fodder and not science. Electric vehicles are not ?green? as fossil fuel creates electricity. Lithium batteries are costly and create toxic waste and the electric grid can not support electric vehicles. Not withstanding electric vehicles are costly and cause dangerous fires.

Comment ID: 237

First Name: Terrence

Last Name: Tougas

Commenter Email: ttougas@icloud.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 07:34:04 AM

Comment:

Name: Tougas, Terrence Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a State and a country, we have done far too little to address the clear and catastrophic threat of climate change. We threaten the very survival of our descendants through our inaction. This regulation is at least a small step in the right direction.

Comment ID: 238

First Name: John

Last Name: Drabik

Commenter Email: jhd1972@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Taxpaying citizen

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 09:24:00 AM

Comment:

Name: Drabik, John Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Still hasnt been proven as fact that; environmentally wise, energy wise, or dollar wise that forcing the decision of all electric (battery transportation is a legitimate idea. Forcing it is just going to make angry taxpayers. I dont see China forcing this choice on their people.

Comment ID: 239

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Coughlin

Commenter Email: Headmetron@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: retired

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 09:43:10 AM

Comment:

Name: Coughlin, Robert Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Most smart businesses take the logical path first and do an extensive cost analysis and a through feasibility study as well as an economic impact study before embarking on a change that will impact all of it's customers. The State of Conn. should, but won't, lead by example by first phasing out it's own fleet of gasoline and diesel vehicles and equipment as a real test to see how practical this proposal might work in the real world before imposing such a costly rule on it's already overburdened taxpayers. How about starting with installing solar on all of the state owned buildings?

Comment ID: 240

First Name: CHARLES

Last Name: Morrill

Commenter Email: cmcsmor@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Morrill, CHARLES Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Currently the world generates nearly 37% of it's electricity from coal. By 2040 if we continue on this path of EV's that could mean a nearly 300% increase in electricity. Nowhere do I see any solutions to that problem. Rare earth minerals required for batteries, Windmills built out of composite materials that all contain petroleum products will not supply enough electricity. This is truly a poorly thought out plan with the intent to control and crush the economy. Please do not pursue this path! There is room to have a more thought out comprehensive balanced approach. Stop appeasing the Green Zealots and step back and think!

Comment ID: 241

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Gargiulo

Commenter Email: magargiulo@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: 0

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 11:00:44 AM

Comment:

Name: Gargiulo, Michael Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing to express my deep opposition to this proposed regulation. There are numerous reasons why I feel that this proposal is fraught with problems. 1) EVs do not have the range to satisfy all potential light and medium duty vehicle needs. 2) Our Electrical grid cannot handle 1.2 million cars being plugged in each day. 3) EV Batteries have a distinct life span and degrade over time leading to increases in the number of charges and a decrease in range. 4) If an EV's battery is damaged in an accident the car is typically totaled as the battery replacement cost is often higher than the cars value. This will increase Auto Insurance premiums for all CT residents. 5) Fire Departments are not equipped to handle EV Battery fires. 6) The State and many municipalities rely on contractors to assist in Snow Removal. We cannot afford to have roads not plowed in a timely manner because the contractor needs to recharge their pickup. 7) People just do not want these vehicles. The number of EV vehicles registers in CT is less than 5%. 8) People will switch from buying a New vehicle in State, to buying a used vehicle from out of state, causing a reduction in Tax revenues due to the lower price for a used car. 9) People will resort to repairing older cars versus purchasing new cars. I could go on but I think you get the idea. If the State insists on Forcing me to buy a product that I do not want, moving to another State would definitely be a consideration.

Comment ID: 242**First Name:** john**Last Name:** bermingham**Commenter Email:** ctjabham@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** bermingham construction LLC**Commenter Title:** president**Posted Date:** 08/11/23 11:17:01 AM**Comment:**

Name: bermingham, john Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is impractical for state legislators to pass laws about the future of technology in such a fast moving environment as transportation .

Comment ID: 243**First Name:** Kyle**Last Name:** Norton**Commenter Email:** Superawesomekn@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 11:18:08 AM**Comment:**

Name: Norton, Kyle Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I love cars that go vroom vroom but get that we need more renewables. The state needs to significantly invest in our grid and charging infrastructure if we're realistically switching to electric on in 12 years. I hope they pull it off.

Comment ID: 244**First Name:** Duste**Last Name:** Dunne**Commenter Email:** info@email.actionnetwork.org**Comment Input Method:** Email**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 11:22:39 AM**Comment:**

Name: Dunne, Duste Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 DEEP Commissioner Katie Dykes , Re: Notices of Intent to Amend Air Quality Regulations and Revise the State Implementation Plan. As a resident of Connecticut, I am writing to express my support for clean car and clean truck standards proposed by DEEP. With 100% of Connecticut an ozone nonattainment zone, our entire state is breathing dirty, polluted air, with disproportionate impacts in our most vulnerable communities. The adoption of Medium and Heavy-duty Emission Standards for trucks and the adoption of California Light Duty Vehicle Emission Standards for 2027-2035 for cars by the end of 2023 will ensure Connecticut loses no time in delivering the climate, environmental justice, health, and economic benefits these rules will provide. Although trucks and buses make up only 6 percent of all vehicles on the road, they disproportionately spew 53 percent of nitrogen oxide emissions and 57 percent of PM 2.5; and these are linked to childhood asthma, chronic illnesses, lung cancer, and premature death. Clean truck regulations that are now in place in 8 other states (Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Vermont, California, Colorado, Oregon and Washington). Connecticut residents deserve the same protections from truck pollution. Connecticut became a leader on clean transportation by adopting the Clean Cars I standards two decades ago. By adopting the California Light Duty Vehicle Emission Standards for 2027-2035, our state will update those standards and continue to enjoy the benefits of reduced pollution from cars. I urge DEEP to protect our climate and health by passing these proposed strong clean vehicle standards that will reduce vehicle emissions, our most significant source of climate pollution -- and protect our air. The time to act is now. Adopt the Medium and Heavy-duty Emission Standards and the California Light Duty Vehicle Emission Standards for 2027-2035. Duste Dunn dustedunn@gmail.com 871 Main Street, C Monroe , Connecticut 06468

Comment ID: 245**First Name:** Kathy**Last Name:** Michalski**Commenter Email:** mkathyct@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** None**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 11:28:27 AM**Comment:**

Name: Michalski, Kathy Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Can we please just slow down? There is much to figure out before deciding on this regulation for cars and trucks! Too expensive and is anyone talking about where the batteries to run these vehicles are coming from? It is both sad and scary to be relying on such a source of energy. We simply are not ready!

Comment ID: 246**First Name:** James**Last Name:** Daly**Commenter Email:** daly3putt@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 11:29:21 AM**Comment:**

Name: Daly, James Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Totally against banning gas powered vehicles

Comment ID: 247**First Name:** Thomas P.**Last Name:** Ganley**Commenter Email:** thomas-ganley@att.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** (over-taxed) taxpayer**Commenter Title:** Mr.**Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Ganley, Thomas P. Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly opposed to yet more half-baked "green" forced regulation. Electric vehicles are a boondoggle at best. The infrastructure isn't there to support them. The costs for this nonsense is astronomical. The Dems have made us (CT residents) slaves to the most expensive electric rates in the country, partially by other inane regulation (buying more expensive electricity rather than producing less expensive energy), yet here you are trying to make it worse. And to Ed Lamont and his cronies, we should be doing exactly the opposite of what NY State is doing, not trying to be Cuomo/Hochul Jr.

Comment ID: 248**First Name:** Karen**Last Name:** Banks**Commenter Email:** karenveebanks@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Banks, Karen Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I feel that the concept of this proposed regulation is admirable, but I think that because we are a small state and one of 6 New England states and border the larger state of New York that we should be working with our local states and not looking to CA for setting up our regulations. Until our neighboring states have enough charging sites for electric cars, etc. to accommodate EVERYONE'S NEEDS (we have lots of more remote areas in ME, NH, VT and NY) and that we consider WHERE the electricity is coming from, we should not pass this. Our electric rates are very high in New England and we cannot afford to have them rising even more because of the demand from electric vehicles.

Comment ID: 249

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Sandler

Commenter Email: petersandler@usa.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 12:05:26 PM

Comment:

Name: Sandler, Peter Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 In a world where reliable electricity supply continues to become less and less of a reality, it is nonsensical to believe that government can mandate that all new passenger vehicles must be powered by electricity commencing in 2035. Our electrical distribution grid is already under strain and forcing further demand onto the system by electrifying vehicles will only create further issues for grid operators and consumers. What will happen on hot days when we are asked to turn off our air conditioners because of strain on the grid? "Sorry, you can't charge your vehicle and go anywhere today!" Furthermore, the farce that electric cars are 'cleaner' is exactly that - a farce! Having previously worked in the base metals sector for one of the world's largest base metals traders, I can tell you that the notion that electric cars are cleaner only holds true if you ignore all of the pollution and environmental destruction created by the mining, smelting, and refining of all the metallurgical components required by electric vehicles. It's time to stop this crazy collision course that the state has put us on. Drop the 2035 ban on sale of petroleum-powered passenger vehicles.

Comment ID: 250

First Name:

Last Name:

Commenter Email:

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 12:25:41 PM

Comment:

Name: , Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject:
 Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Good afternoon, this ruling will most likely cripple the state in many ways. 1. The infrastructure is not in place for this and will cost a lot of money to put in place. This is to include transmission lines, generation facilities, and charging facilities. We pay enough in taxes as it is why do we want to incur more. 2. Electricity rates are astronomical. Other than Hawaii, Connecticut has the highest rates in the country. This will just make the rates go up even further. 3. The amount of energy needed to accomplish this will most likely create the same more greenhouse gas emissions than the vehicles on the road. 4. a. We cannot count on solar or wind power as they are not a constant around the state. b. Solar farms need large clearings to accomplish their goal. Not to mention that they would have to be very large and unsightly. Clear of trees negates what you are trying to accomplish seeing as tree take carbon dioxide and turn it into oxygen. Besides how would you get all of this land, are you going to use eminent domain, purchase up farms and cost more money, use public land that is there for recreation? None of these seem like good ideas. There is not enough guaranteed sunlight to offset this cost to put power to the grid. It also seems like once you hit the ROI it will be obsolete and need to be replaced. c. Wind farms also require large clearings to erect the towers. They make significant noise. Have a reputation of killing or injuring wildlife. When they fail it's a major incident with the unit self-destructing or catching fire. All of these are extreme scenarios, but they are there and do happen. The ROI on these is not great either and again once you get

to the ROI it most likely will be obsolete and need to be replaced. Again, I don't feel as if there is enough sustainable wind to create the energy needed. 5. To bring in the energy from elsewhere is also expensive in itself. This goes back to the fact that in the continental United States we are already paying the most for electricity. 6. Your vehicle runs out of energy is another issue in itself. The cost of a tow truck would become astronomical. There are not enough charging stations in enough places to accommodate this, and it would cost a lot of money to make this so. 7. FIRE HAZARD: EV fires are extremely hard to put out not to mention the environmental impacts ground and air. With a fuel fire it can burn off or be put out and contained for remediation. With EVs burning so hot they are very tough to put out and roadways/roadsides will be affected by the heat. There for not only will there be a large clean-up cost, but the roadway/roadside will also need to be repaired. 8. Repair costs are enormous. It is estimated that right now it is \$5000 to \$20000 dollars to replace a battery. Dead battery cells can cause fires and other issues with these vehicles. So, the cost of ownership will be super expensive and price many people out of having the ability to own a vehicle. We have choked out the exhaust of cars so much that all it does is use more fuels. There needs to be some balance with all of this. Everyone says it is for the environment, but what about other places around the world that will not do this or may not even be able to afford it. Our little bit will not make the difference on a global scale. This has been brought up in US Capital many times and it seems like each time it gets brought up it gets shut down. So why are we doing this here. There are many videos up that show this with high-ranking officials being questioned and either not having answers or being proven incorrect. These are just a few examples of reasons not to go through with this regulation. We as a small state with already enormous tax burden and extremely high electric rates should not be looking at making those that live here poorer. This is all this would do. With all this being said I think this is a very bad idea. Not to mention that Connecticut is once again trying to follow California's lead. This has not proven beneficial many times prior and just drives people and businesses out of the state. If we keep losing our tax base, we will once again raise taxes and costs driving even more people out of the state or into deep poverty which also cannot be sustained. Please do not enact this regulation it is bad for the economy, bad for the state of the state, and will not make a lot of difference as it would take the world to make this change to make a large difference. We do not need to be at the front of the charge with the state of the economy/state.

Comment ID: 251

First Name: Andreas

Last Name: Savvidou

Commenter Email: asavvidou@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: .

Commenter Title: Mr

Posted Date: 08/11/23 12:39:47 PM

Comment:

Name: Savvidou, Andreas Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The ban on gas power vehicles, cars, lawnmowers and such should not be submitted. The state is a long way off from having the necessary support structure in place such as charging stations throughout the state ,rest stop charging stations.

Comment ID: 252

First Name: Jacky

Last Name: Fromentin

Commenter Email: Jafromentin@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 01:02:25 PM

Comment:

Name: Fromentin , Jacky Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No please do not stop the sale of gasoline-powered vehicles because the cost of electric cars are too expensive and it cost almost the same to recharge as gasoline cars , so we want to keep the cars running on gasoline...thank you

Comment ID: 253

First Name: Kenneth
Last Name: Zeitz
Commenter Email: bass5000bass@yahoo.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/11/23 01:06:55 PM

Comment:

Name: Zeitz, Kenneth Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 How does government expect us to go to all electrical cars when electricity is so expensive, we are warned during summer that the electric companies may have brownouts because everyone one uses a/c. We barely produce enough electricity to keep up with our basic electrical needs . The batteries are heavy and will wear down the roads. How will all the batteries be recycled. What if I have a power outage and I can?t charge my car to get to work? Motorcycles use gas and the road so they will have to be made electric also. Hopefully I?ll be retired by 2035 and move out of the state .

Comment ID: 254

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Queno
Commenter Email: Mike.queno@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/11/23 01:34:47 PM

Comment:

Name: Queno, Michael Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Regulations with a lifespan of 12 plus years seems outrageous and will likely be obsolete by the time it?s enforced or respected by Connecticut residents. The regulations coming from climate change concerns will only weaken our ability to live the lives we all take for granted in this country because if the whole world isn?t on board, then the environment will continue to suffer. Furthermore, fiscally responsible citizens will continue to demand for gas powered vehicles. The gas powered automobile continues to stand the test of time and will continue to do so. The representatives in power should wake up and stop this broken logic of forcing it down our throats when many of those in power have demonstrated a pattern of rule for thee not for me. The pandemic regulations were the greatest example of this hypocrisy carried out by our government officials. Perspective and realistic goals should be the focus of the government. One major concern for our citizens is the property tax abuse. It?s gotten out of hand and quite unreasonable given other states ability to keep them reasonable. And a welcome quick fix to us all during a period of inflation and unsecured debt would be eliminating the emissions program. If you?re gonna eliminate gas car sales end something that?s obsolete and a burden to us all. Lead us with results rather than a 12 year time line that means nothing to any of us right now.

Comment ID: 255

First Name: VIRGINIA
Last Name: JEWELL
Commenter Email: ginjewell@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/11/23 01:38:40 PM

Comment:

Name: JEWELL, VIRGINIA Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think this EV stuff is garbage. It will take years to perfect, I don?t agree with any of it. California is a very sick state!

Comment ID: 256

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Dickinson
Commenter Email: RLDickinson@snet.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date:
Comment:

Name: Dickinson, Robert Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I fully support this regulation to phase out the sale gas & desal powered cars. Imposing an exoculating carbon tax ten or more years ago would have been preferable but now we must do the maximum that we can to stop use of fossil fuels.

Comment ID: 257
First Name: James
Last Name: Byrne, Jr.
Commenter Email: jjpbatberrypatch@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: Self
Commenter Title:
Posted Date:
Comment:

Name: Byrne, Jr., James Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Thou shalt not mandate to the private citizens of the State of Connecticut exactly what type of legal vehicle they may drive, gas or electric powered. Removing this choice will impose a large Financial Hardship on most our Citizens.

Comment ID: 258
First Name: Rebecca
Last Name: Shinkoff
Commenter Email: rshinkoff@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/11/23 02:41:25 PM
Comment:

Name: Shinkoff, Rebecca Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a voting resident of Connecticut I am opposed to a ban on gas powered cars and trucks. The process of extracting lithium for electric vehicle batteries consumes significant amounts of energy and water and mining of lithium pollutes the air and water with chemicals and heavy metals. The disposing of the batteries once they are beyond the useful life also creates issues for the environment. The ecological damage done by lithium mining is not a better solution to the pollution created by gas powered engines. Forcing citizens to not have the choice of what type of vehicle to purchase and drive in a democratic society is incomprehensible. I strongly encourage a vote against such regulations.

Comment ID: 259
First Name: Kristen
Last Name: Wagoner
Commenter Email: kwag77@cox.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/11/23 03:02:07 PM
Comment:

Name: Wagoner, Kristen Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support this regulation. While I live in a rural

area and enjoy clean air, not everyone in the state has the same experience. Reducing the exhaust from oil burning vehicles will do a lot to improve quality of life for people in the cities and suburbs. It is also an important step to help combat climate change which seems shockingly out of control right now. I would suggest that we invest in ensuring that our electric grid will be able to accommodate the added load both from a production and a reliability perspective. Thank you.

Comment ID: 260

First Name: Anthony

Last Name: Cwikla

Commenter Email: Capaction@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 03:08:28 PM

Comment:

Name: Cwikla , Anthony Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I absolutely oppose the implementation of any environmental standards that California has adopted including any bans on any gasoline engines in any form. This would cause irreparable harm to the citizens of this state. There is not enough energy production for Electric vehicles and most don't want them. I strongly suggest the legislature move on from this madness.

Comment ID: 261

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Brault

Commenter Email: mbro11459@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 03:17:39 PM

Comment:

Name: Brault, Mark Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Unless some clean alternatives to energy are developed to charge electric cars and trucks there is no point in mandating gas vehicles not be sold. The current methods of green energy are an environmental disaster that is harming our planet worse than fossil fuels. The solar and biofuels as well as the batteries for electric vehicles are an environmental hazard to produce them. Their life span is short and the child labor to mine the raw materials is a humanitarian disaster. These types of laws are putting the cart before the horse. I do not support any such bill.

Comment ID: 262

First Name: Joanne

Last Name: Wengler

Commenter Email: jweng6174@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 03:25:41 PM

Comment:

Name: Wengler, Joanne Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against this proposed regulation. I do not believe that I should be forced to buy an electric car in a free America. I also believe there is not enough infrastructure in place to support this. Has anyone thought this out? What will happen to all the gas powered vehicles? What will happen to all the used batteries that power these electric cars? How much would you have to spend to replace the battery? It is bad enough that we are forced to buy a certain kind of light bulb and everything else that has been forced on us. We should have the freedom to purchase what we feel is the correct choice for us.

Comment ID: 263**First Name:** ELLEN**Last Name:** NARDONE**Commenter Email:** smilin66@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** NA**Commenter Title:** NA**Posted Date:** 08/11/23 03:29:08 PM**Comment:**

Name: NARDONE, ELLEN Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think the government's push to end gas-powered vehicles is absolutely ridiculous and un-American. We are all aware that we need to take care of our environment and our world, but forcing Americans to purchase battery-powered vehicles is insane. As far as I am aware, we still live in America where citizens have the choice to purchase what they want - not what the government forces upon us. For all of the talk about how fossil fuels are so bad for the environment, there seems to be very little discussion about the strip mining of the minerals required to build these batteries. I also hear no discussion on how we are supposed to dispose of these batteries when they need replacement. We already have a problem with how to get rid of these car batteries??? Additionally, President Biden has just banned the mining of the required minerals here in the US, so we are forced to purchase these minerals from areas of the world where there are no regulations on how these elements are mined, not to mention the fact that some of these countries force child labor to mine. It's so backward! How can we claim we want to save the environment and make deals with countries that force children into slavery. It's very wrong. How about we just let capitalism work, and we will find safe ways to reduce gas-powered vehicle usage. In the meantime, keep your government-forced demands out of my life.

Comment ID: 264**First Name:** Joseph**Last Name:** Greenier**Commenter Email:** greenierjoe@icloud.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Retired**Commenter Title:** Retired**Posted Date:** 08/11/23 03:51:12 PM**Comment:**

Name: Greenier, Joseph Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would agree to eliminating the ability to purchase new gasoline powered vehicles as soon as the following conditions are met: 1) The average price of a new electric vehicle is at or lower than the average price of a new gasoline powered vehicle. 2) The home charging station is provided if needed by the purchaser of the new electric vehicle. 3) The infrastructure including lower electric rates for vehicle charging and quick charge stations in good supply across Connecticut.

Comment ID: 265**First Name:** Ronald**Last Name:** Chaika**Commenter Email:** Rc77@startmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 04:12:44 PM**Comment:**

Name: Chaika, Ronald Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Our current standard of living, especially transportation is dependent on gasoline and diesel fuel. Our electrical grid cannot handle as many electric vehicles as needed to replace the ones now that run on hydrocarbons, nor will it likely ever. Public transportation is terrible, i don't know anyone of any age or social group that wants it. California is a mess in more ways than one. We should not be looking at that state as a case study for best practices. Thank you for your time.

Comment ID: 266**First Name:** Richard**Last Name:** Sider**Commenter Email:** r.sider@cox.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 04:46:21 PM**Comment:**

Name: Sider, Richard Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to register my concerns regarding this regulation. In the relatively short period 11 years, to forbid the sales of gas powered cars is misguided. In that period of time we would need modify our grid, increase our power production (or purchase) and install charging capabilities in almost all residences in the state and at a sufficient number of public locations to permit citizens and transients to use such vehicles. First of all, I have never seen CT move that fast on any infrastructure issues much less one of this magnitude. Second, if you are going to force our citizens to switch to electric vehicles then you must in good conscience make sure that we have our fair share of whatever battery recycling facilities are necessary to handle our cars. My understanding is that recycling the batteries is a major problem for which no satisfactory technology, much less one that keeps the heavy metals out of the environment, is currently available. Third, the cost of electricity in CT is already so high that charging an electric car is already more expensive than filling a gas tank with an equivalent miles worth of charge. If you are willing to subject our citizens to this increased cost, you should also be willing to support the construction of additional nuclear power plants in our state to keep the cost of electricity down. To meet the power requirements of fully electrifying the fleet of cars used in CT you would need to cover the state in wind mills or solar power plants and they would be more friendly to the environment than a few nuclear plants. I seriously doubt that the citizens of this state would be willing to grants permits to the number of solar or wind farm necessary to do this job. This regulation is a severe and infeasible overreaction. Thank you.

Comment ID: 267**First Name:** George**Last Name:** Walsh**Commenter Email:** barknguns@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 04:54:12 PM**Comment:**

Name: Walsh, George Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please vote NO on this bill! Forcing these type laws goes against our freedoms to choose what kind of powered vehicles we want. The government needs to stop manipulating our behaviors and allow the free market to decide what vehicles are best for the job. Forcing everyone to buy non gas powered vehicles is foolish and puts way to much pressure on the grid that is not ready or reliable.

Comment ID: 268**First Name:** Alesia**Last Name:** Kennerson**Commenter Email:** akennerson8926@charter.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 05:55:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Kennerson, Alesia Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have grave concerns on this proposed regulation. While I understand the need to protect our planet, this is overly aggressive without any data to indicate

that we would be better off in 2035 with no new gas powered sales of cars. How would this impact the electricity grid if all new cars thereafter would be EV cars? What does the production of only EV cars look like? What do we do with all the old EV batteries? How much hazardous waste would this generate? How much does EV batteries cost? Will this put a burden on low-income families? Would there be a government subsidy which then puts the onus on the middle class when they have to buy their own replacement batteries? There are too many unanswered questions for this sweeping change. This should be studied to gain these and other answers before we adopt such a radical change.

Comment ID: 269

First Name: Gary

Last Name: Chucta

Commenter Email: gjchucta@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 06:14:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Chucta, Gary Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do believe climate change is taking its toll on the country. I would have to be in support of a ban. Thank you , Gary

Comment ID: 270

First Name: Brian

Last Name: Corson

Commenter Email: bjcorson@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: retired

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 06:45:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Corson, Brian Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 1.How is the state planning to supply electricity to charge vehicles, we are near capacity already 2.How are people that live in apartments, condos, or other places that do not have charging facilities going to charge their cars

Comment ID: 271

First Name: tom

Last Name: cipollo

Commenter Email: tcipollo@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: none

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 07:02:58 PM

Comment:

Name: cipollo, tom Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 are you nuts. this state has the highest electricity rates as it is and our grid is no where near capable of supporting this kind of move. no way this should even be thought about and your going to tell me i cant own a gas powered car if i want to. pretty sure that breaks some kind of constitutional rights and the stupid high taxes i am paying to live in this state. leave us alone with this nonsense idea. the disposal of ev batteries is was worse for the environment then gas exhaust

Comment ID: 272

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Parnes

Commenter Email: Robertp1165@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 07:10:06 PM

Comment:

Name: Parnes, Robert Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Great idea. It is time to work to stop global warming and this is a good way to move us forward.

Comment ID: 273

First Name: Edward

Last Name: Marshall

Commenter Email: emarshall5600@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: NA

Commenter Title: NA

Posted Date: 08/11/23 07:53:02 PM

Comment:

Name: Marshall, Edward Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Forcing the extinction of gas powered vehicles is not based on reality. It would take 40 years just to make an electric grid to accommodate this insane idea. The cost to consumers would be immense to support this scheme. The majority of people want gas powered vehicles. We don't want electric cars. China and the rest of the world will continue to use coal and oil power and gas powered vehicles. They don't care about emissions. The US will be put at a disadvantage if it has electric vehicles. This whole idea to force people to not have gas powered vehicles is a communist scheme to destroy the US economy. The members in Ct. legislature who are pushing to ban gas powered vehicles are communists and have no place in a free America. Free choice and the pursuit of happiness are a cornerstone of US life and the rights, guaranteed by the US constitution and the bill of rights.

Comment ID: 274

First Name: john

Last Name: leardi

Commenter Email: mr.shawn.oconnor@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 08:31:16 PM

Comment:

Name: leardi, john Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hi my name is John Leardi and I am in Meriden, Ct. I am upset to find out that Ct legislatures want to ban gas powered cars after 2035, if we survive this long. I dont think the politicians should get involved in what the American people drive, or own. I think we should be able to vote on if we want non gas cars or not. There is too much government overreach. Thank you. Sincerely, john Leardi.

Comment ID: 275

First Name: Sue

Last Name: Morton

Commenter Email: smorton1116@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Private citizen

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 08:50:51 PM

Comment:

Name: Morton, Sue Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This ban is totally outrageous. The property alone

on these highly expensive vehicles is one big issue! The other is that many of us in rural America have to travel great lengths to go to stores or whatnot so car charging is a huge issue. The mileage these vehicles can go is less than most cars now. It's take fossil fuel to make electric! You save nothing!

Comment ID: 276

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Barnes

Commenter Email: rdb0924@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 08:51:08 PM

Comment:

Name: Barnes, Richard Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Remember the Millstone craze in the 60's. With 7% EVs today we get 12million tons of Batteries/year that can only recover 2-5% of the RARE earth components. They cannot be stored in landfills. New tech ideas include no batts EV with * & - ions in a water solution. Hydrogen fuel using modified gas engines. We have time to make informative decisions WHEN all the information is available. Don't jump the gun and start another Atomic miracle electric craze that hurts the environment more than helps it!

Comment ID: 277

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Kesilewski jr

Commenter Email: Cootrp14@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 09:15:02 PM

Comment:

Name: Kesilewski jr, Peter Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 An attempt to ban the sale of any gasoline or diesel powered vehicle is an outright overstepping of government. These vehicles may cause more greenhouse gases for a short period of time, but that pales in comparison to the strip mining required to extract lithium from the earth and the coal fired generators at the electric plants. We can't afford to make this large a mistake. Electric vehicles are not reliable enough for the masses to depend on for survival. Yes, survival. What happens during a natural disaster (tornado, earthquake, hurricane,etc) when the power plants are shut down causing power outages everywhere? Can't drive to an area with power if your car isn't charged. Can't get to a hospital if your injured. Stuck on a highway in the snow? No problem, turn on your heater. Oh, the battery will drain and then you can't leave if a plow comes through? No one will read this far. I just needed to say my peace. Thank you.

Comment ID: 278

First Name: Suzanne

Last Name: Freniere

Commenter Email: sunsue38@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 09:51:10 PM

Comment:

Name: Freniere, Suzanne Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not support the ban on gas powered vehicles by 2035. Destroying our planet by digging for tons of lithium, child labor digging for it, the cost is outrageous, electric vehicles are a fire hazard, the toxic batteries are ridiculously expensive, what happens to the batteries when they don't work anymore, not reliable in cold weather, electricity to charge these things will be too

expensive for most people, to take away our RIGHTS to choose our method of transportation is unconstitutional and leans towards taking more control of our lives. I WILL NOT COMPLY! It goes against everything I believe in. We are a CONSTITUTIONAL REPUBLIC, not a communist country!! STAY OUT OF OUR LIVES!! You people are insane!

Comment ID: 279

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Kos

Commenter Email: dreamweaver1962@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 10:58:51 PM

Comment:

Name: Kos, Robert Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a really bad idea. The energy needed to charge non gas cars causes just as much pollution. The battery driven cars are far too expensive and have too many problems. long distance travel is almost impossible and you can't go get a gallon of charge after your stuck in traffic. we will need tremendous advances in electric cars before we can consider removing gas driven cars from our society.

Comment ID: 280

First Name: Dinis

Last Name: Cabtal

Commenter Email: denis_cabral@live.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Town resident

Commenter Title: Tax payer

Posted Date: 08/11/23 11:05:36 PM

Comment:

Name: Cabtal, Dinis Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As an owner of 2 classic cars and a fan of the right to repair, this ban in gasoline powered cars seems to be a bit of an over reach. I get we fallow c.a.r.b (for the right reasons) to keep our air clean, but we can't funnel all our energy needs to one company (for me it's eversource). Our energy sector needs to be diversified to keep prices at bay. Not only that, some electric car companys lock you away from fixing your own car witch helps save people money. Bottom line, it's a drastic move for our economy as a whole.

Comment ID: 281

First Name: Mathew

Last Name: Mathews

Commenter Email: mathew_mathews@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/11/23 11:12:09 PM

Comment:

Name: Mathews, Mathew Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not agree with the regulation of banning gas powered cars. It brings hardships and brings into question feasibility / affordability to common man. Market forces should drive options and fund research for alternate solutions. Arbitrary dates without even having infrastructure nor reliable power sources is very bad move. This state has one of the highest cost of per KWH energy, this will rule transportation out of the hands of common people. Using pseudo science to drive decisions impacting millions is not the right way.

Comment ID: 282**First Name:** bruce**Last Name:** bourque**Commenter Email:** bdb654@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** retired**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/11/23 11:26:25 PM**Comment:**

Name: bourque, bruce Submission Date: 8/11/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I can't believe there are people in this state that are so illinformed that they would follow the fools in California. I find that the "leaders" in this state have a hard time thinking for themselves. It would be nice if they could show some concern for the people here. It is awful to see how bad the democrats have gotten in the last 50 years. I'm not sure if it is the power hungry government, or the idiots that vote them in. I used to be a strict recycler until I found out my work was wasted and most of it ended up in a landfill. Don't follow the Feds, Don't follow California, Go back to the way it used to be when we cared about the people of this state!!!

Comment ID: 283**First Name:** James**Last Name:** Anastasio**Commenter Email:** janastasio@cox.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** CAR97787282**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 12:32:15 AM**Comment:**

Name: Anastasio, James Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing to inform you of how I do not agree with this new crippling policy. All this will do is make our country weak and make us vulnerable to foreign countries who hate this country just so fools can feel good by thinking we are saving the world when our enemies are growing stronger. Is China still drilling for oil and mining for coal? Is Russia still drilling for oil and mining for coal? What about Iran, Iraq, and Sadie Arabia? They are not led by a bunch of pie-in-the-sky leaders that have taken over their country. Fools, fools, fools are what you are.

Comment ID: 284**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Turner**Commenter Email:** jwtjr2110@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 07:09:53 AM**Comment:**

Name: Turner, John Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Higher price: Full hybrid vehicles are thousands of dollars more expensive than traditional gas-powered vehicles. Higher upkeep: Hybrid powertrain parts are higher to maintain and repair costs are astronomical. How can a family of four struggling now to pay rent, bills, mortgage, afford gas and clothes be expected to now pay for a higher cost vehicle because it's the law? More weight: Due to the traction battery pack and motors, HEVs are significantly heavier than gas powered vehicles; this leads to longer braking distances and poorer handling, which leads to the life of brakes and brake pads degrading quicker. Safety: High-voltage battery packs present safety issues both during maintenance and usage. Lithium-ion battery fires are extremely difficult to extinguish. FYI you cannot use water on them. Significant battery degradation: Car dealerships are promoting a mileage range. The mileage range is significantly degraded, especially during the colder months when the defroster, heater, lights are all on at once. So a mileage range of 360 miles quickly degrades to 260 miles. Charging: What is the plan for charging stations? Are all charging outlets going to be the

same type of plug and receptacle? Is there a standard for this? These are just some of the questions that need to be addressed before a mandate is pushed. Thank You

Comment ID: 285

First Name: Ernest

Last Name: Pitti

Commenter Email: epitti2005@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: N/A

Posted Date: 08/12/23 07:13:19 AM

Comment:

Name: Pitti, Ernest Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello: I believe the State of Connecticut is not ready to enact a regulation that prohibits the sale of gas powered cars! Before doing so, I believe we not only should focus on repairing and replacing aging and dangerous infrastructure such as our roads and bridges. Furthermore, I believe the citizens do not have a complete picture of the cost associated with this transition and how it will limit their abilities to thrive in the already very expensive state of Connecticut.

Comment ID: 286

First Name: Ashley

Last Name: Austin

Commenter Email: austinacresnosto@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Farmer

Commenter Title: Sole proprietor

Posted Date: 08/12/23 07:29:56 AM

Comment:

Name: Austin, Ashley Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't believe electric cars are an adequate replacement for gas power vehicles. In the long run the disposal, the batteries will be more toxic to the planet. That says nothing for the way in which these cars are manufactured and the rare earth metals that are required to make them. They are mined from countries that employ slave practices So the cost of these cars are way too high on a moral level and all we would be doing is contributing to this deplorable miss use of other human beings. I do agree that we can do better than petroleum powered vehicles, but Electric is not the solution.

Comment ID: 287

First Name: Sweeney

Last Name: Martens

Commenter Email: cheyenne_7294@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Martens, Sweeney Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Banning the sale of gas powered vehicles after 2035 will not only devastate small businesses, but have you considered where this cobalt comes from? Yes, big companies indirectly buy from places like the Dominican Republic of Congo. Find a better solution to save the planet. Maybe start with China. We don't live in a bubble they are the biggest culprits to destroying our planet. Do you us using modern slavery to run electric vehicles is acceptable? I don't, I think this is disgusting and wrong. I do not agree with this and stop with the government control already!!! Take the all lives matter sign out of your yard if you are pushing this agenda.

Comment ID: 288

First Name: Veronica
Last Name: Guillet
Commenter Email: havaneseup@sbcglobal.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/12/23 08:08:59 AM

Comment:

Name: Guillet, Veronica Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not want the government to determine what type of vehicle is suitable for my personal use and business use. This plan would force people, in the age of pandemics and communicable diseases to use public transportation. That is gross negligence on the part of our government as they would indirectly but clearly be placing people's lives and health at risk. Walking in my neck of the woods is out of the question, and requiring people to be in close proximity while traveling early in the morning, will just create more hostility during rush hour.

Comment ID: 289

First Name: Brian
Last Name: Johnson
Commenter Email: btj934@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/12/23 08:09:07 AM

Comment:

Name: Johnson, Brian Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Does anyone proposing this nonsense do even a modicum of research? The infrastructure is not there to support such proposals. There are nowhere near enough chargers and the grid couldn't handle it if there were. Usable range on electric vehicles, should one have to engage in highway travel, drops precipitously and charging times, even with fast charge options (which, fun fact, reduce battery lifespan), are beyond inconvenient. Fire risk, while small, remains. Oh, and most repair facilities are not equipped or trained to handle electric vehicles, nor are many inclined to change that, for a whole host of reasons, not the least of which is the dramatic increase in their insurance premiums attached to becoming an electric certified facility. Stop tilting at this virtue signaling windmill?

Comment ID: 290

First Name: JOHN
Last Name: Public
Commenter Email: Noneofyourbusiness@yourmomshouse.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/12/23 08:12:51 AM

Comment:

Name: Public , JOHN Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Banning gas-powered cars completely may be seen as impractical due to various reasons such as existing infrastructure, affordability concerns, and limitations of alternative technologies. Transitioning to entirely electric vehicles would require substantial changes in charging infrastructure, addressing battery production challenges, and ensuring affordability for all. Additionally, some regions may rely on gasoline-powered vehicles for specific use cases like long-distance travel or heavy-duty applications, where electric alternatives might not yet be fully viable. A more gradual and holistic approach to promoting sustainable transportation might be a more realistic solution.

Comment ID: 291

First Name: raymond

Last Name: barbour**Commenter Email:** rbarb68773@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 08:41:02 AM**Comment:**

Name: barbour, raymond Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing you this morning concerning the bill about stopping producing gas powered cars and trucks. As a person who drives everyday, I rather drive a gas powered 1/2 ton truck over a battery truck. Please do not pass this bill. Thank You Raymond Barbour

Comment ID: 292**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Russo**Commenter Email:** russojohnnt@att.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 08:46:13 AM**Comment:**

Name: Russo, John Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 If the Legislature thinks this is a good policy (Public Act 4-84/22-25), then the State should switch over their vehicles and mandate the State legislatures to drive all electric vehicles. The ones who create the laws should have to know the consequences of their policies. Then they can tell everybody how great or bad it is. Some years back there was a war on incandescent light bulbs. The government made it hard to buy them and they wanted us to use fluorescent bulbs (CFL). The fluorescent bulbs were an inferior product. Thankfully, LED bulbs became affordable and we switched to them. The State should not be forcing people to buy certain products, period. With reference to this proposal I'll list some obvious considerations: can the existing electrical grid handle it, will there be enough charging stations, what about people who aren't able to charge at their homes (e.g. apartments & condos), what about those that have long commutes, what about those that have large loads to carry (e.g. farming), what about the cold weather (we aren't California), will the technology change, will software cars be easily hacked, will our State become less resilient to disaster (diversity fosters resilience), will there be enough minerals to mine to make the desired number of vehicles (will we change from oil wars to lithium wars), will fire departments have to upgrade to deal with metal fires, will home and auto insurance costs increase, what about the extra weight of EVs verse ICEs (will this wear down the roads faster, and are the building structure such as parking garages able to handle it, will EVs go through more tires), what about people not being able to service their cars, what about the jobs and local business within CT that services ICE vehicles, what about EV battery life, (replacement is difficult and the cost is ridiculous)? I could go on, but I hope I've made my point. EVs have some advantages and other disadvantages. People need to make up their own minds to determine what works best for their situation. If the product is superior and the experience is pleasant then people will naturally buy EVs. The government should not get in the middle, it will only disrupt the process and we will all suffer. Lastly, we must remember CO2 it is a trace element it makes up only 0.04% of our atmosphere (the Earth is not Venus - with 96.0% CO2). This is government over-reach please do not support it. Thank you.

Comment ID: 293**First Name:** Melissa**Last Name:** Nimmo**Commenter Email:** melissanimmo@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 09:03:08 AM**Comment:**

Name: Nimmo, Melissa Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support the adoption of Connecticut's Public

Act 04-84 and Public Act 22-25. We must move forward in our adoption of California greenhouse gas emission standards for passenger cars, light duty trucks, and medium duty passenger vehicles. I also laud the creation of Public Act 22-25 to add medium and heavy-duty vehicles in these higher standards and applaud a ban on the sale of new gas-powered passenger vehicles by the year 2035. We must work together to decrease our reliance on fossil fuels; increase the accepted mpg on all vehicles and move toward natural sources of solar, wind and hydro energy. I DO NOT support HB 5277 which moves our state and country backwards in energy policy and increased reliance on foreign energy!

Comment ID: 294

First Name: Joseph

Last Name: LaVorgna

Commenter Email: josephandsandy@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/12/23 09:07:47 AM

Comment:

Name: LaVorgna, Joseph Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Another insane regulation that has implications beyond what proponents of the bill understand.

Comment ID: 295

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Nimmo

Commenter Email: nimmo.rw@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/12/23 09:23:04 AM

Comment:

Name: Nimmo, Robert Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writting in support of the proposed regulations that would ban the sales of new gas-powered passenger cars (beginning in 2035) and that would gradually prohibit the sale of new gas-powered trucks. This is a gradual change that is necessary to stall the impact of internal combustion engines on climate change. Contrary to State Representative Mark Andersond position I believe that transitioning to innovative technologes advances the Connecticut and US economies, reduces air pollutants and improves public health. Public Act 04-84 which requires the state to adopt California greenhouse gas emission standards for passenger cars, light duty trucks, and medium duty passenger vehicles was signed into law by Governor John Rowland in 2004, 19 years ago. These changes are not happening fast enough to stall the impacts of climate change in Connecticut, the U.S., and the only world we have.

Comment ID: 296

First Name: dave

Last Name: ellington

Commenter Email: esat243@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/12/23 09:45:27 AM

Comment:

Name: ellington, dave Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 that is a start

Comment ID: 297

First Name: Scott

Last Name: Weiman

Commenter Email: scott726@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/12/23 10:23:30 AM

Comment:

Name: Weiman, Scott Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please don't ban gas powered vehicles. To do so would be reckless and irresponsible. This isn't California and will never be California. Stop trying to regulate every part of our lives. We can figure out the gas vs. electric thing on our own. Instead of forcing people to do things, try making it easier and affordable to do those things. We're not children, please don't treat us like children. Thank you

Comment ID: 298

First Name: Rick

Last Name: Fiamengo

Commenter Email: rickfiamengo24@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/12/23 10:40:15 AM

Comment:

Name: Fiamengo, Rick Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am a lifetime home owner in CT for over 40 years. I want to be able to purchase ANY type of vehical i choose. If conneticut will force me to purchase only vehicals they approve of (i.e. Electric) then i will be saying GOOD BYE to CT.

Comment ID: 299

First Name: Pat

Last Name: Casertano

Commenter Email: pac36d@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Casertano, Pat Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't understand how the state of Connecticut can tell us what kind of vehicle to drive! I'm retired and can't afford and don't want an electric vehicle. With the price of electricity in this state how can you even consider this law! Time for some new voices in our state government who live like the rest of us.

Comment ID: 300

First Name: Frank

Last Name: Blume

Commenter Email: frankblume@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/12/23 11:18:36 AM

Comment:

Name: Blume, Frank Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Stupid idea!Stop believing what the government is telling you!

Comment ID: 301**First Name:** Verna**Last Name:** Blume**Commenter Email:** fblume@att.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 11:21:00 AM**Comment:**

Name: Blume, Verna Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not approve of this.

Comment ID: 302**First Name:** mary**Last Name:** harlo**Commenter Email:** mare1010@cox.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 12:14:13 PM**Comment:**

Name: harlo, mary Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to banning 'gas-powered vehicles'

because not only the State of CT, but this country (as a whole) does not have the resources available to generate the amount of electricity it would take. How would that electricity be generated? From generators powered by gasoline or natural gas? Eliminating combustion engines in vehicles is not the be-all/end-all answer/solution. There are way too many variables. What do you do with the spent batteries? They're not recyclable. What happens when they catch fire? Let them burn for hours & hours on end? The emissions given off from those fires contains cyanide! Did the government even consider that? Maybe if some genius/rocket scientist can come up with a way for vehicles to run on water, that might be a more feasible solution? I'm not being sarcastic; but banning gasoline/diesel powered vehicles within the next 20 years is as viable a solution as making all vehicles run on water. More & more people are making their vehicles last longer, due to the exponential rise in costs across the board.

Comment ID: 303**First Name:** Susan**Last Name:** Gallagher**Commenter Email:** Susangallagher54@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 12:34:15 PM**Comment:**

Name: Gallagher, Susan Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm wondering how we are going to be able to get

up and running to power electric cars by 2037. I'm not optimistic that this can be done and that our grid can take it.

I'm also thinking about myself, a senior, 66yrs old. I'll be 80 and my car will be 16 yrs old. I live in an apartment building. If I have to buy an electric car, you're telling me it's going to be easy for an 80 yr old to find a open spot to charge my car and then sit around waiting for it to charge? This is just not doable. It's so unrealistic. You can say goodbye to more people who pay taxes in CT if this happens.

Comment ID: 304**First Name:** Alfred**Last Name:** Wilke**Commenter Email:** alnhelenw@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:** None**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 03:49:07 PM**Comment:**

Name: Wilke, Alfred Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Looks like our liberal legislators are tying the State's future to the asinine strategies of California's Progressive political movement. So much for independent local government. That will really speed up the exodus to citizen friendly states! Congratulations in promoting an already failed state to economic ruin!

Comment ID: 305**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Ferrante**Commenter Email:** jfsr@juno.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** N/A**Commenter Title:** N/A**Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Ferrante, John Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Gentlemen: I have significant concerns about the unintended consequences of the proposed bans, including their impact on businesses and residents, as well as the finances of many who are already grappling with high costs and taxes. I believe your proposal, which clearly mimics California, would lead CT down the same bad path as that unfortunate state with equally bad consequences. That is exactly what happened when CT mimicked CA years ago by deregulating the electricity supply, a critical infrastructure. In addition, it appears that these proposals disregard the overall scientific analysis, in a rush to join the misguided popular bandwagon of energy supply. Please abandon these efforts.

Comment ID: 306**First Name:** Renee**Last Name:** Weimann**Commenter Email:** rweimann23@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 03:59:33 PM**Comment:**

Name: Weimann, Renee Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 So, you want to ban ALL gas powered cars & trucks by 2035... because that's the answer. That's your answer to the countless things wrong with this state and our country. I am all for clean energy and saving the environment, but it is disappointing at best, that your energies and attention are not focused on what really needs attention-- education and immigration, & better gun control laws. Not to mention ridiculously high taxes, the complete and utter breakdown of agencies like DYFS, our criminal justice system and the lack of services and care given to our veterans. These issues are at the top of our lists, but you are focused on making EV mandatory. Do you career politicians have any idea how much an EV costs?..not all of us can afford one. Most of us can barely pay the mortgage/rent or afford medications. Do you even have a plan to increase the power grid to support this newest mandate? Here's the scenario- I buy the EV, I get taxed on it about 3 times before I even get it home and then I have to pay MV taxes on it every year. THEN... I have to charge it every other day and that drives up my power bill, or I have to pay for it at a charging station. Then what happens when the battery doesn't hold its charge as long as it used to. Then what do I do? Making things mandatory is not the way to a better society. You can be in favor of something, but opposed to it being mandatory. You can be against something, but not in favor of it being banned. SMART people understand this. Once again, Hartford, you are out of touch with your voters.

Comment ID: 307**First Name:** lisa**Last Name:** damiano**Commenter Email:** rl7493@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 05:00:01 PM**Comment:**

Name: damiano, lisa Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against any government taking away my choice to choose gas vs electric - now or in the future. Let the consumers make the choose by purchasing! I am a member of the Association of Realtors but not the president. The space would not let me remove the information.

Comment ID: 308**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Murphy**Commenter Email:** jbmurphy616@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 05:41:56 PM**Comment:**

Name: Murphy, John Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Proposal is ridiculous. CT doesn't have infrastructure to support. Also, people who are not well off can't afford. As far as protecting environment: 1) Electricity to charge must come from electricity generation plants (coal?). Finally, bad for environment: Fires, where to dispose of worn out batteries? Mining for minerals to make batteries done by children, and bad for environment.

Comment ID: 309**First Name:** Richard**Last Name:** Gannon**Commenter Email:** painman@cox.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 06:46:24 PM**Comment:**

Name: Gannon, Richard Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't think an outright ban on gas powered cars is appropriate. I would like to see an incentive to purchase a hybrid or electric car.

Comment ID: 310**First Name:** Rosann**Last Name:** Bourdeau**Commenter Email:** r_bourdeau@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/12/23 08:16:51 PM**Comment:**

Name: Bourdeau, Rosann Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 don't believe we are ready to commit to this amount of electric cars. The generation capacity of the state is insufficient to support the added load to the grid,

the cost of adding charging stations to existing buildings is expensive, we do not have recycling stations to deal with the batteries at the end of their lifespans, and there isn't enough infrastructure to charge vehicles in a prompt and convenient manner on trips. This proposal is premature until these matters are addressed.

Comment ID: 311

First Name: Tod

Last Name: Lorusso

Commenter Email: todlor3@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/12/23 09:03:14 PM

Comment:

Name: Lorusso , Tod Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is not a good plan. Gas cars should always be an option. We should always have a choice. If someone makes a fantastic electric car then we will buy it. Right now it doesn't exist and can you pretend to plan WHEN it will exist. PLEASE do not pursue this plan.

Comment ID: 312

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Batista

Commenter Email: mikeb@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Hillside Neighborhood Association

Commenter Title: President

Posted Date: 08/12/23 10:41:12 PM

Comment:

Name: Batista, Michael Submission Date: 8/12/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposed "Low Emission Vehicle IV Program and Advanced Clean Cars II" legislation mirrors California's approach to emissions standards, but it's crucial to recognize the pitfalls and drawbacks that California's similar policies have faced. While the goal of reducing emissions is admirable, emulating California's model without addressing its shortcomings could have detrimental effects on Connecticut's economy and citizens. California's experience with stringent emissions regulations has not been without its challenges. The state's aggressive push for Zero Emission Vehicles (ZEVs) and near-zero-emission vehicles (NZEVs) has led to several issues that Connecticut should heed before enacting similar measures. California's heavy focus on EVs has contributed to affordability issues for consumers, as electric and hybrid vehicles are often more expensive than traditional gasoline-powered counterparts. This financial barrier can deter lower-income individuals from transitioning to cleaner transportation options. Furthermore, California's charging infrastructure hasn't kept pace with the increased demand for electric vehicles. The lack of convenient and accessible charging stations has led to range anxiety among EV owners and dissuaded potential buyers from embracing electric mobility. A hasty shift to ZEVs without adequate infrastructure support could result in similar issues for Connecticut residents, undermining the convenience and appeal of cleaner vehicles. California's regulations have also had unintended consequences for the automotive industry. Smaller manufacturers have struggled to comply with costly and complex requirements, resulting in limited vehicle diversity and potential job losses. Connecticut should carefully consider the impact on local manufacturers and the broader economy before imposing similar stringent mandates. Moreover, California's focus on passenger vehicles overlooks the significant emissions contributions of other sectors, such as heavy-duty vehicles and industrial sources. A comprehensive approach that addresses all sources of emissions is essential for meaningful progress in tackling environmental challenges. In conclusion, Connecticut should critically assess California's experiences with emissions regulations before blindly adopting similar measures. The state must consider the economic impact, affordability barriers for consumers, and the need for robust charging infrastructure. A more balanced approach that takes into account local factors, consumer preferences, and lessons learned from California's shortcomings is crucial to ensure that the legislation benefits both the environment and the state's residents without causing unintended harm.

Comment ID: 313

First Name: Mary
Last Name: Fairchild
Commenter Email: mary-fairchild@sbcglobal.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Fairchild, Mary Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think that this is a poorly thought out proposal. The danger to the environment with the electric vehicles available to day and the prohibitive cost in this state to charge them in addition to the inevitable rise in the cost of using electric vehicles that will be passed on to the consumer is appalling. Please reconsider this proposal.

Comment ID: 314

First Name: Kristen
Last Name: Bulkley
Commenter Email: bulkfabfour@me.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/13/23 07:02:03 AM

Comment:

Name: Bulkley, Kristen Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The bill to ban gas-powered cars and trucks in Connecticut is actually terrifying. This will destroy businesses and industries that rely on them. Electric vehicles have already been shown to be inordinately expensive, a huge strain to our electrical grid, extremely inconvenient when charging, and not making much a dent in any environments when you need gas-powered factories to make them. This bill will be the reason many of us flee this state. A disaster in the making.

Comment ID: 315

First Name: William
Last Name: Fantoli
Commenter Email: Billsherfan@cox.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/13/23 08:11:29 AM

Comment:

Name: Fantoli, William Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to banning gas powered vehicles by 2035. I do not feel the state or the country a prepared for this. Also, the cost to retired persons as myself would not be affordable. We should explore development of other ways to use fossil fuels to make them more efficient and useful in the future. You cannot force individual to change over that fast to a new and unproven technology.

Comment ID: 316

First Name: Joseph
Last Name: Bonessi
Commenter Email: j.bonessi@sbcglobal.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/13/23 08:28:07 AM

Comment:

Name: Bonessi, Joseph Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 California should not even be a state let alone follow their regulations! You'll only be crippling the middle class more than we already are.

Comment ID: 317

First Name: Steven

Last Name: Jaroszewski

Commenter Email: sjaros@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/13/23 08:38:08 AM

Comment:

Name: Jaroszewski, Steven Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My name is Steven Jaroszewski and I have a home in Sandy Hook, CT. I would like to comment regarding the new CT law which prohibits the sale of new gasoline powered cars by 2035. Please note that I already own two hybrid electric plug-in cars ... and I love them. I have been an electrical engineer for over 45 years. I received my BSEE in 1978 from UCONN and an MS and Degree of Engineer in Engineering from UCLA in 1982 and 1985. Unfortunately, from what I can tell, the current electrical generation and electrical distribution system in CT will not support even one new 220v/60a electric charger in every house that has an electric car ... never mind the new requirements to switch to electric ranges and electric gas dryers in every home. It appears that significant changes will be required to meet the necessary increase in power generation capacity and a significant change will be required to distribute the electrical load to the CT residences before the state goes all electric. The required changes are huge and across the entire distribution system in CT. Additionally, if these changes are not implemented then power shortages and brown outs will be common in the future. I checked our street in CT and we have three (3) 25 KVA transformers to service 10 houses. My guess is that a single 25 KVA transformer to support 3 houses is typical throughout CT and likely the entire US. Each 25 KVA transformer is rated to provide about 115A at 220V. The local electric utility company says the transformer can handle more than 115A for short periods but it can't handle twice that for extended periods, like when charging multiple cars at three separate residences for 8 hours or more. Charging a single car at a single residence can take 60A to 100A for 8 hours. Charging 2 cars at each residence for a single transformer can easily take 360A to 600A for 8 houses. Simply put, using a single 25 KVA transformer every 3 or 4 houses is not enough to support car chargers in every home. That's not the only problem. A huge increase in non-fossil fueled electrical generation capability will also be required to meet the extra electrical demand. I did a quick back-of-the-envelope calculation to determine how much more electrical power is required to replace the fossil fuel energy that is currently used to generate electrical power in CT. That number is enormous. CT generated 825 Trillion BTUs of electrical power for consumers in 2021. 180 Trillion BTUs came from nuclear generation plants (two active reactors at Millstone point), 597 Trillion BTUs from fossil fuel generation plants, 36.5 Trillion BTUs from renewable energy and only 11 Trillion BTUs from solar. Is the plan to replace fossil fuel cars with fossil fueled electrical generation facilities? That certainly doesn't make any sense. I love solar power but a massive increase in solar generation wouldn't work since most vehicle charging occurs at night. Would you replace that 597 Trillion BTUs with additional nuclear plants? If so, we need to build at least 7 new nuclear reactors in CT. I don't know about you but I think that is a very bad idea. We will need a huge increase in electrical generation and we will need massive changes to the electrical distribution system including higher voltage lines to bring the power down the streets and more transformers that are rated at more than 25 KVA over the entire distribution network. The entire grid and power generation capability of CT needs to be rebuilt to support the huge increase in electrical demand that is required with this new law. Are you willing to assume the risks associated with the construction of 7 new nuclear plants in CT??? Where will the additional nuclear power generation facilities be located??? Will they be located all along the beautiful CT coastline??? Somehow, I think that will be a very tough sell. Will the entire grid and power generation capability of CT be rebuilt before 2035??? Not likely! If you don't have answers to these questions, then you are moving ahead without full knowledge of the consequences. I strongly suggest that you move a bit slower.

Comment ID: 318

First Name: Anthony

Last Name: Albano

Commenter Email: talbano15@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/13/23 08:38:13 AM**Comment:**

Name: Albano, Anthony Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not agree with this proposal. 1) it is a copycat proposal of California with little or no Connecticut research of their own. 2) in copying California we are I a climate that is vastly different than California and should be strongly considered. 3) How is this proposal going to effect the unstable grid that we already work off of? As it is Connecticut imports the majority of our electricity. - This will continue to push the price of electricity up and greatly impact families and businesses. As this occurs our State officials will once again tell us they have no control over EverSource and UI (summer of 2022).

Comment ID: 319**First Name:** Danny**Last Name:** Jovanelly**Commenter Email:** djovan9388@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/13/23 09:26:56 AM**Comment:**

Name: Jovanelly, Danny Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I will purchase an electric vehicle after ALL State, city, and towns motor vehicles (including snow plowing and removal, recycling, utility and road repair as well as police cars and police motorcycles) are electric vehicles.

Comment ID: 320**First Name:** Terri**Last Name:** Yuhas**Commenter Email:** Rooftop1931@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/13/23 10:08:15 AM**Comment:**

Name: Yuhas, Terri Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not agree with the proposed required move to electric vehicles for Ct residents within the proposed time frames for the following reasons based on my understanding; the first is safety - in the event of an accident the fire caused by electronic vehicles burns very hot and is difficult to extinguish. This can be a much greater risk to drivers and their families- are people aware and have they been asked if they accept that risk? Safety and charging stations- charging stations are not manned today and the ones I have seen are in retail areas where no one is around once the store closes. People have to sit alone in their car for quite a long time and have to get out to use their credit card. This can be a dangerous scenario for anyone as they may be targeted for theft - I would like to see all commercial charging stations manned 24 by 7 to ensure people's safety and also provide immediate customer service in the event of an issue with the station or payment. This is especially dangerous for the older population who may only go to full service gas stations today. Ruth is that people's children will need to go recharge their parents cars knowing an older person may not be able to sit that long or understand what to do in the event of issues such as charger not working or credit card not working or they drop their credit card while trying to use it but have difficulty getting out of their car. Impact - the impact is unfairly disproportionate to suburban and rural areas as they need to drive much farther for basic services than urban areas. Impact and availability- today people line up at gas stations for a 20 minute refueling. I cannot imagine the lines at charging stations which would be unacceptable. Availability- what happens if a driver is running low on charge and is in a strange area? Again no customer service station open which can lead to a dangerous situation. Availability and impact if the power grid goes down-people cannot travel or get to work. Jobs- today service gas stations hire a lot of employees. They may not be high paying jobs but it is a start for some families and much

needed. Is ct ready to retrain them all? Again higher impact to rural and suburban areas. Time to charge- it takes a long time to charge a car today. Electric vehicles also cannot go as far.. which loops back to earlier safety concerns. This has to be addressed. I think Ct role is to first ensure Ct residents are safe. I would like to see all of these issues clearly communicated to Ct residents in a manner of what is in place today and how that may change in the future, all potential risks spelled out clearly and potential required operational changes that may affect their daily lives. Passing this law requiring a move to electronic vehicles before we address all the issues I think would have a huge negative impact on Ct residents and leave us open for safety risks that if spelled out clearly and communicated to all Ct residents would not be acceptable. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment ID: 321

First Name: Jerry

Last Name: Ledger

Commenter Email: jjldgr@ieee.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/13/23 11:55:56 AM

Comment:

Name: Ledger, Jerry Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Mark, I am disappointed in your lack of understanding of the global weather crisis and the causes of it. We should be doing much more in restricting all pollutants by any means possible including finding ways to remove all vehicles with dangerous emissions with viable alternatives

Comment ID: 322

First Name: Max

Last Name: Vladimiroff

Commenter Email: vldm@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/13/23 01:37:46 PM

Comment:

Name: Vladimiroff, Max Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The transition to electric vehicles is occurring swiftly. General Motors has already pledged to exclusively offer zero-emission vehicles by 2035. The legislation under consideration in Connecticut won't alter this trajectory; rather, it would formally acknowledge the inevitable shift. I wholeheartedly urge you to cast your vote in favor of passing the Advanced Clean Cars II regulation to prohibit the sales of new gas-powered passenger cars.

Comment ID: 323

First Name: dawn

Last Name: handschuh

Commenter Email: dawn303030@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/13/23 03:56:55 PM

Comment:

Name: handschuh, dawn Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly support passage of this regulation that would require car dealers in the state to start selling more zero- or low-emission vehicles through 2035 until the new mandate begins. I also support a required increase in percentage of electric vehicles sold in the state by 2032.

Comment ID: 324

First Name: Jeff**Last Name:** Tooley**Commenter Email:** jjtooley@alum.mit.edu**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Veeder-Root**Commenter Title:** Engineer**Posted Date:** 08/13/23 04:28:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Tooley, Jeff Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I believe banning the sales of new gas-powered passenger cars is misguided toward the goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Per U.S. DoE data last published in February 2020 the average fuel economy for cars is 24.2 mpg, while for light trucks / vans is 17.5mpg - <https://afdc.energy.gov/data>. I drive a Hyundai Sonata hybrid w/ a solar panel roof which achieves 55mpg year round (60mpg in the summer). If there were a ban on the sales of only new gas-only powered passenger cars makes sense, then this ban could immediately reduce tailpipe greenhouse emissions by ~50%. The battery material needed to produce a single EV can instead be used to produce over 70 Toyota Priuses. A typical EV carries a load of over 1,000 pounds of batteries that is both wasteful for the typical commuter and this heavy load reduces the efficiency of the EV drivetrain. The currently available battery material supply is only able to displace ~40% of the cars on the road for EV's. Although costs are coming down, EV's are not yet economically competitive (disregarding any tax credits) with a comparable ICE vehicle. Hydrogen combustion or fuel cells are interesting vehicle drivetrain technologies that have the potential to compete with EV's. But fuel cell technology is currently expensive and hydrogen fueling infrastructure is lacking. Turning back to ICE vehicles, biofuels and e-fuels are both fuel types that are backward compatible with ICE technology and, depending upon how electricity and hydrogen are produced, are better for the environment. Biofuel is a lower carbon emission fuel that is ready to scale to increased volume. E-fuel, which is produced by removing carbon dioxide from the air, is a carbon neutral fuel that is still in the technology development phase, but with support from Porsche low volume production results are promising. Combined with technologies that are either being scaled or researched to capture carbon dioxide underground or at the point of ICE exhaust and using alkaline to safely store carbon dioxide in the ocean, I believe a more effective strategy to reduce future greenhouse gas emissions is to regulate the type of fuel and means of capturing any tailpipe emissions, rather than banning a drivetrain technology which, if ICE were to burn e-fuel, can be the least carbon-intensive drivetrain amongst all commercially viable options.

Comment ID: 325**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Ryng**Commenter Email:** jeryng1@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/13/23 07:55:11 PM**Comment:**

Name: Ryng, John Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As of 8/14/23 many Connecticut linesmen were laid off because there is a dire shortage of electric components to properly maintain our electrical grid system. Many building projects in Connecticut are on hold because of this shortage. Is DEEP aware of this and the possibility that shortages may linger for many years since many of the components are made overseas. This is a disaster in making unless these components are made in the U.S. Any potential change in regulations should be contingent on the availability of electrical charging stations, competition in the generation and sale of electricity and the fabrication of all electrical components needed to maintain our national grid system in the U.S. Otherwise, our transportation system will be at the mercy of belligerent foreign countries and consumers will be fighting for space at generating stations that may be selling electricity provided by one seller at prohibitive rates.

Comment ID: 326**First Name:** Gerald**Last Name:** Freidman**Commenter Email:** buzzclu@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/13/23 08:19:51 PM**Comment:**

Name: Freidman, Gerald Submission Date: 8/13/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please know that I am totally opposed to any regulation/legislation which would usurp my right to purchase and own any type of motor vehicle that complies with the safety laws currently in place within the State of Connecticut. From an economic standpoint, alone, you are treading in dangerous waters: - By the nature of supply & demand, by eliminating the eventual sale of gas-powered vehicles there will less and less "used" gas powered vehicles available to purchase at a constantly increasing price. - Electrical car manufacturers, seeing this, will continuously raise prices far above what common people can afford. - As gas powered vehicles begin to disappear, the auto mechanics who have been servicing them will have less to work on and will eventually lose their jobs, increasing unemployment in our state. - The cost of a home charging system is expensive to install and would generally require a major upgrade to the to the homes' system. Whole neighborhoods would require major grid updates because of electric demand. Remember "black outs and brown outs" because of a/c demands? - The electricity rates in Connecticut are already too high! Increasing demand will further drive up those prices. How much can the average citizen afford? - The average time to stop and fill a car with gas is maybe 5 minutes. Older and handicapped drivers can always request assistance and be on their way. A partial recharging can last 30 minutes or more if they can find a charging station and the wait for a unit to become available is not encumbered by long lines. There are so many more considerations to ponder in taking such a foolhardy action in changing the law. There is not enough time/space to do it here. There are MANY arguments which can be made to "clean air" and the environment. Gas powered vehicles are NOT the only cause of air pollution. Ask a Fire/Paramedic about the dangers of responding to fires involving passengers in a lithium powered vehicle! Please know that I am a 79 year old disabled military veteran who STRONGLY opposes what you are suggesting. If this appears to be heading to fruition, you can count on another taxpayer leaving this state. Thank you. Gerald R. Freidman

Comment ID: 327**First Name:** Tracy**Last Name:** Russell**Commenter Email:** trussell@barnesaero.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Ct Resident**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 06:30:23 AM**Comment:**

Name: Russell, Tracy Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to submit comment on the proposed law effecting the sales of gas-powered vehicles in 2035. I don't believe that this is an appropriate action to be taken. First, I don't believe that our electrical grid will be ready for this mandate. Even if it is, the cost to the state resident to purchase a new electric vehicle, many people cannot afford this. second where is the freedom to make a choice of what type of vehicle you buy? Isn't this state all about choice? (My body my choice??) Where is the free market? This is not a good decision (for the state) to make for the people without the people making the choice for themselves. I know that this is in the name of climate change, but I do believe there will be unintended consequences.

Comment ID: 328**First Name:** Kevin**Last Name:** Keller**Commenter Email:** wakeboarding1@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 08:17:49 AM**Attachments:**

Banning gas car sales.pdf

Comment:

Name: Keller, Kevin Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 See attached PDF

Comment ID: 329

First Name: James

Last Name: Umbarger

Commenter Email: jumbarger@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: N/A - retired

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 08:47:12 AM

Comment:

Name: Umbarger, James Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have seen several articles on this proposal and the effect on gas stations, auto mechanic shops and charging stations. But, I have seen no discussion on the thousands of underground gasoline/diesel tanks and their removal or remediation. This is an environmental problem that will have many significant environmental aspects

Comment ID: 330

First Name: Edward

Last Name: Maccio

Commenter Email: Ed.maccio@msn.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 09:13:32 AM

Comment:

Name: Maccio, Edward Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The people of this state do not want this. This is all about control. In what way you may ask- control of people's travel- Evs have very limited range compared to gas powered cars along with recharge time- who wants to wait around for the battery to recharge vs 10 minutes to fill a tank with gas, control of who has a car- evs are much more expensive than gas powered cars- less people will be able to afford forcing them onto public transportation which leads to loss of independence, reliability- how many battery fires have there been and evs cars not working in floods. I can go on. Politicians for got some time ago- they work for and represent the citizens, not the other way around.

Comment ID: 331

First Name: Lisa

Last Name: Jolley

Commenter Email: ljolley558@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 09:48:51 AM

Comment:

Name: Jolley, Lisa Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please don't make such important and far reaching decisions based on what is politically correct. We do not have the infrastructure to support total conversion to electric transportation and our electric rates are already through the roof. The additional amount of electric generation you are proposing will require the burning of vast amounts of fossil fuels to produce the electricity. What if we have another Super Storm Sandy? No electricity for a million people! No driving! Do your research on the consequences of eliminating gas powered vehicles and then do the right thing for the people of Connecticut.

Comment ID: 332**First Name:** David**Last Name:** Angliss**Commenter Email:** david@anglisscolohanpc.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 09:54:50 AM**Comment:**

Name: Angliss, David Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have a number of comments on the proposed ban of cars and trucks: 1. The use of EV's will only reduce emissions by .18% according to a Wall Street Journal article. 2. The carbon foot print to produce the EV's is very large and used electricity from non-renewable sources. 3. Much of the electricity to charge and EV will come from non-renewable sources. In CA there is not enough electricity being produced to allow charging of cars. That will happen here as well. 4. The biggest problem with EV's is the amount of rare earth materials that have to be mined to create the batteries. Not only is a large amount of energy expended to do this but the environmental impact is very large. Countries like China have most of the mines for rare earth materials under their control so we are exposed to that type of control. The evaporation of water in Argentina to extract the lithium is creating water salinity and contamination problems. 5. The recycling of EV batteries is of great concern. They will cause an environmental problem. 6. What happens to the auto mechanics, gas station owners and all workers related to them. That transition will be a financial disaster for our residents. 7. How will this help if all states do not go in this direction?

Comment ID: 333**First Name:** Roy**Last Name:** Merritt**Commenter Email:** roymerrittjr@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 10:24:27 AM**Comment:**

Name: Merritt, Roy Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a lifelong resident of Connecticut, I am writing to express significant concerns regarding the proposed regulation concerning Advanced Clean Cars (Tracking Number PR2023-023), which would require that all cars and trucks sold in CT by 2035 be electric or plug-in hybrid vehicles. My concerns are as follows: 1. The limited range issues of electric vehicles are impractical for many residents who have lengthy commutes, spend most of their workday driving, or travel out-of-state for work (i.e., those working in construction, delivery drivers, taxi or uber drivers, regional or traveling sales, etc.). 2. The lack of charging infrastructure currently present in our state, particularly in rural areas and along our road networks that is necessary to conveniently re-charge a 100% electric fleet of private vehicles amongst state residents. 3. The significant cost and environmental impact to provide the required charging infrastructure, as well as the huge increases required to our electrical generation and distribution networks. 4. How would the state provide adequate charging capacity for those residents who live in apartments (both large complexes and private duplex or in-law apartments)? Would landlords be responsible for providing the charging infrastructure or would the state fund these improvements? 5. CT already has a strained electrical grid and some of the highest electricity costs in the country. Mandating electric vehicles will only create additional demands for electricity which will further strain our generation and distribution capabilities and increase costs on the consumer, who are already financially strained by the high cost of living in CT. 6. Many residents rely on older gas-powered vehicles and cannot afford a new car or truck, particularly a high-priced electric vehicle. Will these people be forced to relocate out-of-state due to the unaffordability of most electric vehicles? 7. What will be done with all the used car batteries from electric vehicles when they are at the end of their useful life? 8. How will all the raw materials required for the batteries in electric vehicles be procured? Will CT look to develop local or domestic sources for the materials and fabrication required, or continue to have the industry import much of the required raw materials from foreign countries (many who are our adversaries)? I would urge the State to reconsider any mandates prohibiting gas-powered vehicles and requiring sales of only electric or plug-in hybrid vehicles until the above concerns are satisfactorily addressed. My

recommendation would be to allow all types of power-systems for vehicles in CT while an organic transition to alternative vehicle power sources occurs without any random, forced deadlines. Thank you, Roy Merritt, Jr.

Comment ID: 334

First Name: Cathleen

Last Name: Stark

Commenter Email: Starkwoman06470@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 10:37:55 AM

Comment:

Name: Stark, Cathleen Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposal makes me think of buying something based upon wishes beyond financial means founded upon hoped for funds in the future. Same unsound logic for many reasons beginning with unreliable energy sources with an inadequate grid system to support the needs now ,hence the terms ? rolling blackouts? I am assuming attachment with correction measures needed for unrealistic plan A. Realistic planning for the future is called for, not pie in the sky wishes and promises that will lead to a cycle of issues to be resolved after the horse is out of the barn. Cathleen Stark

Comment ID: 335

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Gilgosky

Commenter Email: maybock@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 10:52:02 AM

Comment:

Name: Gilgosky, Peter Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is Reckless and Irresponsible to think that electric vehicles can replace safe, dependable and much less expensive fossil fuel vehicles as long as the federal government doesn't continue to destroy the fossil fuel industry which greatly inflates the cost of gas to the consumer and obliterates our energy independence for the sake of a political agenda! EV's are proven NOT SAFE (they spontaneously combust), limited range, outrageously expensive and with the present minuscule infrastructure available to charge the vehicle in and out of home further discussion of ev's in their present raw stage and unstable form shouldn't even be considered without first solving all of the many issues plaguing the industry let alone the lack of electrical supply to support ev charging stations without compromising electrical supply for the consumer. And preventing the utility companies from artificially inflating their rates exorbitantly. That's nothing but pure GREED at the consumers expense making their lives, living conditions and wallets much lighter, for what? Question: Why hasn't anyone else thought of these issues and if they have why would a reasonable person decide to continue with aggressively pushing this political agenda down our throats and not dismissing this scheme offhand because it's not logically, economically or scientifically feasible in its present form period!

Comment ID: 336

First Name: Stephen

Last Name: Simonin

Commenter Email: ssimonin@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 10:56:44 AM

Comment:

Name: Simonin, Stephen Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the state's Department of Energy

and Environmental Protection (DEEP) is accepting written comments on two proposed regulations, one that would ban the sales of new gas-powered passenger cars (beginning in 2035) and another that would gradually prohibit the sale of new gas-powered trucks that are used to ship goods and provide essential services. I have significant concerns about the unintended consequences of the proposed bans, including their impact on businesses and residents, as well as the finances of many who are already grappling with costs associated with living in one of the nation's most energy-expensive states. If you intend to call these GREEN energy then they can only be powered by hydro, wind or solar! Using our grid requires burning oil or coal and at a lower efficiency than burning gas directly and a much higher cost to all of in \$ and the pollution it creates. SO NO way should this be imposed on us

Comment ID: 337

First Name: Debby

Last Name: Riendeau

Commenter Email: inspirationsta@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 11:22:37 AM

Comment:

Name: Riendeau, Debby Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No. Just no. Our power infrastructure is not sufficient to handle a change to electric vehicles. Until the issue of how to safely produce and DISPOSE of the batteries for these types of vehicles is solved I don't believe a change is going to be beneficial. Also, the cost to individuals, small businesses and municipalities to create & maintain ?charging stations ?, not to mention the inconvenience in times of power outages is too great.

Comment ID: 338

First Name: John

Last Name: Woodilla

Commenter Email: jwoodilla@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 11:47:29 AM

Comment:

Name: Woodilla, John Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Department of Energy and Environmental Protection: I have had an electric vehicle (EV) since May 2020. I love it. I do not do much driving anymore ? mostly just local. I am fortunate in that I can recharge my car in my garage most of the time, just on 110 volts. Others won't be so fortunate. It doesn't really matter how long it takes me to recharge my car, but it will surely matter a great deal to others. We read about greater numbers of charging stations being planned. That's great ? we need many more. However, it is most likely that these charging stations will be installed along our Interstate highways at rest stops. That's an easy way to get your numbers. But what about Connecticut residents who live in the cities of our state? Do they have to drive out to the Interstate to find a charge? Many people don't have to drive to an Interstate to get to work. They park their cars along city streets bumper to bumper because they don't have a driveway or garage. Where and how do they recharge their car? Drop an extension cord out a window and drag it across the sidewalk to their car? It might work if you lived on the first or second floor of a 3, 4, or 5-story walkup, but it will be very inconvenient for upper-story folks. The liability associated with people tripping over extension cords on sidewalks is considerable, as are snowblowers chewing up extension cords accompanied by some big sparks in the winter. The residents of our cities will become extremely angry. You will need acres of charging stations within our cities. You are looking at 2035 as the date for purchasing only EVs; new gas-powered vehicles will be banned. But we could still purchase used gas-powered vehicles. With declining gas-powered vehicles on the highway, there will be fewer and fewer gasoline stations staying in business. Finding an open gas station will be the opposite of today's problem of finding a working EV charging station. This will anger residents who can't afford a new EV and continue with their old gasoline-powered vehicle. Just saying that we'll be EV only at some date in the future is perilous without planning now for how and where we charge these vehicles, especially in the cities.

Comment ID: 339**First Name:** Jan**Last Name:** Schuck**Commenter Email:** Jschuck01@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 12:26:59 PM**Comment:**

Name: Schuck, Jan Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a retired teacher in the state of Ct. , I am not allowed to participate in social security and Medicare. Where do you think I am going to get together enough money to buy an electric car? My pension doesn't stretch that far. After 35 years of teaching and saving, I am OK for now, but an electric car is not in my future!

Comment ID: 340**First Name:** Harold**Last Name:** Mitchell**Commenter Email:** mitchellharold@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 12:53:01 PM**Comment:**

Name: Mitchell, Harold Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am concerned about what it means if we are not allowed to purchase a gas vehicle in 2035. EV's are not at a point where they are affordable or maintainable. All components for the battery come from China, which means we are enriching our enemy. Also, what is the long-term effect on the jobs that will be lost due to this mandate. I agree we need to get away from fossil fuels, but battery cars is not a good solution. There may be an alternative renewable energy source for cars in the future. However, we are not within 10 years of that. I think this is a huge mistake by Connecticut to put an end date on this. More should be done to attract new businesses to develop alternate energy sources and put Connecticut on the map. Please don't follow California, people are leaving that state in mass. I would hate to see that happen here as well.

Comment ID: 341**First Name:** Michael**Last Name:** Wodjenski**Commenter Email:** wodje96@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 02:59:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Wodjenski, Michael Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposal is completely unrealistic for CT residents and imposes an unreasonable financial and practical burden on its residents. CT residents pay the 2nd highest electric rates in the country, we are second only to Hawaii. The range of ZEVs is only suitable for short trips and daily commuting. Long road trips are essentially not possible with ZEVs. Charging times are very long (9hrs for household chargers, 40minutes for quick charges). Quick charges cost more than the cost of gasoline. Our current grid is already overburdened, adding a huge demand will create rationing, brown outs, and further escalated pricing. The cost of ZEVs is much higher than ICEs for new vehicles in general and after 7-10 years they require costly battery replacements (\$7000-\$20000). This cost alone will greatly affect lower income residents who rely on purchasing older used vehicles at an affordable price to get by. ZEVs will radically change the low cost used market and price these people out of transportation and therefore out of work. ZEVs are not practical for

emergency scenarios when a reliable vehicle is needed the most: during storms, hurricanes, tornados, blizzards, etc. when the power is out, you won't be able to charge and will be stranded. For ICE vehicles you can simply have a can of fuel around as back up. ZEV are completely not suitable for people who take long road trips or spend extended time in the back country. There are no charging stations in the Canadian bush or remote parts of Maine and likely never will be, you must carry extra fuel to these places as a requirement or risk being stranded. This proposal essentially is taking what is a good solution for some of the residents and grossly mandating to all residents regardless of whether it is a good solution for them or not. I'm vehemently opposed to this proposal. ZEVs will find their place in the market and do not need governmental mandates to force a solution that does not meet the needs of the residents and creates hardship and burden for many upon them. Respectfully, Mike Wodjenski

Comment ID: 342

First Name: Janet

Last Name: Settle

Commenter Email: janet.settle@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 03:09:08 PM

Comment:

Name: Settle, Janet Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am astonished that this legislation is even being considered. Haven't our legislators noticed what is happening in California? The state wants everyone to switch to electric vehicles and then tells them not to charge them due to rolling blackouts. What is the plan to produce all of this electricity? Are they thinking renewable energy can supply this tremendous demand? We all saw our electric bills more than double over the winter. Who could even afford to charge their electric vehicles? With inflation skyrocketing and young families already struggling to make ends meet as well as seniors like us on a fixed income, the added expenses would be devastating. This legislation makes absolutely no sense to me. I would like for someone to explain to me how this could be a good idea.

Comment ID: 343

First Name: Thomas

Last Name: Moriarty

Commenter Email: tmmoriarty112@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: N/A

Commenter Title: n/A

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Moriarty, Thomas Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't believe there is enough information now to set a ban on the sale of gas powered vehicles in 2035. Slow down!

Comment ID: 344

First Name: Judy

Last Name: Lathrop

Commenter Email: jrlangel@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/14/23 03:39:16 PM

Comment:

Name: Lathrop, Judy Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is absolutely absurd. No way would I support this change from gas powered cars to electric.

Comment ID: 345**First Name:** Lorraine**Last Name:** Blight**Commenter Email:** rayyne@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 04:27:55 PM**Comment:**

Name: Blight, Lorraine Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Proposing any regulation concerning banning gas powered cars and/or trucks is extremely premature at this time!!!! It's a short sighted Band-Aid fix that should be the last step in a total revamping process of our current resource capabilities. 1.) We DO NOT even remotely have an electrical grid comprehensive and/or stable enough to support such a move. We can't even handle the level of e-vehicles out there currently. 2.) We're substituting one environmental issue w/ another, as NO ONE has addressed what we're going to do w/ all these batteries that only last around 5yrs and are seriously toxic. 3.) The technology has not yet been developed to support the kind of distance ranges and timelines required for a significant portion of the population to commute or truckers to function within the travel restrictions they currently have to work within, let alone function in rural areas. 4.) The safety issue surrounding batteries catching fire has not been addressed or resolved. 5.) Converting to e-vehicles doesn't really do anything to help our environmental issues, as all that electricity we'll be using is still created using those same fossil fuels and this conversion will only exponentially increase the demand need that we already are struggling to meet! 6.) Why are we not focusing on all that methane that the melting polar regions are releasing - how are we going to fix that!!! Does anyone seriously think that establishing deadlines to ban fossil fuel vehicles can realistically be established without the above major outstanding issues (just to name a few) having identified solutions and at least initial timelines for implementation in place. Anyone with any sense of critical thinking should see a major problem with this! Does anyone seriously think that all of the above issues will have been resolved by 2035, when no one seems to even be looking that these pieces of the pie yet! A perfect example of how unprepared we are for this step was just demonstrated recently when California announced its planned bans and then within a day or two of that announcement, asked everyone NOT to charge their e-vehicles because the grid couldn't handle it - and that's at the current levels of demand! SERIOUSLY!!!!!! Let's not put the cart before the horse and make sure we can sustain whatever decisions are made, before throwing us all to the wolves in knee-jerk, smoke & mirrors and, in some cases, politically motivated solutions!!!! This approach is only going to help the e-vehicle interests, looks good at a glance and by the time we really feel the impact of these decisions, it'll be way too late!

Comment ID: 346**First Name:** Robert**Last Name:** Katrinak**Commenter Email:** rwkatrinak@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 06:36:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Katrinak, Robert Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to proposed regulation Advanced Clean Cars II. While I support a clean environment for all CT residents, this regulation is far too aggressive in its timeline, relies on an unproven technology we have no real infrastructure for, and ultimately places a heavy financial burden on those who can least afford it, the poor living in our state. Let's let the free market work and let the market decide when it is time to permanently move away from fossil fuel vehicles. This should not be CT government's role. Thank you.

Comment ID: 347**First Name:** Wayne**Last Name:** Roberts**Commenter Email:** wroberts@ducks.org

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 06:42:03 PM**Comment:**

Name: Roberts, Wayne Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Where is the plan to have the national yet alone the state electrical grid ready to handle this added load? Where will this electricity magically come from? Who is going to pay for the devastating consequences of lithium mining in 3rd world countries so we can feel all high and mighty about what we are doing for the environment? Poisoning poor people in other countries is NOT a progressive plan.

Comment ID: 348**First Name:** elaine**Last Name:** pacheco**Commenter Email:** esp0661@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/14/23 07:55:16 PM**Comment:**

Name: pacheco, elaine Submission Date: 8/14/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 An EV battery weighs 1000 pounds. It takes 500 thousand pounds of raw ore to make ONE battery. The cobalt comes from the Republic of Congo, where CHILD SLAVE LABOR is used to mine the ore, little Black kids are paid 75 cents a day to mine cobalt. An EV battery can cost up to 22K to replace. Average taxpayers, the poor, people with regular jobs will be hurt by this insane legislation. The poor will be hurt by this legislation. EV's are not good for the environment. This is a ploy by globalists and corrupt politicians to force people to give up their reliable gas powered vehicles to force them into "15 minute cities" and to use crappy, unsafe public transportation that goes to limited destinations. This is horrible legislation. Charging stations are being taken over by drug addict homeless people in other states who target people charging their cars, this will spread to CT, and EV drivers will be sitting ducks. CT does not have the infrastructure for EV's, and as stated above, EV's are inefficient, unreliable when towing, when it is either too hot or too cold, they bad for the environment and the batteries degrade over time. There is ZERO benefit to owning an EV unless you're in on the gift of government incentives which should not be happening. It is once again crony capitalism with the government picking winners and losers without letting the free market and good ideas determine the best products for the consumers.

Comment ID: 349**First Name:** Marilyn**Last Name:** Fuller**Commenter Email:** mrlyn_fuller@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/15/23 08:03:46 AM**Comment:**

Name: Fuller, Marilyn Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't agree to ban the sales of new gas-powered passenger cars (beginning in 2035) and another that would gradually prohibit the sale of new gas-powered trucks that are used to ship goods and provide essential services.

Comment ID: 350**First Name:** Dean**Last Name:** Mitchell**Commenter Email:** kdk14@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/15/23 08:43:12 AM**Comment:**

Name: Mitchell, Dean Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Isn't nice that some of our Hartford politicians are so concerned with our environment, but have lost a sense of reality for their constituents. Sure we need to have less pollutants and reduce green house gases but to force people to have clean cars is when the fact remains that electric and hybrid cars are insanely overpriced. NOT AFFORDABLE FOR THE AVERAGE CITIZEN Additionally, electric cars are using lithium batteries. The key components are all made in China, DO YOU REALLY WANT US TO BE MORE RELIANT ON CHINA?? What's next, are we going to require homeowners to eliminating OIL and GAS Heat next? Maybe our Harford politicians can start working on issues to reduce our costs, energy and insurance could could be a good start for them instead of rubber stamping increases!!

Comment ID: 351**First Name:** Barbara**Last Name:** Tyszka**Commenter Email:** barbtyszka@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/15/23 09:46:01 AM**Comment:**

Name: Tyszka, Barbara Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have significant concerns about the unintended consequences of the proposed bans, including their impact on businesses and residents, as well as the finances of many who are already grappling with costs associated with living in one of the nation's most energy-expensive states. We should be able to have a choice and not be forced into one way of energy. I absolutely oppose the banning of gasoline cars.

Comment ID: 352**First Name:****Last Name:****Commenter Email:****Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/15/23 10:44:08 AM**Attachments:**

Testimony on Emmisions.pdf

Comment:

Name: , Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject:
 Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am greatly dismayed by the arguments put forth by certain individuals, including my representative Holly Cheeseman, regarding the proposed ban on gas-powered cars by 2035. I recently received an email from Representative Cheeseman expressing her considerable apprehensions about the potential unintended consequences of such a ban. However, my concerns run deeply in another direction. July 2023 marked the hottest month on record in our state's history, and each year is going to get hotter. I find it disingenuous to stoke fear over unintended consequences when the undeniable reality is that our planet is rapidly warming, and if we do not take bold steps now, the real consequences will be catastrophic for future generations. While I respect the need for a thorough examination of any policy's potential impacts, I find it disheartening that the argument of the Connecticut GOP seem to downplay the urgent need to transition away from fossil fuels in order to try and score political points. Our environment is in a critical state, and immediate action is imperative. We should be focusing on innovative solutions that prioritize a sustainable and livable future for our communities. It is important to consider potential unintended consequences of policies such as this one proposed, it is equally critical to weigh these against the very real and imminent threats posed by climate change. As we move towards a future

less dependent on fossil fuels, it is essential to focus on innovative solutions that can effectively mitigate these consequences. We should be celebrating the positive impacts of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, improving air quality, and fostering technological advancements in the automotive industry. We owe it to ourselves and generations to come to make responsible choices that mitigate the ecological challenges we currently face. Thank You Nicholas Menapace Niantic, CT

Comment ID: 353

First Name: Cliff

Last Name: Perkins

Commenter Email: cliffp97@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Perkins, Cliff Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To prohibit the sale or use of petroleum powered vehicles would in my opinion be an economic disaster. Most People in this state are struggling now. To make them have to pay an insane amount of money for an EV is crazy. The electric grid cant handle it now and I doubt it will be able to in 2035. We would still be using fossil fuels to generate the electricity to charge them. There's NO WAY renewable energy will be able to keep up with the demand. Eversource will be charging crazy fees for power to compensate for having to update the grid All the metals used in the batteries comes from China. Batteries are toxic, when they die most of the components are not recyclable. We cant afford this state now, Please don't make it worse!

Comment ID: 354

First Name: Janet

Last Name: Rinaldi

Commenter Email: janetmsw@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: none

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/15/23 04:04:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Rinaldi, Janet Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to express my concern regarding regulations Public Act04-84 and Public Act 22-25 that call for a ban on gas powered vehicles by 2025. Concerns are: -cost of electric vehicles -any reimbursement for gas powered cars that need to be rid of -electric grid going out and need the car in case of emergency -cost/and how often need to repair/replace battery -how is battery disposed of/how does disposal affect environment -what country makes these batteries -electric companies have monopoly on what will be burdensome cost

Comment ID: 355

First Name: Nancy

Last Name: Moss

Commenter Email: mossnd@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/15/23 05:27:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Moss, Nancy Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not want the banning of cars or trucks!!!

Comment ID: 356

First Name: Guy

Last Name: Gennette

Commenter Email: GuyG509@Snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/15/23 06:40:52 PM

Comment:

Name: Gennette, Guy Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I've recently read your proposal to ban the sale of vehicles fueled by liquid Hydrocarbon fuels and to push for the use of electrically powered vehicles only. My comment is what are you officials Crazy or what? the electrical Power generating companies can barely keep the lights on now with oil and Gas-powered power plants. Just where do you think we'll get the electrical power to fuel up a million plus battery powered vehicles? It would be a different story if we still had a Nuclear power plant here in Connecticut, but the one we had has been closed since 2004. So to have the electrical power capacity we are either going to require new Nuclear Plant construction or more Oil and Gas fired power Plants because Wind Powered generators and Solar Power won't cut it. It won't reduce the need for additional electrical power at all. I for one hope that the Government of the State of Connecticut wakes up before they implement this terrible idea before billions of dollars are thrown away to No benefit for the Citizens of the state.

Comment ID: 357

First Name: Donald A

Last Name: Dube

Commenter Email: drdondube@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: self

Commenter Title: retired

Posted Date: 08/15/23 09:21:33 PM

Comment:

Name: Dube, Donald A Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support a systematic approach to addressing greenhouse gas emissions and transitioning to a sustainable energy economy. As a retired nuclear engineer, I note that nuclear energy currently provides approximately 90% of Connecticut's emissions-free power. In this regard, the State legislature's support of the continued operation of the Millstone nuclear power plant, with wholesale price locked in at about 5 cents per kilowatt-hour for 10 years, has proven to be a wise decision. Likewise, legislation supporting the addition of modular nuclear reactors at the Millstone site is a positive step. By my calculation, the transition to an all-electric vehicle transportation sector will add about 1000 megawatts of load to the state's grid -- equivalent to that of a large nuclear reactor. Across New England as a whole, the equivalent of some five large reactors would need to be added to the grid to meet EV charging needs. That said, I do have some concerns with the way that "zero emissions" vehicles are being portrayed to the public, and the implementation of the proposed regulation. For one, energy analysts are in strong agreement that there are substantial "upfront" emissions in the mining and processing of materials for an EV, particularly minerals such as lithium for batteries. Some estimates place this at as much as 250 tons of earth per vehicle. An EV must be driven many tens of thousands of miles before the emissions savings offset the upfront emissions. Secondly, the EV batteries must be charged from the grid. Presently, and for the foreseeable future, the marginal fuel that can be dispatched on the New England grid is natural gas-fired power, which does have emissions. For this reason, the emission reduction is not 100%, but more in the range of 60 to 70%. This is still substantial, but I believe that referring to the EV as "zero emissions" is misleading the public. At a minimum, these limitations must be made clear to the citizens. Finally, I have major concerns with the "mandate" nature of the proposed future ban on sales of internal combustion engines beginning in 2035. In my opinion, denying the consumer choice is un-American and likely will not pass Constitutional muster in the courts. In Communist Poland in the 1950s, 60s, 70s and 80s, the government decided what bread would be sold, when, where, at what price, and the family allotment. In some small villages, there was but one bakery. A family of four children and two parents was allowed one loaf of bread per day. Parents sent the children to wait in line in the early morning before school, sometimes for hours. Authoritarian governments deny choice, not democracies. The END should never justify the MEANS, even if it is for a worthy cause. An April 2023 Gallup poll found that relatively few Americans currently own an EV (4%) or are seriously considering purchasing one (12%). Another 43% of U.S. adults say they might consider buying an electric vehicle in the future, while 41% unequivocally say they would not.

I therefore propose scrapping the regulation that mimics the California standard, and starting over, even if it means new legislation. At a minimum, more credit should be given to hybrid-electric and plug-in EVs in this transition period.

Comment ID: 358

First Name: Nancy

Last Name: Moss

Commenter Email: mossnd@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/15/23 09:32:02 PM

Comment:

Name: Moss, Nancy Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not want you to ban gas powered cars and trucks!!!!

Comment ID: 359

First Name: Nancy

Last Name: Moss

Commenter Email: mossnd@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Moss, Nancy Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not want you to ban gas powered cars and trucks!!!!

Comment ID: 360

First Name: Sherry

Last Name: Bermingham

Commenter Email: sdbham@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/15/23 09:37:40 PM

Comment:

Name: Bermingham, Sherry Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental

Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Though I hope we can be more energy efficient, I am unable to fully endorse all electric at this time due to several factors that impact me directly. First, the charging infrastructure is not developed enough for my use. My family lives significant drives down south. In route there are only a few convenient charging stations and those are at the NJ turnpike. There are only a couple so if they are taken, it's an even longer wait. My aging garage is not equipped with appropriate charging capabilities nor complete protection from the elements. It would require significant investment in modifying the garage. Living in CT, we're subject to winter weather a good 6 months of the year. EV's do not retain their charge efficiently in the cold. I don't want to be doing short drives from my home and worry about running out of "fuel." Let's quit with the deadline and keepign working on the goal of energy efficiency, however it may look. Thank you.

Comment ID: 361

First Name: Jon

Last Name: Sigler

Commenter Email: jon@jonsigler.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/15/23 10:47:55 PM**Comment:**

Name: Sigler, Jon Submission Date: 8/15/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Our electrical network is not ready for the load that will be created by this increased need. From delivery to generation. Generation in our local area is mostly natural gas which has little environmental benefit over gas. I'm all for environmental progress and support reducing greenhouse gases. But don't see a need to create a new problem just to have what is just a feel-good news headline.

Comment ID: 362**First Name:** Capt. Andrew Jay**Last Name:** Woods, Jr.**Commenter Email:** PoliceCaptain@msn.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Captain, Retired**Posted Date:** 08/16/23 01:44:36 AM**Comment:**

Name: Woods, Jr., Capt. Andrew Jay Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have significant concerns about the timing and unintended consequences of the proposed bans, beginning with their potential financial impact on families and businesses already grappling with the high costs associated with today's high inflation and interest rates. We live in one of the nation's most energy-expensive states, in part due to Connecticut's very fragile electric grid. You need only look at your electric bill to see federal and state governments are already taxing CT consumers with a "Congestion" surcharge, as well as infrastructure subsidies. Our grid itself is a limiting factor and, in my studied opinion, along with my experience working with California on its 2008 Global Warming Solutions Act, I do not believe Connecticut's present grid will be ready to shoulder the load of a rapid move to full electrification of transportation - now, or by 2035. The problem is, California has had a 15-year head-start working on solutions for their motor vehicle regulatory edicts and technology. While I believe it is foregone conclusion that CO2 emissions reduction, cleaner transportation and green energy generation are our future, I've always been of the mind that transitions are best handled in stages, and only accelerated to the point of emergency action in terms of the rush to develop solutions, the technology needed for a diversified transition, and in ways that do not damage our economy or leave us without solutions for toxic byproducts we may unintentionally create without immediate mitigation strategies. The 2035 standards being proposed by Governor Lamont and DEEP Commissioner Dykes were adopted from California's 2008 Global Warming Solutions Act, our nation's most aggressive emissions regulations. Our fragile grid and a profound lack of charging infrastructure, puts us at a 15-year disadvantage versus our friends in California.

Comment ID: 363**First Name:** Patrick**Last Name:** Morton**Commenter Email:** mortct@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/16/23 08:56:05 AM**Comment:**

Name: Morton, Patrick Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think this is the worst idea proposed in my lifetime. If you think getting rid of our main source of transportation and delivery of goods and services, before technology has solved problems of Electric or even better Hydrogen powered cars. This would cause significant hardship in constituents means of transportation. Reasons for not getting rid of Gas powered cars 1 Our Electric grid couldn't support it. 3 Not enough charging stations. (taking much more time to charge than fill a gas tank) 3 The Electric cars are too expensive and CT State property tax would effect us too much on cars at those prices. 4 Range is still too limited. I have an idea. If people want an electric car they can buy one. If don't want one they can buy a

gas powered vehicle. The Idea that our government would try to dictate how we can travel is unconstitutional. We have the right to travel as we see fit. Climate change science isn't going to start with us. Get China, India and Pakestan to cut back on fossil fuels use. they are the worst polluters after all.

Comment ID: 364

First Name: Frank

Last Name: Fearnley Sr

Commenter Email: frakk001@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/16/23 08:58:53 AM

Comment:

Name: Fearnley Sr, Frank Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose any ban on gasoline powered vehicles whatsoever. EV vehicles are demonstrably hazardous at best, insufficient to meet the demands of our country, catch fire, are deadly when exposed to salt water in a State predisposed to hurricanes, In additions,it requires FOSSIL FUELS to generate the electricity, nor the capacity to charge these vehicles and there simply isn't the grid nationally or in state to support this sort of ban. In addition,if something happens to the power grid, these vehicles will not charge nor run

Comment ID: 365

First Name: Karen

Last Name: Katrinak

Commenter Email: kkatrinak@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/16/23 09:28:35 AM

Comment:

Name: Katrinak, Karen Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to propose a slow conversion. Hybrids are becoming more popular and acceptable. Why go straight to all electric? It is not feasible, financially responsible, or what the public wants. I look around where I work in Bridgeport and I see cars parked up and down the streets. Is the state and federal govt. honestly thinking that citizens can afford to convert to electric. Imagining these cars plugged in on the streets (only temporarily, because the expensive charging cords will be stolen). Residents will have to pay more in their electric bill which they can not afford at this time. Connecticut has extremely high electric costs. I am also not interested in subsidizing those that would not be able to afford to convert since my tax dollars already go towards programs that I do not agree with. Let us use common sense for a change I am sorry to say. Let us push hybrids then slowly make the move. It does not sound like this has been thought out completely. Thank You Karen Katrinak

Comment ID: 366

First Name: Dan

Last Name: Bowler

Commenter Email: dbowler2@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Bowler, Dan Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Regarding Public Act 04-84 I am against this very foolish plan. Connecticut can't provide enough electric power to meet this demand Costs more for delivery charge than the product. How does the State plan to generate more electricity ? Putting the state in charge of distribution is

a bad joke. Oil works just fine and is provided. efficiently thru the private sector Electric vehicles are hazardous waste products on wheels. Following a bankrupt California is another stupid idea. The people and groups behind this are either naive or diabolical. I vote and plan to actively fight this destructive bill. Dan Bowler

Comment ID: 367

First Name: paul

Last Name: Bernauer

Commenter Email: pbernauer@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/16/23 10:53:03 AM

Comment:

Name: Bernauer, paul Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not agree with the proposed timeline to phase out gas powered vehicles. The EV options are not developed enough yet, the supply chains needed to produce the batteries are not stable enough to assure ongoing availability, the recycling of batteries has not even scratched the surface of what will be needed and the charging infrastructure and transmission infrastructures are not nearly at a place that would be required to seriously implement an EV only solution. Will these things be rectified by 2035, I have to think not given the pace of infrastructure development, the apathy of the public for EV vehicles and the significant price differential between ICE and EVs. Especially for lower income people, the cost of EVs is out of reach. If new ICE cars are prohibited for sale, the cost of used ICE vehicles will climb and then they will also be out of reach for lower income folks. I suggest taking a more measured approach and let the infrastructure catch up to a point where an accurate timeline can be identified and implemented. To do otherwise is to inject uncertainty into the market and further polarize the customer base into those who can afford vs those who can't. Not the role of a state government to pick winners and losers for their constituents. Let the market adjust into hybrid vehicles and then as the infrastructure matures, see EVs come into their own.

Comment ID: 368

First Name: Richard

Last Name: McKinniss

Commenter Email: rick@wellspring.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Wellspring Church

Commenter Title: Senior Pastor

Posted Date: 08/16/23 11:49:29 AM

Comment:

Name: McKinniss, Richard Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 An irony of all this is that because of all the energy needed to produce windmills, solar panels and electric batteries, new studies are showing that the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions to this "net zero" transition is close to zero. It turns out, green energy causes some pollution, too. Furthermore, already this year electric car batteries are responsible for 13 deaths and 66 severe injuries in New York City alone. Not to mention all the infrastructure costs that would be needed to re-charge EV's. This entire idea is a green-eyed boondoggle. NO!

Comment ID: 369

First Name: Lisa

Last Name: Medeiros

Commenter Email: LisaMedeiros@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/16/23 12:43:15 PM

Comment:

Name: Medeiros, Lisa Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This scheduled is very aggressive. I'm not sure that the electrical grid will be able to handle this huge additional strain, cost would need to be passed to the ratepayer. While I understand that reducing carbon emission is necessary, electric cars are not a cure all for our current environmental disaster. Lithium batteries have their own set of issues: including what do you do with them at the end of their life span, they easily catch fire, as well as making your vehicle considerable heavier which affect your ability to stop. Studies have shown an increase in the amount of damage to your car and passengers if you are in an accident.

Comment ID: 370

First Name: Erika

Last Name: Talnagi

Commenter Email: era603@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Resident

Posted Date: 08/16/23 01:25:01 PM

Comment:

Name: Talnagi, Erika Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am not happy about this proposed legislation to ban sales of the new gas cars. People should have a choice to buy and drive what they want. Electric cars also have they disadvantages like finding charging stations, charging times, higher initial costs, limited driving range, battery packs can be expensive to replace, and overall higher cost. Plus electric car batteries use lithium cobalt oxide to extract lithium ions which creates a charge. Creating these batteries involve mining for lithium, and according to UL Research Institutes, the open-pit mining technique releases dust which can contaminate the air and water, posing a health risk for humans and animals. Not to mention sometimes due to weather there is no power and electricity doesn't work for days. Also the timeline is quite short only 12 years.

Comment ID: 371

First Name: Ann

Last Name: Marshall

Commenter Email: totne57@icloud.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Marshall, Ann Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO to the ban on gas-powered CT cars.

Comment ID: 372

First Name: Barbara

Last Name: Muldoon

Commenter Email: barbaramuldoon@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Muldoon, Barbara Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I cannot think of a more onerous burden to put on the shoulders of Connecticut residents than this one. I will carefully watch and note the names of any legislator who supports this bill, and I will not cast my vote for him or her. I continue to read articles concerning electric cars and I continue to be unimpressed and very concerned about problems with using them and

with their reliability. The results of the switch to all electric cars - particularly since electric cars require material that can only be obtained from countries THAT ARE NOT OUR FRIENDS - is not a very smart thing to do.

Comment ID: 373

First Name: David

Last Name: Hamilton

Commenter Email: Daveh370@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Hamilton, David Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO to the ban on gas-powered CT cars!

Comment ID: 374

First Name: Darlene

Last Name: Dobler-Palin

Commenter Email: darlenedoblerpalin@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Dobler-Palin, Darlene Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Ladies/Gents CT is not CA. The limitation on vehicles imposed should stick to safety concerns. Choices on use of combustion engine vs electric is up to individuals. EV's have many other negative attributes like ethical sourcing and disposal as well as the fact they require charging stations which are powered by....power plants running on fossil fuel. This has gone too far, there should be no limitation on combustion engine usage. Thank you for your time

Comment ID: 375

First Name: Anthony

Last Name: Sodoski

Commenter Email: asis1123@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Engineering Manager

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Sodoski, Anthony Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly not in favor of the proposed ban on gas powered vehicles in 2035. I have significant concerns about the Electrical Power grid and its capacity to supply the increased demand on its infrastructure. Has there been an in-depth analysis (data) as to the feasibility of the foreseen demand on the grid and associated costs to upgrade it? Especially concerned with the financial burden to the states middle and lower income working families including our seniors on fixed income. Furthermore, how are the residents in our congested cities who mostly park on the streets able to charge their vehicles? CT is already one of the costliest states in the nation to live in and this additional cost hardship will discourage any potential economic & social growth in the future. Don't follow California's destructive electric only vehicle model by forcing residents into an unpopular policy. CT needs to let its people decide what transportation type is affordable based on their financial situation not dictated to them by the state government. I agree CT needs to reduce its carbon footprint but mandating the sale of ?electric vehicles only by 2035? is not the carbon free path CT should be pursuing in getting there. Most CT residents can't afford electrical vehicles.

Comment ID: 376

First Name: Isabel
Last Name: Sodoski
Commenter Email: asis1123@sbcglobal.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Sodoski, Isabel Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly not in favor of the proposed ban on gas powered vehicles in 2035. I have significant concerns about the Electrical Power grid and its capacity to supply the increased demand on its infrastructure. Has there been an in-depth analysis (data) as to the feasibility of the foreseen demand on the grid and associated costs to upgrade it? Especially concerned with the financial burden to the states middle and lower income working families including our seniors on fixed income. Furthermore, how are the residents in our congested cities who mostly park on the streets able to charge their vehicles? CT is already one of the costliest states in the nation to live in and this additional cost hardship will discourage any potential economic & social growth in the future. Don't follow California's destructive electric only vehicle model by forcing residents into an unpopular policy. CT needs to let its people decide what transportation type is affordable based on their financial situation not dictated to them by the state government. I agree CT needs to reduce its carbon footprint but mandating the sale of ?electric vehicles only by 2035? is not the carbon free path CT should be pursuing in getting there. Most CT residents can't afford electrical vehicles.

Comment ID: 377

First Name: Matthew
Last Name: Sodoski
Commenter Email: mattsodoski@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title: Engineer
Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Sodoski, Matthew Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly not in favor of the proposed ban on gas powered vehicles in 2035. I have significant concerns about the Electrical Power grid and its capacity to supply the increased demand on its infrastructure. Has there been an in-depth analysis (data) as to the feasibility of the foreseen demand on the grid and associated costs to upgrade it? Especially concerned with the financial burden to the states middle and lower income working families including our seniors on fixed income. Furthermore, how are the residents in our congested cities who mostly park on the streets able to charge their vehicles? CT is already one of the costliest states in the nation to live in and this additional cost hardship will discourage any potential economic & social growth in the future. Don't follow California's destructive electric only vehicle model by forcing residents into an unpopular policy. CT needs to let its people decide what transportation type is affordable based on their financial situation not dictated to them by the state government. I agree CT needs to reduce its carbon footprint but mandating the sale of ?electric vehicles only by 2035? is not the carbon free path CT should be pursuing in getting there. Most CT residents can't afford electrical vehicles.

Comment ID: 378

First Name: Jeffrey
Last Name: Peterson
Commenter Email: Jeffrey110704@yahoo.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/16/23 07:03:34 PM

Comment:

Name: Peterson , Jeffrey Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against gas vehicle ban. We have

the right to drive gas vehicle. The government shouldn't tell us what is better. Jeffrey R.Peterson 3729 Whitney Avenue hamden ct 06518

Comment ID: 379

First Name: David

Last Name: Ruf

Commenter Email: David.ruf@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/16/23 07:41:19 PM

Comment:

Name: Ruf, David Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO to the ban on gas-powered CT cars! I work in the Chemicals industry and can categorically say that, while EV's are worth exploring as a transportation technology, we are very far from declaring them ESG for several reasons: - they are NOT ?emissions free? as so many wrongly say - our electricity in the US mostly comes from fossil fuels - the materials used for the batteries are mined with un-ecological methods in conflict mineral countries (cobalt from Congo, etc) - Dependence on China - across battery / cathode / anode materials, China processes 80% of the world's consumption for batteries. So, we would be putting our entire transportation capability at the whim of China and we would cease to have transportation in the US if China decided to cut us off. - Lack of recycling - you cannot put an EV in a junkyard, the 2,000 pound battery would eventually leach toxic chemicals and heavy metals into the groundwater. You MUST have recycling already built to have battery powered cars - Lack of Energy Efficiency: EVs are not energy efficient due to the lack of Energy Density of batteries compared with gasoline. So, moving the 2,000 pound battery consumes enormous amounts of energy compared with moving a much lighter gas engine and gas tank

Comment ID: 380

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Dalidowitz

Commenter Email: rjdalidowitz@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/16/23 08:22:51 PM

Comment:

Name: Dalidowitz, Richard Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposal to ban gasoline powered cars by 2035 is irrational and as a graduate engineer I oppose it on several levels. Major auto makers (at least the ones who are honest and realistic) also do not believe this is a viable goal. Frankly it is troubling to see CT pounce on this (as a California wanna be) in a haphazard way rather than rigorously think this through using strategic planning methodology. Perhaps the agency can answer the following - 1) Is there an established plan for infrastructure to support electric vehicles and what is the estimated cost? 2) Does CT have a viable and effective plan for the disposal/recycling (cradle to grave) of the batteries and other hazardous materials that will be generated by these cars? Case in point, no such plan exists for PC, cell phones etc. 3) Is there any assurance that sufficient mineral raw materials will be economically available for these cars? I recently bought a hybrid car (which I consider to be a very viable (and practical) alternative to traditional ICE (internal combustion engine) cars. I received only one key fob at purchase about 8 months ago because the chips were in short supply. 4) Does CT have the grid infrastructure to support the demand? I believe our electrical grid is already fragile; Eversource is running around Central CT butchering every tree remotely near a power line. As a Master Gardener, it has always been my understanding that trees were an excellent "sink" to absorb CO2 from the environment. It makes little sense to cut down trees wholesale (highway buffers, developments etc) unless, of course, there is an ulterior motive, other than reducing CO2. Where is the DEEP on this and is there any coordination between these agencies? One final point (I have many more but have lost faith in the process as increasingly, elected officials disregard "public opinion" and follow the partisan herd). Does the state have a backup plan, such as, providing incentives for average folks like myself to purchase an "interim" solution, ie a hybrid or hybrid/plug-in vehicle, just in case this proposal bombs. By the way, I regularly get 42 mpg with my hybrid SUV, but see very few in the Costco parking lots and even fewer at

the State Capitol. Why is that? My understanding is that tax incentives have been significantly reduced at the Federal level, seemingly to benefit only a few select manufacturers. Why is that? Why not expand the program to maximize emission reductions, if in fact the end result is to improve the environment, or is it? I welcome a response to these questions, but doubt I will receive one, but, thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Comment ID: 381

First Name: Jeff

Last Name: Knebel

Commenter Email: jknibbs@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/16/23 11:56:25 PM

Comment:

Name: Knebel, Jeff Submission Date: 8/16/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No to the ban on gas powered vehicles!

Comment ID: 382

First Name: Heidi

Last Name: Bradrick

Commenter Email: odettel@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Bradrick, Heidi Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I hope that all the parties involved in making this decision have fully studied the impact (financial, environmental) in going forward with this. We have to have 'rolling outages' due to lack of electricity, we are 'running out' of clean drinking water - and on and on. I am by no means an expert on any of this but in doing a little research the proposal seem to be an impractical answer. Encourage electric cars but don't make them the only option. One article I wanted to submit is >10MB. Read "Environmental impacts of lithium-ion batteries" - Wikipedia. Extraction Disposal and more.

Comment ID: 383

First Name: Lisa

Last Name: Dahill

Commenter Email: ldahill@hartfordinternational.edu

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Hartford International University for Religion and Peace

Commenter Title: Professor

Posted Date: 08/17/23 09:53:56 AM

Comment:

Name: Dahill, Lisa Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly support Governor Lamont's proposed new clean air transportation standards. Having moved to Connecticut from California a year ago, I have experienced in California the difference such standards make in improving air quality -- a massive immediate public good -- as well as in reducing carbon emissions. This is a win-win on every level as we work toward the society-wide transition toward renewable energy sources our planet and future require of us.

Comment ID: 384

First Name: Patricia

Last Name: Tartaglino

Commenter Email: Trish.tartaglino@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Resident

Commenter Title: Ms

Posted Date: 08/17/23 10:05:18 AM

Comment:

Name: Tartaglino , Patricia Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Asinine Proposals

Comment ID: 385

First Name: Thomas

Last Name: Meiklejohn

Commenter Email: TWMeiklejohn@lapm.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Meiklejohn, Thomas Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support any and all efforts to phase out gasoline powered cars and encourage electric vehicles.

Comment ID: 386

First Name: Stephen

Last Name: Giller

Commenter Email: bgiller@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/17/23 12:31:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Giller, Stephen Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I unquestionably oppose this proposed ban on the sale of gas powered cars. ? It is an overreach by government to interfere with consumer markets in this manner. ? The process of approving such a far reaching regulation without a vote by elected officials is absurd. ? Connecticut's electric market is not prepared to handle the additional demand for electricity this would create. Based on past performance of both Eversource and state government it is inconceivable that this could change in only 12 years. If EVs are truly a superior product consumers will make the choice to purchase them.

Comment ID: 387

First Name: Joan

Last Name: Marchell

Commenter Email: joanmarchell@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/17/23 12:43:04 PM

Comment:

Name: Marchell, Joan Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is unconstitutional via the commerce clause for state legislators to dictate to their constituents the consumption of an unaffordable product i.e. electric vehicles. I do not have the time to spend at a charging station nor the money to purchase an electric car that has no resale value and no place designated to dump hazardous and toxic lithium batteries in these vehicles. They offer no payment to the state gas tax, are too heavy for roads and do not run in floods or cold. It seems somebody is getting a big kickback supporting China etc.

Comment ID: 388

First Name: Joe
Last Name: Sanders
Commenter Email: 37jsanders@outlook.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/17/23 01:08:27 PM

Comment:

Name: Sanders, Joe Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposal should be scrapped entirely. The CT legislature is elected to represent the citizens of the state. We do NOT have the same needs as California and should not be outsourcing governing responsibilities to other states, or to regulatory agencies beyond oversight of the CT General Assembly and thereby the state's citizens. The truth is that electric vehicles have a significant environmental impact over the life of the vehicle. This starts with the manufacturing process, much of which is done in countries with very lax environmental and human rights standards. This continues as the battery systems need to be charged by infrastructure that cannot achieve ?green? status, is not currently reliable, and is currently very expensive and subject to volatile price swings. The environmental impact continues to when batteries need to be replaced (far sooner than modern IC engines), and including the disposal of old batteries. The state of CT cannot handle the trash disposal and recycling needs we currently have, and yet some propose plowing forward while turning a blind eye to current realities. Probably none of these facts will sway the true believers that embrace climate change with a religious furor, intent to upend the American economy regardless of the cost or impact on people. The truth remains that electric vehicle have a hefty price tag and are not as cost effective as IC power. That will likely change somewhat in the future, but should not be prematurely mandated by those with a pre-determined outcome by government regulation. The regulators consistently prove their ability to impose significant burden and cost to vehicle manufacturers, drive up costs to consumers, and enact policies which rarely produce the promised results. As usual, the best course of action is to enact minimal and appropriately crafted regulation where necessary, with the intent to allow manufacturers to build vehicles that are affordable and truly fit practical sustainability, providing citizens the freedom to choose where to invest their hard-earned money. If electric vehicles are truly the future, keep the heavy hand of government off the scale and let the free market work as intended. Proceeding with the proposal is a vote to increase costs on all state residents. New vehicles, which are already beyond the affordable cost for many residents in the state, will become more expensive simply due to regulatory fiat by another state. This is wrong and will have harmful consequences for hard working families in the state, no matter what the intentions of those proposing legislation will claim. Modern IC engines are very clean, and produce much less air pollution than other significant contributors. Such as the Canada wildfires. Those wildfires have caused far more environmental damage than the clean, modern IC engines on CT roadways, but state government has not pursued legal or regulatory action to address this.

Comment ID: 389
First Name: Mark
Last Name: Taylor
Commenter Email: gator9931@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: CEMA
Commenter Title: member
Posted Date: 08/17/23 01:55:38 PM

Comment:

Name: Taylor, Mark Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No to the ban on gas powered vehicles! This is unfair to the people of Connecticut.

Comment ID: 390
First Name: Robert
Last Name: Dzurenda
Commenter Email: bbdzur@aol.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/17/23 02:14:19 PM**Comment:**

Name: Dzurenda, Robert Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against the ban on gas powered vehicles for several reason. It is very risky to ban certain vehicles, you should let the people decide what they want. There is already too much government interference in people's lives, this will make it worse. Electric vehicles are not a substitute for gas powered vehicles. You are fooling the general public into thinking there are no emissions with electric vehicles. What about the CO2 emissions during production and charging? Banning gas powered vehicles puts us at a disadvantage. Please stop the foolishness!

Comment ID: 391**First Name:** Richard**Last Name:** Jordan**Commenter Email:** rjorda133@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** NONE**Posted Date:** 08/17/23 02:37:06 PM**Comment:**

Name: Jordan, Richard Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The US is about 13% of global emissions. Cars produce 20% of that. So if we stopped using cars entirely 2.6% of the worlds emissions will go away. EV's wont even come close as it takes CO2 to make the BEV cars, significantly more than ICE cars, plus the production of the electricity in our grid is still heavily reliant on fossil fuels net change in CO2, likely a rounding error. Add the fact the China is INCREASING its coal usage there will be no benefit for destroying the economy and making cars so expensive that average people can't buy them. By banning ICE cars people of low and moderate income will lose their transportation. Most people in the state do not have garages for charging, electricity has gotten much more expensive and as noted above the change in CO2 will be negligible. Let the market decide if they want the electric cars. Millions of people have already done that. The proposal to follow the CA rule will entice people to buy ICE cars out of state where there is no such mandate, therefore hurting in state new car dealers and cause severe economic hardship on low and middle income citizens. A bad idea to try to change a market through legislation.

Comment ID: 392**First Name:** Stephen**Last Name:** Giller**Commenter Email:** bgiller@cox.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** n/a**Commenter Title:** n/a**Posted Date:** 08/17/23 03:30:12 PM**Comment:**

Name: Giller, Stephen Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly oppose this proposed ban on the sale of gas powered cars. It is an overreach by government to interfere with consumer markets in this manner. The process of approving such a far reaching regulation without a vote by elected officials is absurd. Connecticut's electricity supply market is not prepared to handle the additional demand for electricity this would create. Based on past performance of both Eversource and state government it is inconceivable that the necessary improvements could be designed, built, tested, and implemented in only 12 years. If EVs are a superior product consumers will make the choice to purchase them.

Comment ID: 393**First Name:** Jon**Last Name:** Simon**Commenter Email:** jsimon999@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Simon, Jon Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hardly anyone can afford a \$50K EV. I can't. We do not have the infrastructure to power them and never will. Is my landlord of my apartment building going to invest in the service to charge 100 cars here every day? I doubt it even if forced by law. Let's stop the madness.

Comment ID: 394**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Dale**Commenter Email:** jdale@medialinks.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/17/23 05:03:34 PM**Comment:**

Name: Dale, John Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I have significant concerns about the proposed bans. Electric and hybrid vehicles, using mineral batteries are absolutely horrible for the environment. The batteries are toxic and combustible, so very hard to dispose of and represent a significant fire hazard. There is not enough electrical power and distribution to support a large scale migration to electrical vehicles. And most of the electric energy is produced from coal fired plants. This does not help reduce carbon emissions. Additionally, the unintended consequences of the proposed bans includes a significant impact on businesses and residents. Many are suffering due to the increased cost of living over the last 2 years and would be even more hard pressed by having to purchase EVs which are 30% higher in cost than the vehicles they are replacing. This does not make sense for Connecticut. CT is already one of the nation's most energy-expensive states, this would make it worse.

Comment ID: 395**First Name:** Zlatko**Last Name:** Savic**Commenter Email:** turrican6@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/17/23 05:43:54 PM**Comment:**

Name: Savic, Zlatko Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I fully oppose the ban of ICE vehicles (gas powered or otherwise) in any way. We as a society do not have a transition plan in place. We as a CT community do not have proper infrastructure or accessible technology for everyday life to transition to a world of EVs. Higher priority projects should be healthcare and education cost management.

Comment ID: 396**First Name:** Timothy**Last Name:** Kavanaugh**Commenter Email:** timkav25@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Concerned Connecticut Resident**Commenter Title:** N/A**Posted Date:** 08/17/23 05:47:16 PM**Attachments:**

Advanced Clean Cars II Response.pdf

Comment:

Name: Kavanaugh, Timothy Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please find my attached document which, for many reasons, does not support the Proposed Regulation Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023

Comment ID: 397

First Name: Judith

Last Name: Mubarek

Commenter Email: kandj40b@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/17/23 05:48:56 PM

Comment:

Name: Mubarek, Judith Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I feel this is rushing these changes even though 12 years sounds like forever. This would require thousands of charging stations statewide and hopefully vehicles that can travel further than they are now able to on a charge. Also, the cost of these vehicles is prohibitive for many people.

Comment ID: 398

First Name: Adam

Last Name: Gitow

Commenter Email: adam@computerworksct.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/17/23 05:54:53 PM

Comment:

Name: Gitow, Adam Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Only after the entire national electric grid is updated to accommodate the required load, charging stations are as available as gas stations and EV prices are reasonable should there even be a thought given to ban gas vehicles. Have any of the geniuses responsible for this proposal even considered the assault on power generation plants by the current administration? This proposed ban is nothing more than an attempt to appease the vocal minority.

Comment ID: 399

First Name: David

Last Name: Kershaw

Commenter Email: d.kershaw@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/17/23 06:17:12 PM

Comment:

Name: Kershaw, David Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 E-vehicles are nonsense.

Comment ID: 400

First Name: Joan

Last Name: Liska

Commenter Email: JLISKA9000@SBCGLOBAL.NET

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/17/23 07:08:33 PM**Comment:**

Name: Liska, Joan Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a past Conservation Commission chair of Middletown, I lean toward good stewardship of our resources and a clean environment. As a conservationist for most of my nearly 7 decades, I have seen great progress away from pollution as far back as the 1950's when the Connecticut River was so polluted you could not fish in it. More progress will, of course, be best going forward. However, today's full court press demanding that everyone convert to electric EVERYTHING (especially PR2023-023) is ill-conceived and over aggressive. It cannot succeed in the timelines being proposed. Dangling a candy in front of a two-year-old will get a very demanding response from the child, but that candy might not be good for that child, who might choke to death on it when it gets caught in the throat. Using this analogy, this proposal to demand total EV immersion (PR2023-023) sets up the state and the country to choke on overpromising and underdelivering "benefits" of EV. I cite below several topics that should be thought out before any regulations are proposed by bureaucrats that are not elected and thus do not represent the voters' voice. Our legislators should take this entire proposal under advisement and weigh the impact on all the citizens of Connecticut and put it to a legislative vote.

1. Insisting that everyone find the money to purchase an EV (whether or not they have the financial assets to do so) is hubris. Even middle-class families struggling with the high cost of groceries, medicines and other items caused by inflation would be unable to purchase an EV at current list prices. A poor person in a rural area won't have the alternative to find a bus or uber ride. They must have at least an old beater car to get them to work, school, grocery, hospital, etc.
2. The current electric grid cannot handle the massive conversion to "all things electric", including EV's, stoves, heat, etc. It will take a generation or more to build out an expensive multi trillion-dollar infrastructure including charging stations and, even then, the nation's power grid could not handle the load.
3. If the EV runs out of battery charge, will the vehicle be able to make it to the nearest charging station? Will this proposal create a cottage industry of tow vehicles for cars with dead batteries stuck on the highways and byways of our state? BTW, heavy duty trucks require the power that only diesel engines provide to move the nation's products.
4. How long will the EV need to be at the charging station before it has sufficient charge to get to the next charging station along its road of travel or at least to get home? How much lost downtime will be lost during a EV charging timeline, removing the driver from productivity, family life and recreational time? In other words, will the forced down time (waiting for a charge) interfere with daily work and family demands? What happens when you are in a life and death emergency that requires that EV to get you there but there is insufficient battery charge to move the vehicle?
5. When the EV's battery life is exhausted, the replacement cost is prohibitively expensive (currently estimated at \$20,000 though the battery industry is so protective of hiding that cost that an internet search on the information just loops around without coughing up the dollar amount? ultra secret answer on cost). AND, that dead battery is now hazardous waste. That is not environmentally friendly to dispose of. Many waste collection services and sites will not accept hazardous waste or will do so at a prohibitive charge.
6. To manufacture EV batteries, it requires products from China who is politically averse to USA interests. They could cut off access to Chinese products should the political situation deteriorate further. A policy that insists only on EV could kneecap the economy and our citizens from being able to move freely around this great country of ours when the regulations prohibit anything but EV to get around. Think long and hard before you support this decision to ban current fuel systems that are, and could once again be, readily available using clean energy technology available today. My conservationist leanings include a salute to America's freedoms. Putting dead weight anchors on those freedoms for ill-considered full immersion in EV technology is not American. I therefore am against this EV proposal as outlined in PR2023-023 and ask you to vote to defeat this proposal.

Comment ID: 401**First Name:** Adrian**Last Name:** Maung**Commenter Email:** amaung@alum.mit.edu**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/17/23 08:10:08 PM**Comment:**

Name: Maung, Adrian Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the proposed regulations that

would take away our right to make an informed choice as a consumer. There are multiple reasons why one would not want to purchase an electric vehicle including increased cost, need to travel longer distances beyond current range without stopping multiple times to recharge, inability to charge vehicles at home, concerns about the environmental impact of lithium mining as well as eventual disposable of the car batteries etc. This decision should be left to consumers in a free market society and not regulated by governmental agencies. Sincerely Adrian Maung Woodbridge CT

Comment ID: 402

First Name: Marion

Last Name: Pierce

Commenter Email: piercemcp@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/17/23 08:31:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Pierce, Marion Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to express my disapproval of the proposal to get rid of gas-powered vehicles in CT. Where in the constitution does it say that we can be forced to buy a product because the government has taken away our options? These electric vehicles are so expensive that the average person in CT will find it difficult to buy one and then maintain it. With gas cars there are plenty of options for all budgets. What will businesses do when people can't come to work because they don't own an electric vehicle because they can't afford one? What happens to all the mechanics and auto part dealers? What happens to the junk yards that provide spare parts etc.? More business gone from the state, more jobs lost. Electric cars are also not perfected yet and can be dangerous. I feel like this is an intrusion on our freedoms. What next solar homes? All this is fine if you want it and can afford it but it should not be mandatory. There are also many automobile enthusiasts who enjoy working on and displaying antique cars. I really hope you reconsider, Marion Pierce

Comment ID: 403

First Name: John

Last Name: Whitbeck

Commenter Email: Johnhwhitbeck@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Whitbeck, John Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Any unintended consequences espoused by big oil companies are DWARFED by the consequences of not doing everything we can to battle climate change. By all means audit the details of these rules to spread the costs fairly over the CITIZENS of Connecticut, but leave the agenda of BIG OIL out of it. We must fight climate change with everything we've got.

Comment ID: 404

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Pirulli

Commenter Email: ppirulli@budgetblinds.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: President

Posted Date: 08/17/23 08:48:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Pirulli, Peter Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 If I understand this new policy will be implement by some dept. I total disagree with such an over reaching policy that will effect so many people and business. If this

is such a great idea let battery cars/trucks compete with gas powered cars/trucks, if they are better let the consumer select. Also, if this is such an important issue the legislature should make this a law. They are the people who are voted in by the citizens of the state. Again, I TOTAL DISAGREE WITH THIS AND ANY OTHER REGULATION THAT TELLS THE CITIZENS OF THIS STATE HOW TO SPEND THEIR MONEY. Thank You!

Comment ID: 405

First Name: Melanie

Last Name: Geddes

Commenter Email: mggweddingphoto@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Private citizen

Commenter Title: Registered voter

Posted Date: 08/17/23 09:51:41 PM

Comment:

Name: Geddes, Melanie Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The ban of gas powered vehicles will put a much greater financial and environmental impact on the citizens of CT than what we are currently experiencing with the increase in gas prices. It has been my personal experience of switching from a gas mower to an electric is that the quality and performance of electric power equipment at a reasonable consumer price is a disappointing waste of money. To follow suit with electric vehicles would not benefit CT voters or our environment which has been widely misleading. Most CT citizens DO NOT have the financial resources to convert to electric vehicles nor the desire to do so.

Comment ID: 406

First Name: Kelly

Last Name: mulryan

Commenter Email: Hogan.kmh@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: None

Posted Date: 08/17/23 10:07:02 PM

Comment:

Name: mulryan , Kelly Submission Date: 8/17/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Will electric cars be made more affordable? Who will be paying for the install of electric charging stations at CT residence homes? Surely we will need upgrades. Is our infrastructure going to be able to handle this? Are we going to better regulate Eversource since they have a monopoly on electric? Will electric vehicles be able to be charged in the matter of minutes like we can fill up gas vehicles? Will an ambulance run out of charge with a dying patient inside? California is a disaster and we were following them. They have regular rolling brown outs because their electric grid can't handle things as is. This needs to be rethought. Let's get creative and not at the expense of hard working CT people.

Comment ID: 407

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Israel

Commenter Email: sisrael78@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 06:42:23 AM

Comment:

Name: Israel, Susan Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not ban gas powered vehicles in CT. It would be dangerous to the freedom of mobility and thus a safety/security risk to the population, because the function of the power grid and the availability of electricity cannot be guaranteed. Having diverse sources of transportation

are crucial to not risk the shut-down of all activity. Have you ever felt helpless in a power outage? Lines above ground are particularly at risk to go down, and our grids are frighteningly vulnerable to sabotage. Thank you.

Comment ID: 408

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Kuhn

Commenter Email: rwkuhn1020@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Kuhn, Richard Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 A BIG NO NO NO NO

Comment ID: 409

First Name: Klaire

Last Name: Bielonko

Commenter Email: Klaire.bielonko@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Bielonko, Klaire Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is government overreach and plays right into the hands of the monopolized electric energy industry here in CT already plaguing residents. Please consider saying 'no' to this proposal.

Comment ID: 410

First Name: Sally

Last Name: Cascella

Commenter Email: sally.cascella@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Yale New aven Health

Commenter Title: RN

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Cascella, Sally Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut does not have the infrastructure to support this bill. This would have devastating financial repercussions to many CT residents. I do not support this mandate.

Comment ID: 411

First Name: Josh

Last Name: Gregoire

Commenter Email: jmgregoire84@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: N/A

Commenter Title: N/A

Posted Date: 08/18/23 09:33:13 AM

Comment:

Name: Gregoire, Josh Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This shouldn't be on the docket this far out. There needs to be reliable proof that our economy and civilization can support and has the infrastructure to support all

electric vehicles indefinitely before we start passing laws prohibiting the sale of gasoline powered vehicles. Is it in the best interest of our planet to switch over? Absolutely, but we need the infrastructure, which is not close yet, before we can do so.

Comment ID: 412

First Name: Rosario

Last Name: Rizzo Jr.

Commenter Email: theriz4@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: President

Posted Date: 08/18/23 09:37:18 AM

Comment:

Name: Rizzo Jr., Rosario Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 2035 is too soon to implement. Not enough infrastructure will be available by then based on current assessments. Need additional federal and state assistance to provide personal charging stations in private housing and all of the electrical revamping that will be required. Twenty years is more reasonable.

Comment ID: 413

First Name: Kenneth

Last Name: Jones

Commenter Email: jones_ken_us@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: none

Commenter Title: none

Posted Date: 08/18/23 09:39:22 AM

Comment:

Name: Jones, Kenneth Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not support the timeline for elimination of gas powered vehicles by 2035, this timeline should not be regulated by the government, instead by consumer demand. I would support tighter emissions regs on trucks and cars instead, and eliminating many loopholes in current regs.

Comment ID: 414

First Name: Patricia

Last Name: Moores

Commenter Email: moore4brit@msn.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Connecticut Citizen

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Moores, Patricia Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to PR2023-023 an EV (Electric Vehicle) Mandate. I VOTE NO ON THIS PROPOSAL AND ASK YOU DO THE SAME. It is less than ethical for Gov Lamont and the DEEP to try to push through a mandate without due process. Those decisions need to be vetted by elected officials in Congress who represent each citizen's individual vote. We live in a democracy, not a dictatorship. Lamont and DEEP- bring your plan forward to congress for review and a vote. If it's a good plan it will be voted up, if not, perhaps you have something to learn from those who oppose your EV proposal.

Comment ID: 415

First Name: Joan

Last Name: Ferraro

Commenter Email: 331joanferraro@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 10:37:22 AM

Comment:

Name: Ferraro, Joan Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Stop pushing the Green New Deal on us! Many of us know it's not about saving the earth.....it's about a corrupt government trying to gain total control over the public.

Comment ID: 416

First Name: Jane

Last Name: Do

Commenter Email: email@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 10:44:04 AM

Comment:

Name: Do, Jane Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Test test test test

Comment ID: 417

First Name: Jeffrey

Last Name: Poynton

Commenter Email: poyntonbc@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 11:07:40 AM

Comment:

Name: Poynton, Jeffrey Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The power grid system in CT is not up to par for EV. In the winter especially, when the power is out for sometimes a week, how are people going to be able to charge their vehicles. Plus it will cost homeowners thousands of dollars to have to upgrade the electrical system in their homes to be able to supply power to these. Hire electricians to upgrade. Price of electricity now is ridiculously expensive in CT. Would triple in price.

Comment ID: 418

First Name: Bill

Last Name: Carroll

Commenter Email: bwcarroll@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 11:28:26 AM

Comment:

Name: Carroll, Bill Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm against forcing the American people to buy electric cars that aren't any better for the environment than gas powered. The pollution they create to mine the batteries and the cheap labor they use to manufacture the batteries and also when the batteries are no longer usable the land fills they get put into along with the amount of water it takes to put out a electric car fire are all environmental issues. Also are electric grids will not be able to handle it

Comment ID: 419

First Name: Nancy

Last Name: Brooks**Commenter Email:** Quincymoxie@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 11:32:03 AM**Comment:**

Name: Brooks, Nancy Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am totally opposed to this ?bill? Lamont is proposing regarding banning gas powered vehicles. They are not perfected and won?t be for years to come. They are not good for winter weather in the northeast. They have blown up or caught fire without incident. What are you going to do with the old lithium batteries? That is massive pollution right there as they don?t know how to correctly dispose of the batteries. You?re hurting the environment more with these EVs. You need special equipment to charge them up which is very costly as you can?t just plug them into any socket, plus the real cost of of charging them is very high. Why don?t you act like the governor you?re supposed to be instead of a communist dictator? Forget what the other states are doing and concentrate on taking care of the people in Connecticut? Or is that too much to ask?

Comment ID: 420**First Name:** Ralph**Last Name:** Lipeles**Commenter Email:** rlipeles@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 11:39:06 AM**Comment:**

Name: Lipeles, Ralph Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Replacing gasoline cars with electric to reduce pollution is ridiculous. It does not address availability to provide the additional electricity, availability of materials to make the batteries, availability of batteries made in America, disposal of batteries, long recharge time for traveling long distances and for commercial vehicles. Also, The United States is rich in oil reserves. They should be used not left dormant. There is much green in Connecticut to provide clean air.

Comment ID: 421**First Name:** Ray**Last Name:** Zatorski**Commenter Email:** zatorskico@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 11:55:54 AM**Comment:**

Name: Zatorski, Ray Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I object to PR2023-023 for the following reasons: The infrastructure for power does not exist and will not exist to provide electrical power to these vehicles. Being on Planning and Zoning in the Town of East Hampton, I saw first hand the time and regulatory hurdles to put in a one megawatt solar farm and connect it to a substation less than a mile away. A major upgrade to the electrical grid for Connecticut is decades and vast amounts of money away. Blindly following regulations for another state across the nation with very different climate and topography differences than Connecticut with very different available power generation options is very unwise. Following federal regulations and adapting these to our state is a better choice. I do not see a cost and benefit analysis to justify this complete upheaval of our transportation system. A real and objective analysis must be done, screaming CLIMATE EMERGENCY!! is not justification.

Comment ID: 422

First Name: Stacy
Last Name: Munch
Commenter Email: msmunch@atlanticbb.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/18/23 12:02:41 PM

Comment:

Name: Munch, Stacy Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing on behalf of my family concerned about the banning of the sale of gas powered motor vehicles in Connecticut. This is an unfair burden being placed on the residents of our state. Have you taken the time to understand the consequences of this ban? In the name of fighting climate change, this ban will threaten economic stability and growth, stifle innovation, threaten public health and public safety, as well as threaten our national security as we become more dependent on China. I don't get it. How can we even consider banning gas powered vehicles when we have no infrastructure to support our current electric demands? You mean to tell me that in 12 years we will be able to support every household in CT owning one or more electric vehicles? Where is the proof that the production and disposal of components that make up an electric vehicle will not negatively impact the environmental? Where is the proof that an electric vehicle charge will last as long as a gas fill up, take as long to charge as it does for me to fill my gas tank, and take me as far without compromising my safety if I should encounter an ice storm, and health seated above a huge battery? Where is the proof that electric vehicles will be as affordable as their gas powered counterparts. Also, are there plans for the US to take on the manufacturing of electric vehicle components so as to remove our reliance on China even more? If electric vehicles are so great, why haven't they caught on like the iPhone? We didn't have to ban the Blackberry and flip phones or subsidize the iPhone through tax credits, etc. for the market to positively respond to the iPhone. How many members of DEEP personally own solely electric powered vehicles? How can the DEEP and Governor Lamont force a ban without representation through our legislators? I say NO to the ban on gas-powered CT vehicles! Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Respectfully, Stacy Munch

Comment ID: 423

First Name: Ingrid
Last Name: Hess
Commenter Email: ingrid@ingridhess.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title: Realtor
Posted Date: 08/18/23 12:30:13 PM

Comment:

Name: Hess, Ingrid Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Mr. Malloy, This is not about whether electric or gas powered gas vehicles are better or worse from one another. This is not about politically charged OPINIONS or BELIEFS. This is about the government restricting our FREEDOM to choose what we do, how we live, what we buy, what we lawfully choose to do, within the confines of our private lives. This is a very slippery slope towards tyranny. CT has no right to limit my FREEDOM to buy what a free market offers. You are trying to impose on us what California does. California is the most mistaken state to emulate. You are trying to impose the wrong model of government and if you want Connecticut to go to hell like California, this is the quick way to do it. You are restricting my natural right to FREEDOM, given by the US Constitution. Nonsense regulations like this one fast track The Constitution State to The Tyranny State. So today is cars, tomorrow is TYRANNY by the government imposing on me what the government thinks is right for me. Not so fast. Give me choices instead of limiting them. You are spending a lot of money in advertising trying to lure companies to come to Connecticut. Why would any tax paying, producing company move to Connecticut when you continue to come up with hairbrained regulations like this one? I am totally opposed to the restriction of my ability to choose what kind of car I drive. You are infringing upon my FREEDOM and this cannot be imposed to CT residents. You sure know how to make us, tax paying, law abiding, productive citizens consider moving to the smart States that allow us to live in FREEDOM. Respectfully, Ingrid Hess

Comment ID: 424

First Name: James
Last Name: Hardy
Commenter Email: hardyjames543@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: small business owner
Commenter Title: President
Posted Date: 08/18/23 01:01:03 PM

Comment:

Name: Hardy, James Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Unless anything has changed, the cobalt used in electric vehicle batteries is mined in the DRC by six and eight year old boys. I know this because I worked in that industry for about a year and a half. I think this should be considered in the debate about the proliferation of electric vehicles and EV charging stations, which I see everywhere. I think more efforts should be made to support encouraging people to use public transportation, and car pooling. I may have more to add on this topic at a later date.

Comment ID: 425

First Name: Linda
Last Name: Malarkey
Commenter Email: lindamalarkeycpa@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title: member
Posted Date: 08/18/23 01:12:16 PM

Comment:

Name: Malarkey, Linda Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Let me start with I AM an EV owner. I have had my fully electric car since 2021. I love driving electric. My opinion about the state going fully electric is based on my experience as an ev owner and driver. I live in an EV corridor (RT 7 in New Milford). My understanding from this designation is there should be alternative fuel options along this route. From the Brookfield /New Milford connector exit there is 1 Tesla charger with multiple stations. There is 1 non-tesla fast charger (EVGo). This is it.. there are no other charging options all the way up to Kent. There is one non-functioning level 2 charger (been out of service since March of 2022) in the center of New Milford on the Green. I have emailed the mayor to find out when it will be fixed. No response. The charger has been reported to the provider, which has attempted to contact the owner who has been unresponsive. How is the state infrastructure (or lack of it) in this part of the state going to support a full EV requirement. This part of the state doesn't support the vehicles that are driving now. If I did not have a home charger, I would not be able to drive anywhere. As for my home charger, well thank you Eversource for not supporting rebates or incentives for individuals that do not purchase the equipment they sponsor. It shouldn't matter if I have a charger which was recommended by the auto maker (and was the only one available when I took delivery of my car) or if it is part of the Eversource kickback program. My charger is a smart, WiFi compatible, receives updates over the air, there are no manual software updates I have to install. A smart charger is a smart charger and should not be restricted to a limited manufacturer to qualify for incentives & rebates. Eversource is not making it consumer friendly to convert. There are not enough public charging stations available along Route 84 to make travel to other states easy. Until Connecticut has the infrastructure in place to make charging an electric vehicle common place, there is absolutely no way the state should make purchasing a vehicle limited to and EV. The first steps CT should make, would be to make CT electrified, THEN and only then push the requirements to the consumer.

Comment ID: 426

First Name: Scott
Last Name: Pietro
Commenter Email: griff08@yahoo.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/18/23 02:25:30 PM

Comment:

Name: Pietro, Scott Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Representative, I am writing to you today to express my concern about the push to all-electric cars in our state. I believe that this is a burdensome policy that will disproportionately impact low-income and rural residents. One of the biggest concerns I have is the cost of electric cars. Electric cars are still more expensive than gasoline-powered cars, and this gap is only going to widen as the demand for electric cars increases. This means that low-income families will be priced out of the market for electric cars, even with the available tax credits. Another concern I have is the burden of cost to install upgraded electrical service to homes and charger installation. The average cost to install a home charger is \$1,200 to \$2,500, and the cost to upgrade electrical service can be even higher. This is a significant expense for many families, and it is something that should be considered before we make the switch to all-electric cars. I am also concerned about the burden on renters. Many renters do not have convenient ways to charge electric cars, and they may not be able to afford to install a charger at their home. This means that they would be forced to rely on public charging stations, which can be unreliable and inconvenient. Finally, I am concerned about the impact of all-electric cars on our electrical grid. Our grid is already strained during peak demand periods, such as the summer months when air conditioning use is high. Adding millions of electric cars to the grid will only make the problem worse. This could lead to rolling blackouts and brownouts, which would disproportionately impact low-income and rural residents. I am particularly concerned about this issue because of Eversource's history of providing poor service to its customers. In 2019, Eversource was fined \$9 million for failing to provide adequate storm response during a series of winter storms. This is just one example of how Eversource has let its customers down. I believe that forcing the switch to all-electric cars is a risky and irresponsible policy. It is not fair to burden low-income and rural residents with the cost of electric cars, and it is not wise to put even more strain on our already-vulnerable electrical grid. I urge you to reconsider this policy and to focus on more affordable and reliable ways to reduce our carbon emissions. For example, we could invest in public transportation, improve energy efficiency in our homes and businesses, and develop renewable energy sources. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Scott Pietro

Comment ID: 427**First Name:** Laura**Last Name:** Shackelford**Commenter Email:** lshackelfordphd@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 02:25:56 PM**Comment:**

Name: Shackelford, Laura Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Terrible idea at this point in time. Range for fully charged battery is limited. Battery is prohibitively expensive if it needs to be replaced. And what are we doing environment wise with the huge dead batteries? Charging stations for home are an additional expense, and if you don't have 240 power that conversion is also very expensive. 120 power could take 10 + hours to charge the car. But, a main concern is how long it takes to charge a car, and the lack of charging stations in our towns or the whole state. Forget traveling to other states to visit family?having to find charging stations along the way and then waiting hours to ?fill up.? Many families cannot afford any new car, let alone an EV or hybrid. And young drivers are even more likely to be extremely limited in what they can afford. While electricity is currently less expensive when compared to gas, Connecticut is among the top five states in the country for high electricity rates. And since, I've been told that the state legislative department has no control over electric company charges, I expect the rates would surge! Plus who would pay for all the charging stations in towns? Plus people in apartments might not be allowed to have charging stations in the garage. There are so many possible negative results, these are only a few. While it is a noble thought, it is fraught with predictable and unpredictable possibly disastrous consequences. The only clear benefit being lower emissions. This legislation is fantastically premature!

Comment ID: 428**First Name:** Alison**Last Name:** Walck**Commenter Email:** bergersnbits@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 02:43:44 PM**Comment:**

Name: Walck, Alison Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am deeply opposed to the banning of IC vehicles by 2035 in CT. This absurd idea is only thinking of the tailpipe pollution emitted by fuel burning vehicles. There is no talk ever of the ground water pollution caused by the tire wear and the need for larger brakes to stop these heavier vehicles. Climate change is the political hot button yet no ones speaks of ground water contamination as well as these pollutants coming off the roads into the LIS.

Comment ID: 429**First Name:** Linda**Last Name:** Camelio**Commenter Email:** lmcamelio@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 03:00:45 PM**Comment:**

Name: Camelio, Linda Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am completely opposed to being forced to drive one type of car. If that isn't government overreach, I don't know what is. Electric cars are expensive, there are issues with the batteries, and I don't want to have to worry about where the next charging station is when I'm driving. Please give us middle class citizens a break with all these ridiculous ideas.

Comment ID: 430**First Name:** Diane**Last Name:** Paskiewicz**Commenter Email:** dpaskie@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 03:03:18 PM**Comment:**

Name: Paskiewicz, Diane Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is absolutely ridiculous. More than 1/2 the driving population will not be able to afford an electric vehicle, the electricity that will be necessary to "fuel" these vehicles will be astronomical and we will not have those resources available in 10 years. There will be brown out's if not black out's. And I resent being FORCED into a situation that I can't afford. CT is already too expensive...property taxes, sales tax, income tax and now I'm being told I have to buy an expensive car that the grid will not be able to handle??? Just one more reason why not to live in CT!

Comment ID: 431**First Name:** Paul**Last Name:** Miller**Commenter Email:** pemiller1969@msn.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 03:07:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Miller, Paul Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Your thinking on electric cars and trucks saving

the planet are preposterous. If every car and truck were ev we would only diminish fossil fuels by 10 percent. This Montra is a talking point put out by Elites just to remove more of the people's monies.

Comment ID: 432

First Name: Joseph

Last Name: Brady

Commenter Email: beejabers@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: individual

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:10:47 PM

Comment:

Name: Brady, Joseph Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose arbitrary dates to ban products that are legal and work. It creates artificial crises. EVs will overtake gas in time. Also, we cannot predict when the supply chain for EVs at sufficient scale will be ready to replace gas 100% and the US is energy independent with gas vehicles. Whereas, the USA does not have a complete domestic supply chain for lithium and rare earth metals for EV batteries. We depend on foreign countries for EV contents which puts the USA at risk.

Comment ID: 433

First Name: Erin

Last Name: Stewart

Commenter Email: mayor@newbritainct.gov

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Local Government

Commenter Title: Mayor

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:12:18 PM

Comment:

Name: Stewart, Erin Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a leader in the sustainable CT initiative, and a municipality, who has made incredible progress with reducing our carbon footprint, you all know, as well as I do that we are not equipped with the necessary infrastructure to be able to handle a mandate like this. There are not enough charging stations, people can?t, and won?t be able to equipped their homes with the necessary equipment, nor can our electric grid handle the amount of electricity necessary to make this mandate a reality. Furthermore, the residents of the state, especially the ones that I represent, are in no position to be able to afford the expensive vehicles that you would force them to buy. I understand, that it ?sounds good?, and everyone wants to be more environmentally friendly, but you will create chaos by mandating this. Incremental change is more realistic, but forcing some thing down the throats of the people of the state is not going to be positive for anyone, or our environment. Please reconsider.

Comment ID: 434

First Name: JAMES

Last Name: CANGELOSI

Commenter Email: jimpaincenter@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:12:44 PM

Comment:

Name: CANGELOSI, JAMES Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am totally agianst a ban on gas powered cars. There is no way the power grid can hold up. Also we would be at the mercy of Eversource and Ct's doesn't have a great track record of putting the brakes on their ever increasing prices.

Comment ID: 435

First Name: MARK
Last Name: GRADER
Commenter Email: MGRADER@YAHOO.COM
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:13:50 PM

Comment:

Name: GRADER, MARK Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We are not in any position to make this drastic change without having the infrastructure ready for it. I'm picturing miles and miles of electric cars trying to get out of a hurricane's way in Florida, for example. The vehicle's energy will be spent while average citizens are trying to save their lives. That's policy that is putting people in a very dangerous position, the facts are beyond question.

Comment ID: 436
First Name: Brian
Last Name: Quillia
Commenter Email: licorice2020@yahoo.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: self
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:14:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Quillia, Brian Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose this proposal, as it is fundamentally anti-markets. Let the markets decide the mix of vehicles. Also, : Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 437
First Name: David
Last Name: Garneau
Commenter Email: dgarneau40@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:14:19 PM

Comment:

Name: Garneau, David Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Banning the sale of gas vehicles is incredibly overreaching. You have no right to dictate to us what we choose to buy. Electric cars use batteries. Batteries STORE power, they do not create power. They must be charged by using energy from coal and oil fired plants. Lithium is mined by slave labor, it's dangerous, expensive and an ecological nightmare. We have no infrastructure to support the strain on the power grid, our energy costs here in this state are crushingly expensive and many of us just cant afford the cars or the power bills to run them. You're creating another tax hungry situation where we will be forced to pay new taxes and fees, or face fines and increased costs forced on us for not owning battery vehicles. I fully oppose this overbearing legislation. It's wrong, it's bullying, and I don't see how it's constitutional.

Comment ID: 438

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Marchand

Commenter Email: marchand.pn@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Winchester Volunteer Fire Department

Commenter Title: Chief

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:17:19 PM

Comment:

Name: Marchand, Peter Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a fire Chief and a retired Fleet Manager I am totally opposed to any mandates for a switch to electric vehicles. Presently there is not a complete infrastructure to charge all of these cars. Also the fire departments are presently facing a critical shortage of volunteers to answer any and all calls for service. Any electric car fire will require many man hours and a large quantity of water to control. If the car ignites in a structure we are then faced with another situation including life safety of any occupants. I am not against the sale or use of electric cars but we all must be prepared for any new issues that come with them.

Comment ID: 439

First Name: Edward

Last Name: Bouffard

Commenter Email: edbuff@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:17:56 PM

Comment:

Name: Bouffard, Edward Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 440

First Name: Brett

Last Name: Nemeth

Commenter Email: brettneeth1@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Citizen

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:21:40 PM

Comment:

Name: Nemeth, Brett Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I urge you to vote NO on this unnecessary tax on the less fortunate. Removing a low cost fuel option for the working class is the only outcome here, under the guise of "cleaner air".

Comment ID: 441

First Name: David

Last Name: Porter

Commenter Email: david@porter-racing.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:24:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Porter, David Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please stop this nonsense. Battery electric cars are a dead end and the effect on climate change is very limited. This constant meddling by the government in our lives has to stop.

Comment ID: 442

First Name: Vincent

Last Name: Zujewski

Commenter Email: vzujewski@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:25:56 PM

Comment:

Name: Zujewski, Vincent Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The State of Connecticut needs to get out of the "mandating business" when it comes to gasoline vs electric vehicles. Residents of our state should have the freedom to choose what they want to buy based upon their own research of the climate change issues, prices of vehicles and the fuel to power them (CT residents pay 24 cents/KwH supply charge now. Will it double again in the future?), benefits of owning gasoline/electric vehicles in a colder climate like CT, and ability to use/repair such vehicles in our state and region. Let the market do its thing. If one option becomes obviously better, people will buy more of it. Do not dictate what is best for us! Each individual needs to decide for themselves.

Comment ID: 443

First Name: Patrick

Last Name: Droney

Commenter Email: pjdroney@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: N/A

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:26:04 PM

Comment:

Name: Droney, Patrick Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am testifying in 100% opposition to the boneheaded proposal to ban the sale of gas-powered cars in 12 short years...2035. What is the point of punishing Connecticut taxpayers when eliminating the sale of gas-powered vehicles will do nothing when countries such as China, India and others continue to pollute at will. The United States has already cut our carbon emissions significantly over the past decade. This is a foolhardy, kneejerk decision that kowtows to the radical environmental movement. If there is any wonder why people are leaving this state in droves, this answers it.

Comment ID: 444

First Name: Jeffrey

Last Name: Lockwood

Commenter Email: J12481@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:26:16 PM

Comment:

Name: Lockwood , Jeffrey Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I own a Tesla vehicle and enjoy the car period I don't need or want you to tell me what type of car I can purchase period stay out of my life and all will be happy..

Comment ID: 445

First Name: Barbara

Last Name: Tyszka

Commenter Email: barbtyszka@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:26:26 PM

Comment:

Name: Tyszka, Barbara Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I vehemently oppose banning gasoline powered vehicles. Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. Please do not ban gasoline powered vehicles. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 446

First Name: Dawn

Last Name: Browning

Commenter Email: dawn@itrecoveryspecialists.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:28:40 PM

Comment:

Name: Browning, Dawn Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not want to be forced to buy an electric car which already has been determined to be worse for the environment than gas cars. Please do your research regarding disposal and cost of batteries. Also, the mining of lithium to make the batteries which use child labor, slavery, horrendous working conditions and the polluting of the communities water supply. The mining of lithium also caused biodiversity loss, air contamination, CO2 emission which contribute to climate change. Cobalt and nickel mining, which are required for EV batteries also cause detrimental effects to the climate. Disposal of these batteries pose a huge environmental concern. Not to mention you are trying to take away more of our rights to decide what is best for ourselves and the environment.

Comment ID: 447

First Name: Andy

Last Name: Kerchoff

Commenter Email: andy_kerchoff@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:38:32 PM

Comment:

Name: Kerchoff, Andy Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I DO NOT support ANY type of ban on internal combustion engine powered vehicles, period. Such a ban serves special interests only and is straight up un-American.

Comment ID: 448

First Name: William

Last Name: Fredericksen

Commenter Email: fredericksen.william@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:40:45 PM

Comment:

Name: Fredericksen, William Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is absolutely unacceptable to ban the sale of new gasoline-powered cars by any future date. Connecticut does not have the necessary infrastructure to provide electric car charging in equal level to the ubiquity of gas stations, nor will this state by 2035. This state legislature can't even regulate residential electric rates properly so as to make electricity affordable to the majority population of low- and middle-income residents, let alone provide that electricity capacity for a statewide fleet of cars. Charging at home is certainly cost prohibitive to most residents at this time, and is likely to remain so in the future. Add to that the high cost of replacement battery arrays, motors, and other parts and service for electric vehicles, as well as the ridiculously inflated cost of the vehicles themselves, putting them well out of the reach of most of us in Connecticut - A car should not cost more than an entire year's salary for an average family, let alone double what most of us in this state make in a year or even multiple years. Electric cars are well out of the price range of most Americans, even with financing (which many of us in this state can't even obtain). This is not a decision that should be made by any agency, or any official, elected or not, but should be put to a full public vote as a referendum on the ballot. It is also forcing a wrong-headed approach to achieve questionable climate benefits and foisting ridiculous costs on a population that is already paying too much to live in this state.

Comment ID: 449

First Name: Leo

Last Name: Colgan

Commenter Email: lcolgan@grad.bryant.edu

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:44:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Colgan, Leo Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not attack the working class by banning affordable and reliable transportation. Electric vehicles do not currently represent viable alternative to gas vehicles. Furthermore, you cannot tell the how these new regulations will affect the weather. By how many degrees will this specific regulation change temperature? How much more/less rainfall will we get? How will the ratio of cloudy to sunny days be affected? How much more efficient will this make our crop production? You cannot answer these questions with any type of specificity. I know because all of the world's top "climate scientists" are completely incapable of providing any kind of objective measure for the effect of any proposed "climate" measures. To put forth such an impactful regulation, without any kind data supporting an expected measurable outcome, would be horribly irresponsible.

Comment ID: 450

First Name: Joe

Last Name: Helwig

Commenter Email: jhelwig@3sst.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 03:45:12 PM**Comment:**

Name: Helwig, Joe Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 451**First Name:** Charles**Last Name:** Reese**Commenter Email:** charles@accelachv.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Voter**Posted Date:** 08/18/23 03:45:33 PM**Comment:**

Name: Reese, Charles Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While I agree there is a need for reduction of hydrocarbon emissions, I oppose a plan to restrict the sale of gas vehicles by 2035. For this to be a useful step, the power grid must be updated to low-emission power sources and public transportation must evolve such that the need for personal transportation is greatly decreased. It's highly unlikely this will be solved by 2035 and these steps should be the State's top priority. Without a comprehensive plan, this regulation will only punish those that lack the resources to purchase an EV. DEEP is putting the cart before the horse when it comes to the environment.

Comment ID: 453**First Name:** Roy**Last Name:** Filkoff**Commenter Email:** royfilkoff@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 03:52:54 PM**Comment:**

Name: Filkoff, Roy Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not believe it is wise to pass this legislation before we have surety of the alternative to gas powered cars and the related infrastructure. The utilities in CT are already stressed and forcing this change will make things worse. The market should demand this change, not just a law. It is unlikely that things will work out as expected by those making this proposal.

Comment ID: 454**First Name:** Tom**Last Name:** Davies**Commenter Email:** Tsdlyme@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:**

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:54:45 PM

Comment:

Name: Davies, Tom Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Much too premature to do this Infrastructure will likely not be available Too expensive to go down this path

Comment ID: 455

First Name: Eugene

Last Name: Sumner

Commenter Email: scott@sumnercom.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 03:56:13 PM

Comment:

Name: Sumner, Eugene Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a Connecticut resident I find the idea of banning gas powered cars absurd and, more importantly, totalitarian. I wish to maintain my freedom, independence, and RIGHT to make choices as a consumer and a citizen. I do not wish to have the state deciding for me what is best in my purchasing decisions in what is constitutionally an open marketplace. Please do not ban gas powered cars. Thank you.

Comment ID: 456

First Name: judy

Last Name: moran

Commenter Email: judyam123@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 04:09:34 PM

Comment:

Name: moran, judy Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It's ridiculous to think that everyone will be able to afford an electric vehicle. Currently people are driving 10 year old cars and more because they can't afford a new one at half the price of an ev. We've been doing emissions testing for more than a decade, another tax, which was supposedly to help with pollution. This hasn't accomplished anything? Oh, no, well let's move on to another expensive proposition that won't do a damn thing except cost more money. This idea is taking us backwards, maybe horse and buggy days, as there will be no travel or it will take longer. since batteries don't take us as far as gas, not to mention the amount of time to charge. Give me a break!! I'm all for buses and government vehicles, (not police!) but forget it for private citizens. Let it be choice!

Comment ID: 457

First Name: Eric

Last Name: Barbour

Commenter Email: eebrmer2013@mail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Barbour, Eric Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 People should have the choice of vehicles. There are many reasons to not choose an all-electric vehicle: EVs are way too expensive. Limited range, cargo and towing capacities. Long charging times vs. gas refueling. Extended travel distances to find charging stations. Shifts demand to electric grid which cannot support the load. CT electric costs are near the highest in the country. Still burns fossil

fuel to generate electricity. Very expensive batteries with limited life. Battery fire and explosion hazards. Heavy environmental impact of mining, processing and disposal of toxic materials required to make batteries. For these reasons I oppose banning the sale of gasoline vehicles.

Comment ID: 458

First Name: Nicholas

Last Name: Ciarlo

Commenter Email: naciarlo@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Taxpayer

Commenter Title: Owner

Posted Date: 08/18/23 04:16:22 PM

Comment:

Name: Ciarlo, Nicholas Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This attempt to match the losers of California is exemplary of what happens when you elect incompetent people to positions of power. We don't have the electrical infrastructure as well as there will obviously be a push for a mileage tax, since the gas tax will decline accordingly. When that happens, I will buy a gas powered car in Florida where my brother lives and register it down there. I will take my current car(s) and also register them down there. Then I will drive one for 6 months then drive the other one for the other 6 months, so you see, YOU LOOSE EITHER WAY. How sweet is that. A win-win for me.

Comment ID: 459

First Name: DANIEL

Last Name: CASS

Commenter Email: DJCASS51@Gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 04:17:47 PM

Comment:

Name: CASS, DANIEL Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No to banning auto's

Comment ID: 460

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Dewick

Commenter Email: rdewick@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: retired

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 04:18:36 PM

Comment:

Name: Dewick, Richard Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am firmly against out government restricting the purchase of gasoline powered cars in our state by any future date. That would be a direct invasion of our freedom to buy what we choose. Result: a violation of interstate commerce by the State of Connecticut.

Comment ID: 461

First Name: William

Last Name: Bradley

Commenter Email: william.brent.bradley@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 04:21:28 PM

Comment:

Name: Bradley, William Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Subject: Concerns Regarding the Proposal to Ban Gasoline Powered Vehicles in Connecticut To Whom It May Concern, I am writing this letter to express some reservations and considerations regarding the proposal to ban gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut. While the aim to reduce emissions and promote cleaner transportation is commendable, there are several key points that must be carefully considered before implementing such a significant change. Firstly, it is important to acknowledge that emissions from vehicles in Connecticut contribute to a mere 0.04% of global emissions. While local efforts to reduce emissions are important for the state's environment, it's crucial to recognize that such actions, while impactful on a local scale, may not have a significant effect on the global climate dynamics. Secondly, the transition to electric powered cars comes with a substantial cost implication. On average, electric vehicles cost nearly twice as much as their gasoline-powered counterparts. Such a shift in Connecticut would impose substantial financial burdens on both residents and businesses. These costs could have far-reaching consequences on affordability and accessibility for individuals and industries, potentially hindering economic growth. Furthermore, the transition to an all-electric vehicle fleet would demand a considerable increase in energy production. Currently, there is a lack of a comprehensive and feasible plan to generate the required energy within the state and the region. This raises concerns about energy security, potential strain on existing infrastructure, and the potential environmental impact of ramping up energy production. Additionally, the state's electric vehicle charging infrastructure is not yet adequately developed to accommodate the demand that would arise from an all-electric vehicle fleet. It is essential to consider the financial resources required for building and maintaining this infrastructure, and to evaluate how taxpayer dollars will be allocated to support such initiatives. Lastly, it's worth noting that electric vehicles tend to be heavier due to their battery systems, which can lead to increased emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the lifespan of the vehicle. While electric vehicles are cleaner during operation, a holistic assessment of their environmental impact should consider these factors as well. In conclusion, the proposal to ban gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut is a complex issue that requires careful consideration of the points raised above. It is crucial to strike a balance between environmental goals and the economic realities faced by residents and businesses. I urge the State of Connecticut to engage in comprehensive research, stakeholder consultations, and thorough cost-benefit analyses before making any decisions on this matter. Thank you for your attention to these important considerations.
 Sincerely, William Bradley

Comment ID: 462**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Hannon**Commenter Email:** johnh1187@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Hannon, John Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 i do not have \$60,000. + to buy a new EV vehicle , unless Cable TV Ned or Clueless Dementia Joe want to buy me one under the Affirmative Action Anti Inflation Act . How are we to dis[pose of the old batteries ? , left wing liberal democrats forcing this EV debacle down our throats

Comment ID: 463**First Name:** Allison**Last Name:** Harkins**Commenter Email:** agoodman02@snet.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 04:32:07 PM**Comment:**

Name: Harkins, Allison Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 With this overreaching legislation, the state is

effectively trying to force hard-working taxpayers to spend their money on expensive vehicles which they can't afford, or wish to purchase, when it should be focused on other priorities. This is an ill-conceived plan when the current infrastructure cannot support its passing. I am disgusted by what is happening in our state, and this country, with this crazy-making push toward electric vehicles. It should be a CHOICE, NOT A MANDATE!!! Our Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 464

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Lariviere

Commenter Email: ChrisLariviere@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: RiCas Media Group, LLC

Commenter Title: President

Posted Date: 08/18/23 04:33:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Lariviere, Christopher Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposed regulation is insane!! Electric cars are NOT efficient, and absolutely still require FOSSIL FUELS to operate them, no matter how far you PLUG your fingers into your ears, (Yes, Pun Intended). Plugging your electric car into an outlet at your house may make you feel good, but you're only causing more coal to burn at the power plants. Our electric grid can't even handle a few hot days in a row, how the Hell is it supposed to handle even 1 electric car per household? It can't, and you know it. You tried to force solar on us this way, and it was a miserable failure because electricity is extremely cheap as is, and solar technology was no where near ready yet, (and it still isn't). What was that Obama quote?, 'Electricity rates will necessarily sky rocket'. You can not artificially force current tried and true supply costs to increase by cutting oil drilling and outlawing gas powered vehicles in order to create demand, you have and will fail every time. Leave us alone and let us go about our lives THE WAY WE SEE FIT!! If someone wants to buy an (overpriced p.o.s.) electric car, that's their choice. My family DOES NOT choose this, so leave us alone.

Comment ID: 465

First Name: Aziz

Last Name: Dehkan

Commenter Email: aziz@ctclimateandjobs.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Connecticut Roundtable on Climate and Jobs

Commenter Title: Executive Director

Posted Date: 08/18/23 04:38:35 PM

Attachments:

CRCJ Comments ACC II.pdf

Comment:

Name: Dehkan, Aziz Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please see attached PDF.

Comment ID: 466

First Name: Frank

Last Name: Blume

Commenter Email: frankblume@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Last Name: Jolley

Commenter Email: ljolley558@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 05:03:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Jolley, Lisa Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I submitted a comment earlier but forgot the most important argument against forcing CT residents to use only electric cars. I'm an adult and I can decide for myself what type of vehicle I choose to drive. The CT Legislature is not my parent or guardian and has no right to make that decision for me.

Comment ID: 471

First Name: Benigna

Last Name: Montanez

Commenter Email: bening_asis@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Montanez, Benigna Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 "NO to the ban on gas-powered CT cars!"

Comment ID: 472

First Name: Stephen

Last Name: Jenks

Commenter Email: jenksgroup@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: N/A

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 05:06:39 PM

Comment:

Name: Jenks, Stephen Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We don't have the capacity to service an all electric fleet and won't by 2035. This is a solution in search of a problem. Far, far better to encourage Nuclear power electricity generation. If electric cars are so good, stop subsidizing them. Also stop subsidizing wind and solar generation. If they aren't competitive without subsidy, stop wasting money.

Comment ID: 473

First Name: Quoc

Last Name: Truong

Commenter Email: gjesstbq@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 05:10:10 PM

Comment:

Name: Truong, Quoc Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO BAN TO GAS CAR.

Comment ID: 474

First Name: Paul

Last Name: McVay

Commenter Email: 800xpilot@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: CTRA

Commenter Title: Member

Posted Date: 08/18/23 05:49:54 PM

Comment:

Name: McVay, Paul Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Good Morning All, The climate has always changed. Let's take a short jaunt though history. One of the major factors the Battle of the Bulge failed in 1945 was because of the vicious winter. Ok, you don't like that one. In 1683 The Thames River in London Froze for two months. So thick was the ice that carnivals and shops were set up on the river. Not today, or any time in recent history, say 200 years. Still not good enough for you? Ireland wasn't settled until about 10,000 years ago. Why? Because it was covered in ice. Ok, let's venture further. Over the last 100,000 years the North American Continent was covered by glaciers as far as Kentucky. Not once, but three times! Colder climate, glaciers advance. Warmer climate, glaciers recede. The last time, approximately 20,000 years ago, was when human beings crossed the oceans to the Western Hemisphere because the oceans were so low that passage across their expanse was possible. Still not good enough for you?! 65 Million years ago a meteor the size of Paris, 5 miles in case you were wondering, slammed into what is now the Caribbean ocean, possibly the worlds largest impact crater, raining an umbrella of fiery molten rock over the North American continent, setting off volcanos and earthquakes on the other side of the globe, decimating 97% of all terrestrial life and 95% of all life on this planet. Darkening the Earth for several years, or so scientists tell us. Yet here we are describing how bad humans are affecting this planet with our 'Carbon footprint'. This Earth will survive whatever humans will throw at it. Perhaps it's not just the Oil conglomerates are trying to shove gas down our throats, which that mayos probably the case, but we must also consider the large investors that have a great stake in 'Alternative Energy Sources' that are trying to convince us to buy what they are selling. Don't fall for this insane sales propaganda. It hurts all of us whose voices are being silenced. You are not immune. Once the middle class is erased, YOU become the middle class. No one will be there to fight for you. We will all be poor or dead. They are counting on you not thinking that far ahead! If you believe you aren't one of us, You will. At some point. By then it will be too late. They talk a good game. They say pleasant things to you. How you will be part of the future. YOU are not. They don't want you around. Especially if they can convince you of something. You are a useful idiot to them if you fall for their sales pitch. Vote NO on the gas vehicle ban.

Comment ID: 475

First Name: Lissa

Last Name: Jennings

Commenter Email: lissabc13@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 06:01:18 PM

Comment:

Name: Jennings , Lissa Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't think Connecticut should go all electric for vehicles for many reasons. Many families will not be able to afford to purchase electric vehicles nor do they want to. Is the electric grid capable of handling the demand especially during the hottest months of the summer. What is going to happen to all of the had stations that exist? I think hybrid vehicles make sense but I don't agree with all electric.

Comment ID: 476

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Licht

Commenter Email: Candlewoodjen@earthlink.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 06:14:49 PM

Comment:

Name: Licht, Jennifer Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am extremely concerned about the ban on gas powered cars that is being proposed in the state of CT. My husband drives over 2 hours to work in all kinds of weather and would be unable to charge an electric car, making his commute significantly longer. We also drive long distances to visit friends and family frequently and these drives would become next to impossible in an electric car. Our state and others do not have the infrastructure for such a change, and with the amount of power outages we experience here it would be dangerous and extremely difficult to get anywhere during a power outage. In addition to these concerns, electric cars have not been proven to be better for the environment, and they are made with very toxic substances that are mined in other countries using slave labor. Electric cars are also more expensive and not as reliable and have a much shorter life span than gas powered cars. In short, this proposal makes no sense and would be terrible for her residents of our state.

Comment ID: 477

First Name: Isabelle

Last Name: Hargrove

Commenter Email: Isahargrove@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 07:00:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Hargrove, Isabelle Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly oppose this bill. Isabelle Hargrove

Comment ID: 478

First Name: Andrew

Last Name: Olearnick

Commenter Email: olearnickaj@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 07:06:31 PM

Comment:

Name: Olearnick, Andrew Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose your proposal to ban gas cars in the future in the State of Connecticut. It is as usual a half baked idea stolen from California. As usual the Democratic majority is unable to come up with thier own ideas and solutions.

Comment ID: 479

First Name: Donald

Last Name: Hutchinson

Commenter Email: donshutch@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: ceo

Posted Date: 08/18/23 07:07:49 PM

Comment:

Name: Hutchinson, Donald Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Why would anyone in their right mind think that copying California policies is a good idea? I don't think there is any other state more clueless and screwed up than California. You name they have managed to get to last place in every category. This fixation with saving the world has real costs let alone being unworkable to begin with. Electricity costs in Ct are amongst the very highest in the country so now tell me how is it possible to save money charging the batteries.? There is not enough electricity available to accommodate this idea and If you have everyone charging in a small geography the local grid

is not remotely going to be able to handle the load. Not only is the idea enormously expensive and standard of living altering especially for lower-income and average income citizens. There is almost nothing to be gained as we live in a big world and other states and countries are not going to do this because they are smarter than the average Ct legislator!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comment ID: 480

First Name: Erik

Last Name: Conrad

Commenter Email: Erikconrad@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Locksmith

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 07:10:13 PM

Comment:

Name: Conrad, Erik Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No, just no please. This will ruin our future for the state and country. There's no infrastructure in place for electric vehicles and the cost is already so high most Can't afford them. Our State is already at its max for taxation and more taxes means less money in the common persons pockets. So please no just no.

Comment ID: 481

First Name: Matthew

Last Name: Lamoureux

Commenter Email: lam@lamsland.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 08:08:18 PM

Comment:

Name: Lamoureux, Matthew Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While people like to point out the carbon footprint of gasoline-powered cars, few seem to recognize that EVs also come with a massive carbon footprint, especially during production. The reality is, it requires a lot more energy to produce EVs than petrol cars, which means they produce a lot more CO2 in the production phase. How many pounds of CO2 does it take to create a single Tesla battery? German researchers asked this question a few years ago. The answer? About 30,000 pounds. Volvo raised eyebrows at a climate summit when it conceded that its C40 Recharge needed to be driven nearly 70,000 miles before it had a lower carbon impact than a gasoline-powered version. Shifting from petrol cars to EVs will not reduce CO2 emissions nearly as much as many believe. In fact, a recent Wall Street Journal analysis found that shifting all personal vehicles in the U.S. from gas to electric power will reduce global CO2 emissions by only 0.18 percent. This also ignores other adverse impacts of EVs. Nickel, copper, lithium, and cobalt takes a tremendous amount of mining to harvest these elements, and the process is hard on the environment. "You have to mine, somewhere on Earth, 500,000 pounds of minerals and rock to make one battery," physicist Mark Mills of the Manhattan Institute said. a single EV can require a mile of copper wiring. There is a concerted effort to not get them from the USA. . It's far too hard on the environment. Manufacturers rely on Chile, Argentina, and Bolivia for lithium, even though the U.S. holds one of the largest lithium deposits in the world. Instead of strip mining for copper ourselves, we turn to Chile, the world leader in copper production. For nickel we turn to the rainforests of Indonesia and the Philippines. It used to be we were still trying to save the rainforests. Today, EV manufactures are raping them for natural resources to make way for the new "green" economy. There will come a time when it may make sense to ban internal combustion engines burning fossil fuels. ICEs may still have a place if they are converted to burn alcohol, which is made by fermenting plant matter that is otherwise discarded and burns much cleaner than gasoline or diesel. Fuel alcohol also being an easily and cheap renewable resource. There are also some promising discoveries being made in super conductor materials and new better technologies. These may I. The future make the true environmental impact of EVs better than ICE vehicles. Battery-powered cars are much too expensive for a vast majority of Americans, as well. Strong demand for electric vehicles from affluent buyers means that carmakers have little incentive to sell cheaper models. For low- and middle-income people who don't have their own garages or driveways, another obstacle is the lack of enough public facilities to recharge. The average sticker price of an

electric vehicle rose 14 percent last year to \$66,000, \$20,000 more than the average for all new cars, according to Kelley Blue Book. It is estimated this increase will continue to happen until new technologies are developed that will meet what will be a legislated demand, instead of a natural economic demand.

Comment ID: 482

First Name: Mike

Last Name: Levesque

Commenter Email: mhl99r.d@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Levesque, Mike Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not support the ban on gasoline vehicles.

The infrastructure is insufficiently mature to support all electric vehicles. In the recent past the electric grid has been susceptible to catastrophic failure when subjected to loading stresses, without significant improvements, adding more loading will only stress the system even more. There is a lack of coordination and planning on the State and local level on dealing with lithium fires and spills from accidents which are hazardous waste emergencies. Lack of planning for disposal and recycling of lithium which is an environmental hazardous waste.

Comment ID: 483

First Name: Carol

Last Name: Hulbert

Commenter Email: Hhulbert@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Hulbert, Carol Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not think Connecticut should be following

environmental requirements guided by California. They are a failing state with high taxes and poor example of providing the power needed to equip their state with the power needed to keep their economy going. When the power goes out from either over use or other reasons, everything stops. They are not successful using just wind turbines and solar panels to run their power and need more than that. I am increasingly concerned that we need alternative energy supplies and the focus on EV ?s is expensive, inconvenient and not affordable for the middle class or low income residents. And we certainly do not have the infrastructure to support EV?s. We should be investigating other options. What happens if some enemy Hacks into our energy source if it is only electric? No gas powered generators, no one can evacuate, freezers and refrigerators thaw , no heat or air conditioning , no cooking and people will die. I do not believe we should be following the guidance of California for Connecticut?s future.

Comment ID: 484

First Name: Aida

Last Name: Gallagher

Commenter Email: aidagallagher@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 09:34:06 PM

Comment:

Name: Gallagher, Aida Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This requirement to get an electric powered car is unreasonable based on the cost of most electric cars. We also do not have enough infrastructure to support these

cars. Additionally, the cost of electricity is among the highest in the continental US, adding to the expense. This proposal is unreasonable.

Comment ID: 485

First Name: ADRIEN

Last Name: TRUDEAU

Commenter Email: artsr1960@earthlink.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: NONE

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 09:40:48 PM

Comment:

Name: TRUDEAU, ADRIEN Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I find it quite distressing to learn that CT plans to STOP the sales of gas fired cars and trucks starting in 2035. This plan will have no negligible effect on climate issues in our state and appears to be nothing more than following the lead of the "Hate America" opinions of George Soros and his kind. Just stop this useless plan!

Comment ID: 486

First Name: Justin

Last Name: Griffith

Commenter Email: justin.griffith1@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 09:54:09 PM

Comment:

Name: Griffith, Justin Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric vehicles are exponentially more expensive than gas powered vehicles. Electric costs in Connecticut are overwhelming. On Friday 08/18/2023, Ford CEO acknowledged lack of charging stations available. Along with the aforementioned financial burden, what is the projected cost of updating infrastructure to support charging stations? Is Connecticut willing to commit to not increasing taxes to support initiative? Additionally, what is the projected reduction of global temperatures with one state implementing initiative? The purpose of the question is cost per resident versus global impact.

Comment ID: 487

First Name: Daniel

Last Name: Heald

Commenter Email: dan.m.heald@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/18/23 10:06:19 PM

Comment:

Name: Heald, Daniel Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think you have lost your minds. These vehicles are not economical for a family that does more than just commutes to work. Not affordable at all for the middle class. Drive 200 miles and have to let it charge for 11 hours. If you cared about the environment we need to be in diesel vehicles without DEF. The hazardous waste these electric vehicles have impact on being built and when they go to the dump after the 8-10 years due to the batteries only last long that long per the manufacturer. what impact will that bring to environmental waste? So every car fire these have have 4 times the off gassing dangers to the environment than a gas powered or diesel vehicle. Please turn this down and use common sense.

Comment ID: 488

First Name: Tristan

Last Name: Shields**Commenter Email:** tristaneshields@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/18/23 10:58:48 PM**Comment:**

Name: Shields , Tristan Submission Date: 8/18/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To whom it may concern, The thought that our infrastructure would be in a position to support a full shift to electric cars is absurd. Not only is our infrastructure not at a point which would be able to sustain the shift to electric cars due to lack of charging stations, lack of mechanics who can work on electric cars, but also the undue burden placed on families to be forced into a more expensive vehicle. In addition, electric cars are still unreliable in that due to lack of infrastructure you will be limited to how far and where you can drive for work, as seen during extreme weather the batteries do not function properly, and when the need for repairs arise the cost is grossly higher then a gas powered vehicle.

Comment ID: 489**First Name:** Mary**Last Name:** Winchester**Commenter Email:** rewmkw@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Winchester, Mary Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We do not need these type of items stuffed down our throats. The country is not ready for this type of transition. The State of CT and the country has not made enough progress with the move to electric. The vehicles alone cannot take you very far. And I don't like the thought of the USA going to China for the materials to make these expensive vehicles which no one can afford. Forget the tax credits it does not offset the cost the average families yearly income.

Comment ID: 490**First Name:** Gary**Last Name:** Mackiewicz**Commenter Email:** Gmackiewicz@snet.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/19/23 07:07:17 AM**Comment:**

Name: Mackiewicz , Gary Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Stop this now. The cost to taxpayers will be excessive for almost no environmental gain. Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 491**First Name:** Melissa

Last Name: Brady

Commenter Email: bradygirls4@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 07:12:42 AM

Comment:

Name: Brady, Melissa Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is dangerous. Electric vehicles require precious minerals that requires damaging the earth. It is a no win situation. People should have a choice.

Comment ID: 492

First Name: Paul

Last Name: Tyler

Commenter Email: Paulndawn1@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 08:07:34 AM

Comment:

Name: Tyler, Paul Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hi , my opinion of ev cars being forced upon us is unconstitutional . The cars are not good for our environment our earth, it's disgusting what has to be done to produce these vehicles. Then the issue of carbon footprint to charge these vehicles much more than our current gas vehicles. Not to mention the safety of these vehicles fire hazards, weight to our bridges and roads. The hazards to extinguishing the fire of these vehicles. We are not ready for ev or Evs are not ready for our world yet , they are a start to a better way but not even close yet.

Comment ID: 493

First Name: Constantina

Last Name: Karageorge

Commenter Email: constantina.karageorge@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Ms.

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Karageorge, Constantina Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 ~Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. ~On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. ~Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.
ELECTRIC POWERED VEHICLE BATTERIES MAKE THEM HEAVIER THAN COMPARABLE GAS-POWERED VEHICLES WHICH RESULTS IN GREATER EMISSIONS FROM TIRE, ROAD, AND BRAKE WEAR OVER THE LIFE OF THE VEHICLE.

Comment ID: 494

First Name: Ralph

Last Name: Giordano

Commenter Email: RGBOLTZ2@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 09:13:56 AM

Comment:

Name: Giordano, Ralph Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not want to be told what kind of car I can purchase and I say NO to electric cars

Comment ID: 495

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Hurd

Commenter Email: rbhurdaia@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 09:24:49 AM

Comment:

Name: Hurd, Robert Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is crazy!!! There are thousands of gasoline-powered vehicles which are ten years old and older in use in Connecticut today! By 2035, we will continue to use these perfectly good gasoline-powered vehicles (they are called antiques and/or classics). Given that the current electric infrastructure can barely keep up with demand on a hot summer day, how do you expect it to accommodate an all-electric vehicle society in only twelve years? Let's top this intrusive insanity now!!!

Comment ID: 496

First Name: Maryellen

Last Name: Nilson

Commenter Email: mernilson@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: na

Commenter Title: na

Posted Date: 08/19/23 09:28:22 AM

Comment:

Name: Nilson, Maryellen Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 California is the worst managed state in the U.S. Please do not make the mistake of following their lead on this: Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 497

First Name: laura

Last Name: evans

Commenter Email: lauraevans@fastmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 09:32:42 AM

Comment:

Name: evans, laura Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I agree that we need to stop producing gas vehicles.

Comment ID: 498

First Name: Nancy

Last Name: Eaton

Commenter Email: nhesoprano@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Retired

Commenter Title: Retired

Posted Date: 08/19/23 09:45:44 AM

Comment:

Name: Eaton, Nancy Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut's population of 3.6 million people is a mere 1.1% of the total US population. Even if a transition to electric vehicles was the right thing to do for any reason - which it is not - there is very little that a ban on the sale of gas powered autos would do. Must we virtue signal like the state of California? Do NOT ban the sale of gas powered autos. Allow the free market to work. Stop spending my tax dollars on things that should be left to the free market. Stop spending tax dollars on "green initiatives.?"

Comment ID: 499

First Name: Jerome

Last Name: Cincotta

Commenter Email: jerrycincotta1@optimum.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 10:04:29 AM

Comment:

Name: Cincotta, Jerome Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am a 33 year resident of Riverside and am contacting you to say I am against this proposal. I think it is clear that the forced transition to ?green? energy has created more problems with many unintended consequences. The costs imposed by this regulation are going to be significant. Also, where is the infrastructure for all these mandatory EVs? We need a responsible transition plan to be formulated, not have baked legislation. Why are you following California and why are you having this hearing in the middle of August vacations? Can?t we do what is right for the residents of Connecticut? Respectfully, Jerry Cincotta

Comment ID: 500

First Name: William

Last Name: Ducci

Commenter Email: wducci@duccielectrical.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: CEO

Posted Date: 08/19/23 10:12:19 AM

Comment:

Name: Ducci, William Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is to confirm my vehement OPPOSITION to the Advanced Clean Cars II proposed regulations. This would be crippling to me, my family, my business, and my 300 employees.

Comment ID: 501

First Name: Charles

Last Name: Wolfertz**Commenter Email:** cwolfertz39@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/19/23 10:19:54 AM**Comment:**

Name: Wolfertz, Charles Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 There is no way that I want he state of CT dictating to its citizans that they must drive an EV. You Clowns have done enough screw up the state. How about Balancing the budget, reducing crime and reducing taxes to stimulate economic growth.

Comment ID: 502**First Name:** Cathy**Last Name:** Somers**Commenter Email:** csomers254@earthlink.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** n/a**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/19/23 10:29:58 AM**Comment:**

Name: Somers, Cathy Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I hope that by that date you plan to have solar and wind power ready to handle the load required to generate the electricity. Where is the power source for all these initiatives? Our current infrastructure sure can't handle that load draw. It can't handle what's required right now. Why not look at nuclear energy as an option?

Comment ID: 503**First Name:** Sandra**Last Name:** Solimene**Commenter Email:** Skippy_sls@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Resident**Posted Date:** 08/19/23 10:32:10 AM**Comment:**

Name: Solimene , Sandra Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello, while I appreciate the impact gas powered vehicles have on our environment and political power, I am also aware of the impact of mining and drilling for precious resources to manufacture auto batteries/electric car energy storage. Our earth does not have enough materials to replace aging gas powered vehicles with electric ones, and we don't have enough advanced technology to provide alternatives. Further the current charge hold on electric vehicles us pitiful and the time sacrificed by owners to wait for a charge before being able to continue a trip is crippling. I have coworkers who have stranded at work due to lack of charge and often are over an hour late to work because they had to charge. This is not a practical lifestyle for our modern society. In addition, this puts a huge dent in travel and leisure travel by car. People will be forced to fly more often because it will take too long to travel by car due to stopping to recharge. And then thar creates more fuel usage and pollution by planes to move the people the government forced to stop using gas. The intentions are good, but the negative impact is far-reaching.

Comment ID: 504**First Name:** Bill**Last Name:** Steinmetz**Commenter Email:** wsteinmetz@charter.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:**

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/19/23 11:03:41 AM**Comment:**

Name: Steinmetz, Bill Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposal interferes with the free market. We do not need or want our government creating laws that meet with their personal outlook of how things should be. If the American public wants electric powered vehicles the market place should determine this. A race to electrified vehicles should be the will of the people not a bunch of we know what's best for you elected "officials". Try stream lining government, reduce spending and let the market place determine what the people want.

Comment ID: 505**First Name:** Beverly**Last Name:** Allen**Commenter Email:** percy.faith@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/19/23 11:15:01 AM**Comment:**

Name: Allen, Beverly Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My husband and I are against this proposed ban on gas powered vehicles. As residents living in the Free Country of the United States of America, my husband and I prefer to maintain our individual choices on matters that affect and reflect our morals, values, wellbeing, and pocketbook. Thank you for your consideration in this matter, Timothy and Beverly Allen

Comment ID: 506**First Name:** michael**Last Name:** gallagher**Commenter Email:** mgallagher02@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/19/23 11:39:49 AM**Comment:**

Name: gallagher, michael Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is not a viable path forward.

Comment ID: 507**First Name:** Lois**Last Name:** Palmer-Alderson**Commenter Email:** loispalmeralderson@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/19/23 11:48:08 AM**Comment:**

Name: Palmer-Alderson, Lois Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO, NO, NO to this insane and unnecessary proposed regulation. Our cars have infinitesimal effect on global climate. Electric cars cost twice as much to purchase. I'm 82 years old and on a Soc. Sec income; are you going to buy a car for me? How much of our taxpayers money are you going to spend on installing electric charging stations? We are not California and none of us ever want to be! If this is so great, where has all the public information been on it! How about some transparency? NO,NO,NO to another extreme and crazy agenda item created by bureaucrats (unelected and otherwise)to ruin our beautiful state.

Comment ID: 508**First Name:** Charles**Last Name:** Baugh**Commenter Email:** Leadfoot64@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Concerned citizen**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/19/23 12:20:50 PM**Comment:**

Name: Baugh, Charles Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello, my name is Charles Baugh. I am a resident of Waterbury Connecticut. I am writing today to demand that you DO NOT allow or enact any legislation or regulation that would ban the production or sale of gas or diesel powered vehicles, or power equipment within the state of Connecticut. I am not opposed to electric vehicles or equipment however, government has absolutely no business mandating what type of vehicle or equipment I should drive or purchase. Not now, not ever! I firmly believe that the maturity of the technology, the infrastructure, and market conditions should drive if and when people switch to electric vehicles, not government mandates. Internal combustion vehicles have become exponentially cleaner and more efficient in the last 2 decades, and they continue to get better every day. Our economy and infrastructure is built around petroleum, and suddenly switching to electric will cause a collapse of the petroleum economy. Also, as raw crude oil is refined, there are many components that are used in many different applications such as plastics, asphalt, lubricating oils, and of course diesel and gasoline. If we significantly reduce consumption of diesel and gasoline, these components of crude oil will then be wasted and possibly contribute to more contamination and pollution than would happen if we used them as normal. There's also a lot of question about the ability of our electric grid to support this many electric vehicles. Our electric grid is ancient and overloaded as it is right now and when each home plugs into a 30 to 50 amp outlet to charge their cars, it will overload the grid and we will surely have reliability problems and be subjected to rolling blackouts. Also, I'm not sure if it's been considered but when people stop buying heavily taxed fuel like gasoline and diesel where is the government going to get the required funds to operate and provide travel infrastructure? I'm guessing there will either be a large tax imposed on our electric bills (which are already astronomical) or there will be some sort of a mileage tax. Either way, I'm not willing to let government put their hands on my electric bill or my vehicle's odometer or pay tolls. It's not just a no, but HELL NO. And finally, Connecticut has absolutely no business piggybacking California's oppressive regulations. What they think works in California does not work here and as far as I am concerned, California is one of the most restrictive, non-free states in the union and I do not want my life to be conducted like that. Connecticut should be ashamed of adopting anything that California puts forth, and I will not stand for it. So to that end i once again respectfully DEMAND that you DO NOT consider, propose, or enact any legislation or regulation that limits what type of vehicles or power equipment can be sold or used in this state or even on the federal level. Let technology and market conditions dictate if and when we switch to electric vehicles or equipment. Please know that im not alone in saying im watching, im engaged, and i will not back off of this issue, and i am also voting. Signed, Charles Baugh

Comment ID: 509**First Name:** Monica**Last Name:** Malo**Commenter Email:** mmalo14@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/19/23 01:16:38 PM**Comment:**

Name: Malo, Monica Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly opposed to this proposed regulations oon?Advanced Clean Cars. CT is not CA. CT vehicle emission are .04% of global emissions. Banning gas powered vehicles will have no effect. China, India, Africa & South America will continue to use gas powered vehicles.They will continue to use coal plants etc, whatever gives them cheap fuel. This is our government putting a terrible burden on its citizens. They are trying to lift their people out of poverty & we will be driving our people into poverty. The vehicles are very expensive. Not every family will be able to afford an EV & gas poweredvehicle.

That is the only practical way to go about this as you cannot rely on powering the EV. Our electric grid is already an issue. Why would we overload it. In many areas especially cities, people have to park on the streets. This is not practical to be installing charging stations. There are issues now with EV battery fires in garages. If you charge it outside, then there's the risk of the expensive cords being stolen. The EVs are heavier vehicles causing higher emission with the weight of batteries & tires on the roads. They are not paying road use fees like gas powered vehicles.

Comment ID: 510

First Name: Monica

Last Name: Malo

Commenter Email: mmalo14@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 01:17:11 PM

Attachments:

report.pdf

Comment:

Name: Malo, Monica Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly opposed to this proposed regulations on Advanced Clean Cars. CT is not CA. CT vehicle emissions are .04% of global emissions. Banning gas powered vehicles will have no effect. China, India, Africa & South America will continue to use gas powered vehicles. They will continue to use coal plants etc, whatever gives them cheap fuel. This is our government putting a terrible burden on its citizens. They are trying to lift their people out of poverty & we will be driving our people into poverty. The vehicles are very expensive. Not every family will be able to afford an EV & gas powered vehicle. That is the only practical way to go about this as you cannot rely on powering the EV. Our electric grid is already an issue. Why would we overload it. In many areas especially cities, people have to park on the streets. This is not practical to be installing charging stations. There are issues now with EV battery fires in garages. If you charge it outside, then there's the risk of the expensive cords being stolen. The EVs are heavier vehicles causing higher emission with the weight of batteries & tires on the roads. They are not paying road use fees like gas powered vehicles.

Comment ID: 511

First Name: Steven

Last Name: Landin

Commenter Email: scl120@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 01:37:10 PM

Comment:

Name: Landin, Steven Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The state of Connecticut, much like the states of California and Texas is preparing to slow walk off an energy cliff. These states are trying to legislate an energy outcome without taking into consideration the increased demand they are creating and certainly not considering the lack of reliable continuous power sources that they are either closing or not building to meet that increased demand. California, one week after passing the legislation that you are proposing to copy, had to ask their electric car owners to only charge at night because their grid was overtaxed! According to Dave Walsh, an energy expert and former Mitsubishi Power Systems president the mathematics does not work. According to Mr. Walsh it costs four times as much as a natural gas plant to build a solar farm with the same Kilowatt rating and that farm would only produce one quarter of the energy because solar only works six hours a day. A wind farm would cost 9.5 times as much as a natural gas plant and only works eight hours a day, producing one third the power. Where is the power going to come from to charge all these electric cars, trucks, and buses? And even if you produce it the consumer will be paying approximately FOUR times their current bill. Reliability will be the next issue. Solar and wind don't produce continuous power. Oil, natural gas and nuclear do. Batteries will be better but how long will it take for them to hold adequate power? California and Texas have already experienced brownouts and blackouts. Without a plan for more

continuously produced power you are condemning Connecticut to the same problems at peak demand, a peak that you are proposing to increase. In addition, according to Forbes magazine, California has one charging station per 27 electric cars, one of the worst ratios in the United States right now. Has Connecticut solved this problem? I would venture to guess no! Please consider postponing this proposed regulation until proper planning and construction of adequate continuous power plants is accomplished before dooming Ct to massively higher electric bills and frequent power disruptions. Thank you for the consideration of my opinion.

Comment ID: 512

First Name: Nicholas

Last Name: Korn

Commenter Email: nkorns@icloud.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 01:44:42 PM

Comment:

Name: Korn, Nicholas Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To: CT DEEP re: proposed regulations for gasoline powered vehicles From: Nicholas Korn, 73 Shagbark Road, Glastonbury Date: 8/19/2023 I am providing public comment pursuant to the DEEP public hearing on 8/22/2023 regarding proposed regulations concerning gasoline powered vehicles (GPV). It appears that CT DEEP is attempting to copy California's rules governing vehicle emissions. This would culminate in the eventual banning of the sale of new gasoline powered cars by 2035. I object to this idea, for the following reasons: ? At a high level, this is extreme regulatory overreach by unelected officials. Let the market determine what type of vehicles consumers wish to purchase, based on their particular needs and financial situation. At the very least, this matter should be returned to the General Assembly to debate, notwithstanding any supposed regulatory authority granted two decades ago. The idea of imitating California in the ?Constitution State? is outrageous, given the ongoing social and economic dysfunction in that state. ? The rush to EV's (heavily subsidized by government, and heading toward mandates) is wildly premature. There has been inadequate assessment of the end-to-end costs and benefits. That includes upstream requirements for mining of certain minerals needed for batteries, most of which are sourced from other nations, even hostile ones, which entails environmental and social costs (e.g. child labor). Then there is the actual impact of such vehicles on infrastructure and public safety. Due to large batteries, the vehicles are heavier (much so with trucks and buses), creating more wear and tear on roads, and greater mass with the potential for greater damage in any MVC. For the vehicles themselves, tires and brakes will wear faster. There is also a significant fire danger. As we have seen, lithium batteries are prone to burn under certain conditions, and such fires are extremely difficult to extinguish. We have seen in recent news that such fires in EV's being transported on ships caused disasters. Downstream, the batteries eventually die, and must be disposed of. How and where will that be done, and at what environmental cost? ? EV's are less affordable than GPV's, thus having a negative impact on low/middle income families. ? Our electrical grid is not up to the task of charging large numbers of EV's. Even now, we are stretched to capacity. We have the highest electricity costs in the lower 48 states (again, disproportionately impacting low/middle income families), and 40% of our generation comes from one nuclear power plant, which will not last forever. Our natural gas-powered generation is hampered by the lack of pipeline capacity, thanks to resistance by environmentalist advocacy groups. These groups are also responsible for the ban on fracking in NY state, which would access vast stores of natural gas for the Northeast states. ? The reduced greenhouse gas (GHG) impact of EV's is miniscule, given the fact that the largest GHG emitters (China & India) have no interest in radical climate change initiatives. Our governments (Federal and State) are forcing expensive lifestyle changes on citizens by edict, that will have minimal impact on climate change. The most reasonable way to address GHG concerns is to build more nuclear power plants, which contribute no GHG. Stay out of totalitarian industrial policy that forces the adoption of EV's for everyone, whether or not desired or affordable.

Comment ID: 513

First Name: Polly

Last Name: Brody

Commenter Email: berylline33@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: NA

Commenter Title: NA**Posted Date:** 08/19/23 04:09:23 PM**Comment:**

Name: Brody, Polly Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am in favor of regulations that would preferentially support the sale of vehicles that are not gas powered, but have serious concerns regarding a total ban on gas powered vehicle sales. The economic consequences of a total ban have not been made known, and without that analysis, I have misgivings. Will the achieved environmental harm abatement be a net positive or will the resource and energy requirements needed to manufacture and operate electric powered vehicles cancel out the intended environmental gain?

Comment ID: 514**First Name:** Robert**Last Name:** Hawley**Commenter Email:** rwhawley@att.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Resident**Commenter Title:** Citizen**Posted Date:** 08/19/23 05:33:26 PM**Comment:**

Name: Hawley, Robert Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The raw materials for making the car have to be mined, and the process of mining creates a lot of greenhouse gases. Then the raw materials have to be refined before they can be used, which again emits more greenhouse gas. Then more greenhouse gas is emitted in the manufacturing process. Of course the above is also true when manufacturing a petrol or diesel car. In fact, taking into account the whole production process, making a petrol or diesel car releases about 7 to 10 tons of CO2. Making an electric car releases roughly the same amount of CO2, but then you have to add in the production of the battery. Estimates suggest that 150kg of CO2 are released for every 1 kilowatt hour (kWh) of battery capacity. For an electric car to have a decent range (say 300 miles) between charges, it needs a battery that's at least 60kWh in capacity. This means that a further 9 tons of CO2 will be emitted during the making of an electric car, giving a total of 16-19 tons of CO2 emitted. So at this point, an electric car seems worse for the environment than a fossil fuel one.

Comment ID: 515**First Name:** Nello**Last Name:** Palma**Commenter Email:** npalma32@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Palma, Nello Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against a 2035 ban on all gas-powered passenger vehicle sales. It will happen naturally as electric vehicles drop and charging availability improves. I do not want to be forced into buying a new car because the government thinks I should. I like to comment that a lot of hazardous materials are used in the manufacturing of electric vehicles and will need to be deal with at the vehicles end of life.

Comment ID: 516**First Name:** Arthur**Last Name:** Durant**Commenter Email:** Arich90@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:**

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/19/23 06:50:42 PM**Comment:**

Name: Durant, Arthur Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Seniors on fixed incomes will be in no financial shape to purchase electric vehicles, never mind the electric charging setup costs to add charging stations to our residences. By allowing this to occur you are not watching out for the citizens you represent. Plans like this show how really out of touch you all are with the reality of trying to survive this or future economy.

Comment ID: 517**First Name:** Rachel**Last Name:** Williams**Commenter Email:** bowill@snet.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/19/23 06:58:06 PM**Comment:**

Name: Williams, Rachel Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NOW this Liberal Democratic party decides FOR US no gas-powered cars! Not only has there been no forethought to disposal of these vehicles, but they are also expensive and time consuming to "re-fuel" I am aware of mechanics being unable to dispose of the batteries which poses quite an environmental issue. And the Democrats, instead of listening to ALL the citizens, who vote and for whom they are supposed to LISTEN TO decide that they know best for us of the middle-class who cannot afford the initial purchase (and its associated taxes and fees). How shameful that making an EV MANDATE avoids the need for debate and research. HOW IRRESPONSIBLE! So, we have taxes on nearly everything in this State: cars, homes, boats, plastic bottles (yes - the bottle bill is a tax) gasoline, mattress disposal (yes the disposal fee is a tax when one purchases a new mattress) clothing, food and so much more. In all this, there has been no improvement to our lifestyles despite promise of the same. Back in the late 60's- 70's or so, heating homes with electricity was supposed to be the solution to elevated home oil prices and more energy efficient. I don't know any homeowners or renters who prefer the huge cost of electric utilities for their home. Didn't work then and the electric car won't work now. It should be an option - not a MANDATE. It is time for our government to utilize the God-given resources (like oil) that have worked and utilize them; stop outsourcing things (like batteries, medications, power)) to unfriendly countries who are waiting for us to step deeper into this morass of a mess our State and nation has gotten us into so they can absorb our nation. Please stop this stupidly I vote NO to this mandate!!!!

Comment ID: 518**First Name:** Lori**Last Name:** Guerette**Commenter Email:** Lgdeepriver@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Guerette, Lori Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than

comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. We can't afford all electric vehicles, especially on fixed social security income!

Comment ID: 519

First Name: Norman

Last Name: Bulakites

Commenter Email: nbulakites@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 07:48:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Bulakites, Norman Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is insanity. Wait till you see what happens to these electric vehicles with the hurricane. Not only people will not be able to charge their vehicles but there will be many vehicle fires because of the reaction of salt water and the batteries. This country is not ready for electric vehicles. Just because California wants to jump off a cliff we do not have to follow

Comment ID: 520

First Name:

Last Name:

Commenter Email:

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: , Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 521

First Name: Roland

Last Name: Greenwood

Commenter Email: rolliefg@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 09:17:15 PM

Comment:

Name: Greenwood , Roland Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not agree with this regulation. The state of Connecticut should not be forcing its citizens to purchase expensive electrical cars . We must let the auto industry develop a car that the consumers will freely buy. We were told to get rid of incandescent lightbulbs for the CFC lightbulbs which caused pollution. Also, in Europe, they rushed into a green energy policy, only to have their gas from Russia interrupted with a war in Ukraine. There is no way for anyone to know what the future holds and to force Connecticut consumers to buy products, which have batteries, not yet able to be recycled at a full scale, and

the amount of destruction to the earth to get these minerals to provide batteries, which many are made in China, it's not the best option. Thank you, Roland Greenwood

Comment ID: 522

First Name: Ken

Last Name: Boudreau

Commenter Email: mklb42@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 09:30:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Boudreau, Ken Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly urge you to reconsider banning gas powered vehicles in CT. It seems preposterous that CT would simply follow CA direction on a matter of this importance. It makes our grand state appear to be child like in aping its west coast sibling. No matter what the rational is for mimicking CA, CT needs to look to its own uniqueness and the needs of its citizens on a matter of such significance. Banning gas powered vehicles will have a monumental effect on the people of our state, raising prices for consumer goods to levels unaffordable for many of our citizens. You should also be more transparent about the process and provide for a full, unrestricted public hearing. The current plan seems restrictive and designed to limit public input. This matter is too important not to give our citizens and business community all the opportunity they deserve to voice their opinions.

Comment ID: 523

First Name: Tiffany

Last Name: Hawley

Commenter Email: Tiffany367@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/19/23 11:43:01 PM

Comment:

Name: Hawley, Tiffany Submission Date: 8/19/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against the proposed bill. Here's why. On a just a basic human way of life aspect, this is incredibly selfish and inconsiderate to force any one size fits all approach to anyone. Then there is the reality of where the precious metals just to manufacture the EV batteries come from and how they are manufactured. Currently there is child slave labor being used in Africa to procure lithium, and this is just one aspect that is both a violation of human rights and bad for the environment to dig these massive holes in the Earth that are never filled. The average life span of EV batteries are less than five years. Then there is the reality of the disposal of EV batteries. These can not be fully recycled. Solar panels, wind turbines and EV batteries are buried in the ground. That's the sad reality of this expensive effort to control people by where they can live and how they travel. Fully EV vehicles are not cost effective, not affordable, not good for the environment and not efficient. All in all, this move is not at all thought out well because of the examples I just listed, and I haven't mentioned how the electric grid in the entire country is whilst unable to sustain an entire country hooking up to it to charge hundreds of millions of vehicles. Our entire infrastructure can not handle what's on the roads now. Making an electric truck releases roughly the same amount of CO2, but then you have to add in the production of the battery. Estimates suggest that 150kg of CO2 are released for every 1 kilowatt hour (kWh) of battery capacity. For an electric truck to have a decent range (say 300 miles) between charges, it needs a battery that's at least 60kWh in capacity. This means that a further 9 tons of CO2 will be emitted during the making of an electric car, giving a total of 16-19 tons of CO2 emitted. So at this point, an electric truck seems worse for the environment than a fossil fuel one. Other disadvantages include the charging infrastructure needs to be improved, they have limited range and they are heavy, cold weather adversely affects the range. We get both hot and cold weather here in CT that would adversely affect charging EV batteries. For all of this information put forward, I am against this ridiculous proposal.

Comment ID: 524**First Name:** Paul B**Last Name:** Kozikowski**Commenter Email:** paul.kozikowski@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 07:39:55 AM**Comment:**

Name: Kozikowski, Paul B Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the implementation of this regulation. Having had the experience of renting a Tesla for 2 weeks earlier this year, I would never rent or even buy one ever again. Charging station locations and charging times are an extreme disadvantage. Using Tesla's superchargers, it didn't matter where the battery charge level was, 60%, 45% or as low as 11%, it took an hour to bring the battery back to 100%. Had I used the other charging stations, the recharge times would have been 2 to 3 times longer. It currently cost \$0.116 per mile to operate my hybrid. The Tesla cost \$0.113 per mile to operate and one and a half times the cost to purchase. Let the free market decide what is best for the people and not regulation by government.

Comment ID: 525**First Name:** Phil**Last Name:** Clark**Commenter Email:** phil@clarisconstruction.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 08:17:08 AM**Comment:**

Name: Clark, Phil Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We all understand that at some point in the future we will all be driving EVs. But we need to be smart about how to get there and what is an appropriate time frame. I believe, as an architect that has designed over 100 car dealerships and truck service/ distribution facilities, we certainly will not have the infrastructure in place in 12 years to accomplish this very altruistic goal. We need to be smart about this decision and appreciate all the systems, utilities, organizations, and people this decision will adversely effect. Our families in the larger cities need assistance just to put food on the table, how are they going to afford an EV? I think a better goal would be to graduate every child in Connecticut from high school.

Comment ID: 526**First Name:** Jennifer**Last Name:** Killin**Commenter Email:** jenkilkin@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 08:31:33 AM**Comment:**

Name: Killin, Jennifer Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I fully support phasing out gas-powered vehicles in CT, provided that solid infrastructure for alternative-fueled vehicles is in place, operative, accessible to people of all socioeconomic classes, and that the majority of power in CT is produced with renewable energy.

Comment ID: 527**First Name:****Last Name:****Commenter Email:**

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 08:37:36 AM**Comment:**

Name: , Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 528**First Name:** Frederic**Last Name:** Clark**Commenter Email:** faclark88@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 09:09:45 AM**Comment:**

Name: Clark, Frederic Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I fully support this legislation. Change is always difficult, but it is necessary in this case.

Comment ID: 529**First Name:** Tom**Last Name:** Van Heeke**Commenter Email:** tvanheeke@rivian.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Rivian Automotive, LLC**Commenter Title:** Senior Policy Advisor**Posted Date:** 08/20/23 09:18:36 AM**Attachments:**

Rivian_Connecticut_2023_ACCIIACTCommentLetter_FINAL.pdf

Comment:

Name: Van Heeke, Tom Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Rivian Automotive, LLC, is pleased to submit the attached comments in support of the proposed regulation.

Comment ID: 530**First Name:** Kelly**Last Name:** Gale**Commenter Email:** kellyperron@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 09:36:29 AM**Comment:**

Name: Gale, Kelly Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello! I think we need to do everything in our

power to stop climate change and help the environment, and I strongly support any legislation or regulation that reduces or eliminates gas-powered vehicles on our roads and pushes us towards alternate fuels and electric vehicles. Please thank those pushing for this legislation and I hope it passes!

Comment ID: 531

First Name: Peter

Last Name: McGuinness

Commenter Email: findpeter@ymail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: NA

Commenter Title: NA

Posted Date: 08/20/23 10:19:30 AM

Comment:

Name: McGuinness, Peter Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I wish to state my opposition to this proposed regulation. Although regulatory reform to discourage hydrocarbon use is laudable and even desirable, this proposed regulation will create a significant market for ?lightly used? gas engine autos from out-of-state dealers. The issue of gas auto emissions must be addressed at the Federal level by increasing gas engine efficiency, encouraging EVs, and affecting such Federal regulations across ALL states, not just a handful. This proposed regulation will encourage the inter-state importation of ?dirty? and older second-hand gas autos from more lenient states (as such autos will then be less costly) and will likely result in more CT residents driving autos which are registered in those more lenient states. These are unintended outcomes that are harmful and detrimental to all CT residents.

Comment ID: 532

First Name: Barry

Last Name: Diament

Commenter Email: ursaminor1@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 11:11:10 AM

Comment:

Name: Diament, Barry Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 From my perspective, at this point in the progression of global climate change considerations of survival outweigh short-term considerations of economy (or convenience). Any economic hardship engendered by the move away from fossil fuels could be more than offset by subsidies, using a small fraction of the money that would be better spent here in America than in funding support for the war machine that is destroying our country from within.

Comment ID: 533

First Name: Blake

Last Name: Polett

Commenter Email: tokyodreams@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Ms.

Posted Date: 08/20/23 11:53:37 AM

Comment:

Name: Polett, Blake Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To all at DEEP proposing this ban : the proposed ban on gas powered vehicles in 2035 is unacceptable and not the right decision. This is not a communist nation like China, where choice is taken away from the people left and right. Let folks who choose electric do so, give them an incentive or rebate more than they get now if you want to, and let folks who choose gas continue to do so. This proposed ban is a slap in the face to democracy in general and our state needs to remain one where we support

choice in all aspects - from reproductive rights to the choice of which kind of car we can buy and use. Stop driving people out of our great state with these types of financially prohibitive bans and laws. Id like to be able to live comfortably in the state I was born and raised in for the rest of my life, but it?s certainly difficult due to the cost of existing here. Our taxes are sky high, our energy costs are higher than all the other states, and our cost of living in general is through the roof. Now you want us to get electric vehicles which are never affordable, come with lithium batteries that fire depts can?t put out in crashes and that pollute the environment when disposed of; that?s wrong, enough is enough. Stop trying to regulate us into oblivion. I do not support any ban on gas cars, trucks or any vehicles. Leave the freedom of choice to the consumer, we are tired of being slammed by new and intrusive laws. Thank you, Ms. Blake H. Polett Stratford

Comment ID: 534

First Name: Jeff

Last Name: Lazeren

Commenter Email: jlazeren@ritehite.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Field Technician

Posted Date: 08/20/23 12:01:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Lazeren , Jeff Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 How will I be able to work my service truck with a crane and PTO when I drive a couple hundred miles a day and I don?t have time or places to fuel up electrically.

Comment ID: 535

First Name:

Last Name: Maloney

Commenter Email: jack-maloney@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 12:16:47 PM

Comment:

Name: Maloney, Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Ct Vehicle Emissions account for an estimated .04 of global emissions, banning gas vehicles will have no effect on global climate. Biden can't even get China, Mexico or India to go along with stupid regulations. It would create an enormous financial burden on middle class to purchase an electric car. The utility companies could never provide enough electricity to all these cars. it will cause brown outs in the hottest months. There will be no peoples living in this state by 2035. Thje they are already not attracting companies to move here, ask Ned Lamont to ask his wife why.

Comment ID: 536

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Virello

Commenter Email: markvirello@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 01:15:22 PM

Comment:

Name: Virello, Mark Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do NOT stop the selling of gas-powered new cars. Proposals to stop selling gas-powered cars are not good for the state of CT residents. Most importantly, the gas-powered car does not harm the world's environment any worse than the electric alternative when all factors are considered. So there is NO good reason to stop using gas-powered cars at this point. The resources needed for electric powered vehicles currently require obtaining resources by destroying some of the worlds last remaining rain

forests, proven to be essential to the overall health of humans. The infrastructure needed for electric vehicles is not adequate, and if forced to be used more broadly, will result in the less affluent in CT to remain less affluent and or have fewer options to enjoy life. Those supporting the elimination of gas-powered vehicles ignore their plan will take away freedoms unnecessarily of CT citizens.

Comment ID: 537

First Name: Bruce & Laura

Last Name: Clark

Commenter Email: lbclark79@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 01:31:40 PM

Comment:

Name: Clark, Bruce & Laura Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric Vehicles (EVs): The aspiration to save the planet by mandating the use of EVs is noble. Discussion about costs being too high or unfair inconveniences sound like childish whining when put in context with saving our only planet. However, those in charge guiding us through this process must make sure we accomplish three things: (1) Use technologies that work (they don't), (2) cause less harm than the original problem (they don't) and, (3) are capable of being implemented in a timeframe that is meaningful (they won't). EV's are the focus of this particular debate, but without discussion of where all the green electrical power will come from, an EV is meaningless. We are currently watching what amounts to an economic, ecological, humanitarian, and geo-political disaster unfold. Not because of carbon based fossil fuels but due to the new Green Deal itself. Tesla and all other EV owners drive on the backs of barefoot children working in so-called 'artisanal mines' located in places like China, South America, and the Congo. Rules regarding 3TG and Conflict Minerals are well-defined and taken very seriously in my place of business yet somehow never make it to print in EV ads. EVs start out emitting three times more carbon than a traditional internal combustion engine vehicle simply due to their construction - something on the order of 15-20 tons of CO2. A small EV has a 70kWh battery that requires 500,000 lbs. of ore to be extracted and refined. Large trucks and SUV's that America loves will be twice that. All this before the first mile is driven. Unless you live in Norway where 80-90% of electricity comes from green hydroelectric power, the average American will be using electricity that is predominantly fossil fuel-based for the foreseeable future. In the near-term, EVs in some cases will make things worse. EVs are nothing more than remote emission vehicles. Even if all cars magically became electric and all electrons used to charge those batteries magically became green, it would only solve about 10% of the world's carbon problem. Replacing fossil fuel-based machines with electric ones will require a several thousand percent increase in minerals to provide the same unit of energy, be it heat, miles driven, hours on the cloud, etc. All of those additional minerals are supplied by mining and refining, industries with no defined green future. Carbon emissions will rise, not fall, driving us more quickly to the tipping point all due to increased demand and ill-conceived government mandates. This is not just a Connecticut problem, it is global. We might as well start thinking that way. Windmills and solar panels are not energy dense and they are intermittent - something less than a 50% duty cycle. They will require batteries that will supply power for 50% of the time. The world consumes something on the order of 73 trillion watt-hours of electrical power daily. It would require construction of thousands of windmills daily for 30 years to meet only current demand and energy storage for windless days. A battery big enough to store energy for one day would take the Giga Factory 500 years to build. Now add in EVs. Supply chain issues for EV manufacturers are already strained, now add construction of windmills and solar cells to charge them. Do the math. Supply of many key minerals required for our electric future are going to be well below demand in the next few years - the very definition of inflation. It is estimated several hundred new mines must be opened globally, each requiring an average of 16 years to fully develop. The U.S., on the other hand, is closing mines and refusing to open new ones. We are dependent on imports for 100% of 17 minerals critical to the new 'green' future. Globally, China is a leading mining concern and the leading refiner of key minerals necessary for our green future. Such reliance on 'non-allies' could lead to real geopolitical problems. All this while mandating EVs? Invest the time. Do the research. Find out the truth. Please do not mandate EVs, windmills, solar panels or batteries. They will have a place in our future but are not the ultimate solution they are touted to be. Many thanks to Mark P. Mills, a physicist and Energy & Tech expert at the Manhattan Institute and a faculty fellow at Northwestern University's McCormick School of Engineering and Applied Science, and many others who are trying to spread this news. I owe much of the content of this document to their amazing work.

Comment ID: 538**First Name:** Donna**Last Name:** Woolam**Commenter Email:** dwoolam416@cox.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 01:43:02 PM**Comment:**

Name: Woolam, Donna Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear? ? ? ? I write in opposition to the support of all electric vehicles.? As a farm family in your district we can not afford the added financial burden of having to own an electric vehicle for our personal use.? Nor do we consider the use of a lithium battery that has no disposal plan for to be of benefit to the environment.? I would hope I wouldn't have to explain the prohibitive cost of electric farm vehicles to you or the inconveniences of requiring a source of said fuel when farming away from the main farm or trucking our livestock across this state and country. To say nothing of the health hazard to those said animal, having to wait for the hauling vehicle to charge in poor weather conditions..? I am also sending these comments to the Committee.? Donna G. Woolam, South Windsor.?

Comment ID: 539**First Name:** David**Last Name:** Friebel**Commenter Email:** dave@therapykinections.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 01:43:14 PM**Comment:**

Name: Friebel, David Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It has been blatantly real lately that the use of electric vehicles has not been thought through completely. It is of no doubt that the access to reliable and fast charging stations is lacking. In addition, I have recently read an article regarding a person that wanted to travel from Canada to Chicago in his electric truck. Since he was unable to find reliable charging stations along the way, he had to leave his truck at a Ford Dealer and rent a car for the remainder of the trip. Since the very inception of considering electric vehicles, you need a power grid that will support the additional electrical use. How can we create such a grid when we are also being told that fossil fuels should no longer be fueling electrical power stations. I am not speaking in very technical terms, but very realistic terms. What are we going to have to start doing? Are we going to need to have portable mobile charging stations to recharge vehicles that just run out of power? Please think realistically about this.

Comment ID: 540**First Name:** David**Last Name:** Friebel**Commenter Email:** dave@therapykinections.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 01:44:26 PM**Comment:**

Name: Friebel, David Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It has been blatantly real lately that the use of electric vehicles has not been thought through completely. It is of no doubt that the access to reliable and fast charging stations is lacking. In addition, I have recently read an article regarding a person that wanted to travel from Canada to Chicago in his electric truck. Since he was unable to find reliable charging stations along the way, he had

to leave his truck at a Ford Dealer and rent a car for the remainder of the trip. Since the very inception of considering electric vehicles, you need a power grid that will support the additional electrical use. How can we create such a grid when we are also being told that fossil fuels should no longer be fueling electrical power stations. I am not speaking in very technical terms, but very realistic terms. What are we going to have to start doing? Are we going to need to have portable mobile charging stations to recharge vehicles that just run out of power? Please think realistically about this.

Comment ID: 541

First Name: BARBARA

Last Name: O'CONNOR

Commenter Email: BODNATENSE@AOL.COM

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: newtown republican town committee

Commenter Title: member

Posted Date: 08/20/23 01:51:03 PM

Comment:

Name: O'CONNOR, BARBARA Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 government - stop trying to rule my life!!! are we in a socialite, fascist country now? We're already a third world country

Comment ID: 542

First Name: Alice

Last Name: Deloge

Commenter Email: adeloge@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 02:35:48 PM

Comment:

Name: Deloge, Alice Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please vote against this proposal. Electric vehicles are expensive and dangerous. The batteries start on fire and are expensive to replace. Lithium batteries cannot be recycled. Mileage is limited. They are difficult to maintain and ultimately require fossil fuel energy to recharge. We have plenty of fossil fuels if only the fields were allowed to reopen. Our air pollution does not come from CT vehicles, but from particles being carried from the west of us. We cannot afford more taxes, as evidenced by how many people are leaving our state. Too many reasons to not support this move.

Comment ID: 543

First Name: Todd

Last Name: Tymeson

Commenter Email: Turb0racer@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 02:54:37 PM

Comment:

Name: Tymeson, Todd Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Outlawing the sale of gasoline cars in 2035 is a horrible idea. This will not reduce overall global emissions effectively and will create hardships for everyone in this state. Electric vehicles have been tried before and failed. Most people cannot afford to purchase a brand new car that will require the installation of a charger and the increase in electricity. Our electricity is supplied by eversource who uses natural gas combustion to produce our electricity. By going electric all you are doing is putting money in eversource's pocket who will have to burn more natural gas to support an overtaxed power grid. Who will this benefit? Not the general public and not the environment. All this will do is fill our junkyards with vehicles with failed or damaged batteries that cannot be repaired. Most of the citizens of this state are not wealthy enough to

replace a car every 8 years when the battery with very limited range fails. It is not an if but a when with electric cars. The average car on the road is 12 years old. The proposed life of an ev is 8-10 years. How is this helpful to anyone? This state is already overburdened with taxes and now real estate increases due to migration of people coming from New York during covid. How can you expect the people to pay even more for a useless vehicle that cannot hold up to our winter weather and has a very limited range that requires an hour to recharge? All this will do is cause more people to move from this state and into other states. If Evs are so great then why did the LAPD auction off their electric vehicles with very low mileage? Because they were not practical for use as response vehicles. To add more financial burden to this state chargers would have to be installed everywhere possible due to the fact that it take so long to charge one of these vehicles. A charging area would have to be 500% larger than a gas station just to keep with the same amount of volume. This will put thousands of businesses out of business and decrease tax revenue to the state. What will be done about first responders and their vehicles? What if they need to get to an emergency and their vehicle is charging. Now they need a spare vehicle to be ready to respond at all times. Also consider the hazardous waste this will create as more of these cars make it to the salvage yards and have a potential to catch on fire. This has been documented many times that EVs are known to burn up while charging not just after an accident. To make matters worse, firefighters will have to carry more water or a suppressant type of foam to stop these vehicles fires when they do occur. Have any of you taken this into consideration? Keep in mind that the average citizen of this state can barely afford all the increases in costs that we have been swallowing since covid and now inflation. This WILL be the straw that breaks the camel's back.

Comment ID: 544

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Dzialo

Commenter Email: ssdzialo@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: self

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 03:32:07 PM

Comment:

Name: Dzialo, Susan Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Banning gas powered vehicles in Connecticut (which cannot even address the pass-through traffic) will not have an impact on the global environment. However, mining for the mineral resources needed for all-electric vehicles WILL have a detrimental impact on the environment and landscape in locations around the world, driven by a forced demand. In an already failing Connecticut economy, doubling the cost of a new vehicle is no benefit. Nor is the state prepared with the supporting infrastructure for recharging. And what is the source of that electricity? ?Green? efforts are unreliable and inadequate, and proving to have their own deleterious impact. Hybrid technology models such as the Prius or partial zero emissions vehicles like the Subaru are better self-sustainable technologies to encourage. Drivers want cost effective, environmentally friendly vehicles. Let the market operate!

Comment ID: 545

First Name: David

Last Name: Nevin

Commenter Email: dnvnx@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Nevin, David Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut's electrical rates are among the highest in the nation. Will the addition of large numbers of EVs make a bad problem worse? What about fire hazards associated with EVs, affordability compared with conventional vehicles, availability of minerals and chemicals required in the manufacture of EV batteries, sufficiency of charging stations, and the likelihood greenhouse-gas emissions might actually increase as a result of mining, battery manufacture, and the need for increased generation of electricity? Assuming EVs cost much more than conventional vehicles in 2042, as is the case now, are state leaders prepared to continue providing subsidies as very large numbers of people buy electric cars? Do Connecticut

leaders care that their policy will make the United States more reliant on adversary nations such as China and Russia, and contribute to the use of slavery and child labor in African cobalt mines? Connecticut is unprepared for the challenges these policies will create.

Comment ID: 546

First Name: Ben

Last Name: Muskin

Commenter Email: bbmuskin@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Citizen

Posted Date: 08/20/23 05:00:29 PM

Comment:

Name: Muskin, Ben Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing in strong support of adoption of the proposed regulation adoption of Regulation of Connecticut State Agencies section 22a-174-36d, Advanced Clean Cars II (ACC II) Rule. As of July 28th, 2023, eight states have already adopted the Advanced Clean Trucks rule: California, Oregon, Washington, Massachusetts, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, and Colorado, while Maryland and North Carolina are in the process of adopting the rule. Connecticut can and should add its name to the above pioneering states. By supporting this regulation, CT will be taking bold and courageous action to be part of the solution. By failing to do so, CT will be contributing to the destruction of the environment which will have dire consequences not only for the environment, but also for our families, our businesses and for all of humanity. Do the right and responsible thing and adoption the California Low Emission Vehicle (LEV IV) and Advanced Clean Car II (ACC II) regulation.

Comment ID: 547

First Name: Wendy

Last Name: Hellekson

Commenter Email: wendy@hellekson.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 05:02:04 PM

Comment:

Name: Hellekson, Wendy Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please increase the number of charging stations in SE CT. I have an EV and it is wonderful. More people should drive them. Not scary at all. Also working with partners in other states will help address the climate crisis. Also it should be easier for folks in condos to get a 220 outlet on the outside of their unit. My association was very difficult with it.

Comment ID: 548

First Name: Bill

Last Name: Bursztyn

Commenter Email: soundburst1@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 05:37:14 PM

Comment:

Name: Bursztyn, Bill Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am adamantly against this proposed regulation. Government needs to stop eliminating and reducing what should be our choices to make. And the fact that you want to follow in the footsteps of California is especially concerning to me.

Comment ID: 549

First Name: Kurt**Last Name:** Zimmermann**Commenter Email:** kzimmermann12@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 06:37:58 PM**Comment:**

Name: Zimmermann, Kurt Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I want to express my support for keeping the plan to cease all non-electric new vehicle sales by 2035. Please do NOT weaken or repeal the Advance Clean Cars II regulation. Unfortunately I will not be able to attend the public hearing on Tuesday 8/22 at 9 a.m. Please consider my opinion from this written comment. The climate crisis is real, global warming is undoubtedly accelerated by carbon dioxide emissions and the faster we can shift towards environmentally friendlier mobility the better. Electric cars also are quieter and emit no exhaust fumes (locally at least) improving quality of life for people living along busy roads. This will improve public health, e.g. reduce asthma cases. We all profit from a shift to electric mobility and I ask the Connecticut State (and Federal) Government to please support the transition by investing in the required infrastructure. (charging stations, electric grid..) I own and drive an electric car since November 2022 and have used it for road trips to Vermont and New Jersey, recharging the battery at public fast chargers along the way. This is already doable with a little planning. Further expansion of the network of public fast-charging stations will make it even more convenient. I expect that in a few years electric cars will be significantly cheaper than gasoline powered cars and will therefor become more popular. Please support the build-out of charging stations NOW to ease that transition. Please do NOT weaken the Advance Clean Cars II regulation. thank you best regards Kurt Zimmermann

Comment ID: 550**First Name:** Nadine**Last Name:** Mcmillian**Commenter Email:** Nadinemc71@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Mcmillian, Nadine Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To whom it may concern, Please do not pass a law for CT that gas powered gas will be outlawed in 2023. There is no way that a very large portion of our citizens would be able to afford an electric vehicles including myself, a single mother. There is no viable option for me to even charge a vehicle at my residence since I live in a condo. There are certainly not even charging stations to support all residents having to own an electric vehicle. That would require the state to have to spend an astronomical amount of money to build all the infrastructure required. Please do not enact this law. Sincerely Nadine mcmillian

Comment ID: 551**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Kornegay**Commenter Email:** jckornegay@earthlink.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/20/23 07:21:14 PM**Comment:**

Name: Kornegay, John Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the proposed regulations. 1. We are not California and our Legislature and regulators should make their own regulations based on their own studies. 2. The technology to make the proposed change does not exist and the current technologies used are damaging the

environment far worse than ICE powered vehicles. 3. The current technology is based upon the use of slave and child labor in other parts of the world using environmentally crippling mining and other technologies. 4. The weight of EV's using current technologies are far more damaging to roadways than ICE vehicles.

Comment ID: 552

First Name: Cheryl

Last Name: Kornegay

Commenter Email: ckornegay@earthlink.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Kornegay, Cheryl Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Trucks: I am opposed to the proposed regulations.

1. We are not California and our Legislature and regulators should make their own regulations based on their own studies. 2. The technology to make the proposed change does not exist and the current technologies used are damaging the environment far worse than ICE powered vehicles. 3. The current technology is based upon the use of slave and child labor in other parts of the world using environmentally crippling mining and other technologies. 4. The current technology being used for passenger and light truck vehicles is inadequate for that purpose and laughably inadequate for heavier vehicles. 5. The weight of EV's using current technologies is far more damaging to roadways than ICE vehicles. Cars: I am opposed to the proposed regulations. 1. We are not California and our Legislature and regulators should make their own regulations based on their own studies. 2. The technology to make the proposed change does not exist and the current technologies used are damaging the environment far worse than ICE powered vehicles. 3. The current technology is based upon the use of slave and child labor in other parts of the world using environmentally crippling mining and other technologies. 4. The weight of EV's using current technologies is far more damaging to roadways than ICE vehicles.

Comment ID: 553

First Name:

Last Name:

Commenter Email:

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 07:46:54 PM

Comment:

Name: , Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 1. Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. 2. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. 3. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. 4. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? 5. Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. 6. The carbon used to mine all the lead, lithium, copper and other metals to create an electric car is enormous. All the up front mining is just off the charts to create an electric car with a battery. An electric car has an initial higher carbon foot print of a gas car until about 70,000 miles. That is how many miles need to be driven to account for all the carbon used in all the mining that is needed to be done up front to create the battery. 7. Electric cars in the winter are not great. The battery life declines significantly. 8. Banning gas powered vehicles is not a wise decision. If you must ban them for political reasons fine, make the ban effective by 2050 and not 2032, which is only nine years away.

Comment ID: 554

First Name: Doreen
Last Name: Trimarchi
Commenter Email: trimarchidoreen@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: Newtown Neighbors Alliance LLC
Commenter Title: member
Posted Date: 08/20/23 08:21:32 PM

Attachments:

Connecticut proposal vehicles.pdf
 Connecticut proposal trucks.pdf

Comment:

Name: Trimarchi, Doreen Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please accept these letters into public record

Comment ID: 555

First Name: Thomas

Last Name: Scelfo

Commenter Email: t.scelfo@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Vice Chairperson

Posted Date: 08/20/23 08:44:33 PM

Comment:

Name: Scelfo, Thomas Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am expressing my strong opposition to proposed regulations that will restrict the ability of Connecticut residents to select the type of car they can buy after 2035 for several reasons. (1) Electric cars are much more expensive to purchase. This will be an extreme burden for low and middle income individuals, as well as seniors on a fixed income. (2) Low income individuals who frequently purchase used cars will face the extremely high cost of battery replacement. (3) The manufacture of electric car batteries is damaging to the environment, and the components for batteries are often mined in countries with horrific working conditions. (4) Electric charging infrastructure in New England makes an electric car impractical to drive for any distance, and the likelihood that a robust charging infrastructure in large portions of Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine will be in place by 2035 is remote. (5) Electric charging infrastructure in Connecticut for those who don't own homes is poor, and it is extremely unlikely that electric cars in urban environments will be supplied with a robust vehicle recharging for non-home owners because that would largely rely on the private sector (apartment owners, businesses, etc.) to provide those services due to high installation costs and lack of return on investment. (6) Connecticut's electric grid would need to be dramatically expanded to provide sufficient capacity to handle the needs of large quantities of electric charging stations and there has been great opposition from PURA to the needed expansion. (7) Connecticut legislators have been unwilling to require that electric car owners pay for their use of Connecticut roads, despite the fact that the additional weight of electric cars results in more damage to our roads than gasoline powered cars. Connecticut's Special Transportation Fund will be underfunded and, as a result, our roads and bridges will deteriorate at a faster rate. We don't want to see rolling blackouts in Connecticut, like they have seen in California due to lack of sufficient electric supply. Please reject this proposed regulation until the concerns listed above are addressed. Thank you for considering these comments. Thomas Scelfo 81 Berncliff Drive Northford, CT 06472

Comment ID: 556

First Name: Sean

Last Name: Donnelly

Commenter Email: donnellypowerstroke@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 09:10:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Donnelly, Sean Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Total change to electric vehicles is not realistic by the year 2035. For one our power grid cannot take such a demand for power, nor are proper funds being allocated either by the government (local or federal) or by Eversource itself to build up the infrastructure needed to handle such a load on our grid. As it currently is now we happen to get a gust of wind and we're at the risk of losing power. Then you have the typical EV problems at hand. We can start with the labor or fossil fuel powered equipment being used to strip mine for materials used in these batteries. Shipping those materials around the world to then be refined and used to produce batteries. Batteries performance is also a huge issue whether is be the poor range of vehicles to the inconsistency of batteries to perform in a range of temperatures from hot to cold. Which we a Connecticut residents experience every year through the seasonal changes. Now once a battery is dead and needs to be replaced what do we do with the old bad battery? These batteries are not recyclable. They cannot be used to make new batteries. Instead they're destroyed. Or I guess we can incase them in concrete and leave them outside next to our spent nuclear fuel rods as they wait to be buried under ground. To think that in 2035 we'll magically have the technology and infrastructure to accommodate all the new EVs is foolish. in 1969 Nasa put men on the moon a feat that couldn't be duplicated with the technology we have today but some how the people are supposed to believe that in 12 short years we'll have EVs figured out. Sure Lastly we can discuss the price of a new EV vehicle or should we say how unaffordable they are. As someone in the service industry a replacement work truck is \$70,000 on the low end. How much is a EV work truck going to be if a Tesla Model 3 starts at \$40,000. Another expense that businesses are going to be passing along to the customers thus driving up the cost of living yet again by Connecticut legislators. This is not a viable option. If the Connecticut legislators actually care about this so called "global warming" or "climate change" they should be looking at cleaner burning and more renewable fuels such as Ethanol (E85).

Comment ID: 557

First Name: Thomas

Last Name: Catalina

Commenter Email: tomcatalina01@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Catalina, Thomas Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Total change to electric vehicles is not realistic by the year 2035. For one our power grid cannot take such a demand for power, nor are proper funds being allocated either by the government (local or federal) or by Eversource itself to build up the infrastructure needed to handle such a load on our grid. As it currently is now we happen to get a gust of wind and we're at the risk of losing power. Then you have the typical EV problems at hand. We can start with the labor or fossil fuel powered equipment being used to strip mine for materials used in these batteries. Shipping those materials around the world to then be refined and used to produce batteries. Batteries performance is also a huge issue whether is be the poor range of vehicles to the inconsistency of batteries to perform in a range of temperatures from hot to cold. Which we a Connecticut residents experience every year through the seasonal changes. Now once a battery is dead and needs to be replaced what do we do with the old bad battery? These batteries are not recyclable. They cannot be used to make new batteries. Instead they're destroyed. Or I guess we can incase them in concrete and leave them outside next to our spent nuclear fuel rods as they wait to be buried under ground. To think that in 2035 we'll magically have the technology and infrastructure to accommodate all the new EVs is foolish. in 1969 Nasa put men on the moon a feat that couldn't be duplicated with the technology we have today but some how the people are supposed to believe that in 12 short years we'll have EVs figured out. Sure Lastly we can discuss the price of a new EV vehicle or should we say how unaffordable they are. As someone in the service industry a replacement work truck is \$70,000 on the low end. How much is a EV work truck going to be if a Tesla Model 3 starts at \$40,000. Another expense that businesses are going to be passing along to the customers thus driving up the cost of living yet again by Connecticut legislators. This is not a viable option. If the Connecticut legislators actually care about this so called "global warming" or "climate change" they should be looking at cleaner burning and more renewable fuels such as Ethanol (E85).

Comment ID: 558

First Name: Arthur

Last Name: Hendrickson

Commenter Email: ArtHendrickson@netscape.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Hendrickson, Arthur Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My concerns regarding electric cars: 1) Additional stress on a fragile electrical infrastructure 2) Additional weight on roads, highways, residential streets due to heavier vehicles requiring more frequent repair/maintenance 3) Mining for toxic elements (e.g., cobalt, lithium) and sufficient supply 4) Used battery disposal 5) Increased costs (e.g., electric vehicles, residential charging station) 6) Operability in temperature extremes

Comment ID: 559

First Name: Margarita

Last Name: Ramos

Commenter Email: Ramosmargarita13@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/20/23 10:23:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Ramos, Margarita Submission Date: 8/20/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am mother of 3 kids, I paid \$2,300 of a mortgage, I pay 435 of energy, I pay for water, etc, how I am going to pay for an electric car. When I don't have money to take my kids to have fun in a Waterpark, vacation etc ??

Comment ID: 560

First Name: Brendan

Last Name: Gillis

Commenter Email: bgillis4@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:01:42 AM

Comment:

Name: Gillis, Brendan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is ill-thought out legislation. Firstly, who is the government - or anyone - to tell me what kind of car I can or cannot buy?!?!? We live in a condominium. Are they supposed to add a hundred chargers? I don't want to pay for that. Electric cars cost more than gas cars. We are already being hurt by inflation, higher prices for everything, etc. We cannot afford this. Even John Kerry has said that the US could cut its emissions to zero, and if China and India don't play ball, it will do nothing for the planet. This is feel-good legislation that will do nothing to help the planet, and burden CT taxpayers needlessly.

Comment ID: 561

First Name:

Last Name:

Commenter Email:

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:07:53 AM

Comment:

Name: , Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Do not consider eliminating any gas vehicles or thrie sales in Connecticut. Emissions from gas vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Electric vehicles are also unreliable in cold climates. Major cold snaps will shut things down. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. Also at high speeds these vehicles pose more danger. What happens when a vehicle get into an accident? Where does the battery go? At best, if you want to ban government gas vehicles, have at it. Matthew Kieras

Comment ID: 562

First Name: Nikki

Last Name: Sambitsky

Commenter Email: nsambitsky@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:27:49 AM

Comment:

Name: Sambitsky , Nikki Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I?m writing today to OPPOSE Governor Ned Lamont?s ban on gas powered vehicles in the state of CT. This is an impractical ban that targets anyone who cannot afford an electric vehicle. Moreover, a complete changeover to electric vehicles in this magnitude will put a huge amount of stress on the state?s power grid. Not to mention the fact that these vehicles have been bursting into flames because their flaws have not yet been worked out. Additionally, replacement parts for the inner workings of electric cars cost THOUSANDS of dollars. This is not only cost-prohibitive for most of the people in CT, it is also not a realistic expectation to foolishly believe that those of us who live in this state can just plunk down that kind of money simply because the governor made it law to do so. Please do NOT allow this ban on electric vehicles to pass. While there will be a time in the future where electric vehicles will be the main type of transportation, given the expense and serious safety issues that these types of vehicles currently incur, now is NOT that time. Sincerely, Nikki A. Sambitsky Berlin CT

Comment ID: 563

First Name: Roberta

Last Name: Lauria

Commenter Email: roberta.lauria@conning.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:47:38 AM

Comment:

Name: Lauria, Roberta Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing in OPPOSITION to the absurd regulation the DEEP is trying to implement regarding pushing electric vehicles by 2035 in the state of Connecticut. That is a ridiculous regulation. There is no way our state could implement this change in the next 12 years without bankrupting the people, taxpayers, and state. We do not have the capacity to do this. Shame on the person(s) trying to push this and shame on the DEEP for not looking at all the implications this would cause. Stop the nonsense and stop trying to push regulations that will bypass going through our legislatures that represent the residents.

Comment ID: 564

First Name: Nikki
Last Name: Sambitsky
Commenter Email: nsambitsky@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:57:23 AM

Comment:

Name: Sambitsky, Nikki Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 PLEASE DISREGARD MY INITIAL SUBMISSION AS THERE WAS AN ERROR IN MY STATEMENT. THIS CURRENT STATEMENT IS CORRECT AND ACCURATE. I'm writing today to OPPOSE Governor Ned Lamont's ban on gas powered vehicles in the state of CT. This is an impractical ban that targets anyone who cannot afford an electric vehicle. Moreover, a complete changeover to electric vehicles in this magnitude will put a huge amount of stress on the state's power grid. Not to mention the fact that these vehicles have been bursting into flames because their flaws have not yet been worked out. Additionally, replacement parts for the inner workings of electric cars cost THOUSANDS of dollars. This is not only cost-prohibitive for most of the people in CT, it is also not a realistic expectation to foolishly believe that those of us who live in this state can just plunk down that kind of money simply because the governor made it law to do so. Please do NOT allow this ban on gas vehicles to pass. While there will be a time in the future where electric vehicles will be the main type of transportation, given the expense and serious safety issues that these types of vehicles currently incur, now is NOT that time. Sincerely,

Comment ID: 565

First Name: G. Barrett
Last Name: Simson
Commenter Email: gbsimson@yahoo.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:12:34 AM

Comment:

Name: Simson, G. Barrett Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against this regulation for the following reasons: We taxpayers are pro choice - we want to choose our own technology and not have our choices dictated by government, If the technology advances and we still believe this will have an impact on climate change then we will buy an electric vehicle by then. If the market creates other solutions, government is lousy at changing direction or fixing the issues they make. Better to not create a regulation that inhibits a better solution and leave the choice with the taxpayers. How can you possibly think emulating California is a good thing?

Comment ID: 566

First Name: Sharon
Last Name: Natale
Commenter Email: Shar.natale@att.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:13:30 AM

Comment:

Name: Natale, Sharon Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm writing today to OPPOSE Governor Ned Lamont's ban on gas powered vehicles in the state of CT. Why do you feel the need to control everything by putting new laws on the books? Haven't we made progress without putting a ban and controlling what people do? , Not to mention that the people end up paying for all the "freebies" that the Government makes out they give. The Government doesn't pay the bills - the people do.

Comment ID: 567

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Schwartz

Commenter Email: mschwartz613@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:52:36 AM

Comment:

Name: Schwartz, Mark Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The financial impact of having to buy a new car is too great especially in the current economic times. Also, the amount of actual fossil fuel costs are greater with electric vehicles than gas powered ones.

Comment ID: 568

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Pierce

Commenter Email: mpierce48@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:59:15 AM

Comment:

Name: Pierce, Michael Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My comment for a ban on gas powered cars is the same for trucks. When did we become communist? When did our government leaders dictate to the people rather than work for us? Free market would suggests that when you build a better alternative, people will choose to buy it and stop buying the gas powered vehicles. Until then, this is America and the people have a right to choose.

Comment ID: 569

First Name: Jon

Last Name: Dunn

Commenter Email: jontdunn@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:00:28 AM

Comment:

Name: Dunn, Jon Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut regulators should NOT be even thinking about banning ICE cars. Electric cars are more expensive and inferior products given their extended charge times and limited range compared to ICE vehicles. Consumers should decide what type of vehicle is best for their needs -- not unelected, state regulators in Hartford. A decision of this magnitude should be made in Legislature with our elected representatives going on record.

Comment ID: 570

First Name: Thomas

Last Name: Farrell

Commenter Email: tcfarl@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:10:01 AM

Comment:

Name: Farrell, Thomas Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 California is a mess. CT needs to be the constitution state and not follow California's lead to restrict the freedom of choice for Americans, EV's do more damage to the environment than does gas- and diesel-powered vehicles.

Comment ID: 571

First Name: JAMES

Last Name: MCILREE

Commenter Email: burrito_coffer.0l@icloud.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:28:27 AM

Comment:

Name: MCILREE, JAMES Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 An irresponsible proposal that will result in significant out-migration and severe economic harm, particularly to the low-income and vulnerable, which makes this proposal racist.

Comment ID: 572

First Name: Brian

Last Name: Faraci

Commenter Email: bfscomics@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:50:23 AM

Comment:

Name: Faraci, Brian Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to express my opposition to the proposed regulation concerning advanced clean cars II. While I support most efforts to keep our environment clean, I believe that this proposed regulation is misguided, and will end up doing more harm than good. Connecticut already struggles to provide electricity for homeowners and businesses. It's nearly impossible to get a power plant built, or a transmission line run to our state. On top of that electricity costs are already among the highest in the nation and probably aren't going down anytime soon. I agree that electric vehicles have a place in our state, but I think the power grid is not yet equipped to handle a large increase in their numbers. Feel good regulations might seem like the way to go at first, but when digging into what the proposed regulation would actually do the benefits become far less clear. Thank you.

Comment ID: 573

First Name: Andrew

Last Name: Cote

Commenter Email: cote.andy@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 11:13:43 AM

Comment:

Name: Cote, Andrew Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This email is sent to express my opposition to the mandate that all electric vehicles in the state of Connecticut be powered by electricity by 2035. Please allow the public and the market to determine these policies rather than this radical and impractical proposition. The simple fact is that our electric grid infrastructure is incapable of supplying enough electricity to transport everyone. Furthermore, electric cars do not have the range that gas powered vehicles do. Imagine the economic and social

impact this ridiculous policy will have on local businesses that now rely on fossil fuels vehicles. Andrew Cote 16 High Middle Lane Enfield, Connecticut

Comment ID: 574

First Name: John

Last Name: Eselunas

Commenter Email: essay153@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 11:19:54 AM

Comment:

Name: Eselunas, John Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Is Conn. to become a communist state by banning gas powered cars. That is what it looks like to me. Mr. Lopes, I hope you will vote no on this proposal!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Comment ID: 575

First Name: Gary

Last Name: Gladu

Commenter Email: ggladu1953@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 12:02:49 PM

Comment:

Name: Gladu, Gary Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Are you insane? I've never, in my life, heard of a government forcing people to purchase something that isn't self sustaining. What's going to happen when all the materials for making batteries are depleted. This will also stop travel as people won't be able to travel more than 200 miles without stopping for 8 hours to recharge. What about the charging stations. The 8 hour layover is if you are lucky enough to find a charging station that is not in use. What about when the batteries wear out? Right now they are disposed of in landfills that will eventually become toxic. All this crap is so the electric companies and make landslides in sales and government can get there share of kickbacks while the consumer gets screwed

Comment ID: 576

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: McDermott

Commenter Email: kevcmd@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 12:27:35 PM

Comment:

Name: McDermott, Kevin Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposal to ban gas-powered cars will have a negative impact on the quality of life for many Americans. While an admirable solution to reduce carbon footprint and greenhouse gases, the proposal is at serious risk of disastrous consequences. 1) Charging infrastructure is not sophisticated or advanced enough. While there might be a growing number of stations annually, there are typically only two or three ports at each station, and charging a car can take 20-40 minutes. 2) The legislation would put tremendous pressure on gas-powered cars as consumers who can't afford EV need to turn to the last "hurrah" of purchasing a gas-powered car, creating significant supply/demand imbalance. 3) The process of mining and manufacturing precious metals and resources for EVs is extremely dirty and in some cases unethical. While these metals can't be found in CT, the burden falls on third-world countries to mine lithium, cobalt, and copper, often using cheap and unethical labor. 4) Batteries are not advanced, and there are not enough engineers to fix battery problems. Today, you can go to many mechanics around the country and have a car fixed within a few

hours, days, or sometimes weeks. However, the mechanics for EVs require an entirely different skill set, and CT does not have the labor force it needs to service tens of thousands of EVs. 5) Our energy infrastructure cannot support this level of electricity. Rolling blackouts, and requiring residents to reduce their use of AC or lights during hot days only amplifies the fact that we do not have the grid power to support charging tens of thousands of EVs. In conclusion, this is not a solution to save the environment. As children we are told to "save the rainforest" and "preserve nature", however, this proposal seeks to mine and produce precious metals found in these exotic places. While it might make people feel good to drive an EV by not having to go to a gas station, the en

Comment ID: 577

First Name: Wayan

Last Name: Kartini

Commenter Email: wayankartini@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None

Commenter Title: Residen

Posted Date: 08/21/23 12:34:13 PM

Comment:

Name: Kartini, Wayan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hey, I do not agree forcing everyone to have an EV, That green new deal is not make no sense. There no global warming it's all non sense. We need Co2, humans body made out CO2, trees need CO2. We can grow foods without CO2. You gonna starved us all to death. Lithium batteries is not available here in the country, they digging out form other country. This is all nonsense. Why trying to stop the chemtrail, that poisons us all . This EV planned will not work for everybody. And parking garage don't build to hold those EV. Then we gonna builds special parking garage too? That my opinion.

Comment ID: 578

First Name: Monica

Last Name: Pullano

Commenter Email: mpullano2301@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 12:43:32 PM

Comment:

Name: Pullano, Monica Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think banning the sale of new gas powered cars in 12 years is reasonable and important for our environment which is heading toward great peril.

Comment ID: 579

First Name: Karen

Last Name: Renner

Commenter Email: karenrenn11@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 12:54:34 PM

Comment:

Name: Renner, Karen Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 These California regulations are an assault on our freedoms. There will be no ability to buy a new non-electric car in 4 years. That is tyranny. The cost of electric vehicles is too prohibitive to impose on families. Furthermore, the environment suffers from the carbon footprint of EV's. The only impact these regulations have is making consumers pay more for everything. Please do NOT pass these regulations!

Comment ID: 580

First Name: Stephan
Last Name: Chase
Commenter Email: schase@fuelservices.biz
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/21/23 01:12:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Chase, Stephan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is time that politicians stop dictating to residents how they should live. No oil or gas or propane....Only electric stoves, only electric water heaters, only heat pumps.....now only electric cars. The only one with any freedom is Eversource, and i watch them continuously raise the rates. Delivery charges are already higher than what my electric usage is. We do not and will not have the infrastructure to go all electric in 6 1/2 years. We have already seen what happens in a major storm, what so you think we'll do when you push everythig electric. Wake up!!!

Comment ID: 581

First Name: Brittany
Last Name: Moreno
Commenter Email: moreno.a.brittany@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: Kneads
Commenter Title: Owner
Posted Date: 08/21/23 01:31:33 PM

Comment:

Name: Moreno, Brittany Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The argument to ban gas powered cars and trucks has not been substantiated. The making of electric cars creates greenhouse gases. There has not been enough planning to make the switch. The amount of electricity produced would need to increase substantially and the grid cannot necessarily handle the surge.

Comment ID: 582

First Name: Nicole
Last Name: Klarides-Ditria
Commenter Email: Nicole.klarides-ditria@cga.ct.gov
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: 105th District
Commenter Title: State Representative
Posted Date: 08/21/23 01:47:00 PM

Attachments:

Rep. Klarides-Ditria - Testimony in opposition of PR2023-023 - PR2023-020.pdf

Comment:

Name: Klarides-Ditria , Nicole Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Thank you for taking the time to gather input from the public about the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection's (DEEP) proposed regulations to ban the sale of gas-powered passenger cars beginning in 2035, and to gradually prohibit the sale of new gas-powered trucks that are used to ship goods and provide essential services. I write in opposition of the Proposed Regulation Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II, PR2023-023 and the Proposed Regulation Concerning: Adoption of 22a-174-37 Medium and Heavy-duty Emission Standards, PR2023-020. The proposed timetable will put undue stress on our struggling families. Connecticut's median income is \$40,000 yet the average transaction price for an electric vehicle is \$53,438 according to Cox Automotive, parent of Kelly Blue Book. The cost for expanding EV charging and the subsidies for EV home charging stations will also all be covered by our ratepayers through increased delivery rates at a time when Connecticut residents are already paying some of the highest utility rates in the country. Simply put, many of our residents can't afford this. I would be supportive of providing incentives to the public and to our businesses to get more people to switch to using electric vehicles willingly, but I do not support mandating this or banning the sale of gas vehicles in our state. For these reasons, I feel we need to take a step back

and analyze exactly how we're going to implement these policies in a realistic timeframe. We should consider a multitude of different ways that we can make improvements to limit our carbon footprint and help our environment, which includes the sale of electric cars without completely banning the sale of gas-powered automobiles as proposed by these regulations. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment ID: 583

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Lemos

Commenter Email: HSHCatering@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 01:48:26 PM

Comment:

Name: Lemos, Christopher Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposed law should be accepted. Until drastic measures are taken, we will not have a healthy safe planet to leave our families. I think CT should be one of the leaders in this front.

Comment ID: 584

First Name: Sebastian

Last Name: Colbert

Commenter Email: sebekc@zoho.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 01:50:15 PM

Comment:

Name: Colbert, Sebastian Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Banning gas-powered (GP) cars, which is essentially mandating electric-vehicles (EV), is meddling in the free-market economy between sellers and buyers and will have grave unintended consequences. This is not the role of state legislature or regulatory agency ? no matter the reasons for it, and I strongly oppose it. No one forced horse and buggy owners to buy GP cars. Yet eventually, they all did, because they saw the benefit of the GP car. The same is true of EVs. If they are truly better than GP cars, then consumers will switch on their own. Furthermore, there are many other reasons why banning GP cars is a bad decision: 1. People will hate you for it. You are taking their choice away. 2. EVs require more energy and raw materials to make. 3. There are not enough raw materials and the actual mines to make EVs, and mining is not environment friendly. Read ?The Rare Metals War: The Dark Side of Clean Energy and Digital Technologies? by Guillaume Pitron. He did a multi-year study on raw materials needed for EVs and electronics. In simple terms, there isn't enough of it. 4. EVs are way more expensive than GP cars. How will people afford them? 5. The high price of EVs translates to higher prices for car insurance and repair. Again, who can afford that? 6. EVs don't fare well in cold environments like New England. 7. EVs don't handle towing trailers well and lose battery life fast. 8. Charging infrastructure is practically non-existent. Who will build a reliable charging infrastructure? Who will pay for it? 9. How will renters or people living in high density areas charge their EVs? 10. Human nature is that people will find themselves out of power with EVs as they do with their phones today. Having phone out of power is a small inconvenience, but EVs will be a different story. (There are already reports about that) I could go on, but no matter how one looks at it, this is a disaster waiting to happen. Do not ban GP cars! Let the free-market work it out.

Comment ID: 585

First Name: Anna

Last Name: Colbert

Commenter Email: aniac11@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 01:53:30 PM

Comment:

Name: Colbert, Anna Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I want to be able to choose the car I want to drive based on my needs. I am against any type of bans of gas-powered cars.

Comment ID: 586

First Name: Dan

Last Name: Marcil

Commenter Email: dwmarcil@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 02:09:13 PM

Comment:

Name: Marcil, Dan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I applaud this effort to provide sustainable advancement in our vehicle technologies, however this effort must benefit BOTH the people of Connecticut and the environment. While I agree in concept that we need to make a better path forward environmentally, there are several hurdles that in my opinion, will make this untenable for the State of Connecticut as well as your average Connecticut citizen. 1. Electric vehicles are not environmentally friendly - Between the strip mining of rare-earth materials needed for electric vehicles, their limited range, risks of fire, and problems in recycling the materials without more environmental hazards being created, I see this as a deal breaker in and of itself. We should not ditch a working technology (that has been improving emissions for years) for something that really doesn't have the track record yet. In my mind it would be a bit like banning air travel in 2040 because we want spaceships and a base on Mars - an admirable goal, but at what cost? 2. Electric Grid use is not sustainable - Transmission loss from wires in our current grid account for nearly half of the amount of all generated electricity. By forcing more vehicles to use our antiquated grid, we are inviting failures to meet the demand, and inviting greedy corporations to jack up the prices for our citizens - many of which are already struggling. 3. The State has a tendency to exempt themselves - Many of your constituents feel that the people in power have a "The rules are for thee, but not for me" type of attitude. If you are truly serious about making this change, you will need to demonstrate that it can be done - without increasing budgets or funding that the average citizen would not have access to. There is a serious dearth of trust in government these days - it would be great to see some true leadership in this regard. Thank you for your time - feel free to reach me if you wish to further discuss.

Comment ID: 587

First Name: Donna

Last Name: Veach

Commenter Email: Donna.veach@cga.ct.gov

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: 30th District

Commenter Title: State Representative

Posted Date: 08/21/23 02:23:54 PM

Attachments:

Rep. Donna Veach - Testimony - PR2023-023 - PR2023-020.pdf

Comment:

Name: Veach, Donna Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 August 21, 2023 The Honorable Katie Dykes Commissioner Department of Energy and Environmental Protection 79 Elm Street Hartford, CT 06106 Dear Commissioner Dykes, Thank you for taking the time to gather input from the public about the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection's (DEEP) proposed regulations to ban the sale of gas-powered passenger cars beginning in 2035, and to gradually prohibit the sale of new gas-powered trucks that are used to ship goods and provide essential services. I write in opposition of the Proposed Regulation Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II, PR2023-023 and the Proposed Regulation Concerning: Adoption of 22a-174-37 Medium and Heavy-duty Emission Standards, PR2023-020. I think we can all agree that we need to do everything we can to take better care of our natural environment. With that being said, I think we still have no way of knowing the long-term consequences of

the increased use of lithium-ion batteries on our environment or on our health. The type of mining that is required to extract the needed minerals for these batteries is done using an open-pit and brine extraction processes that can cause pollution and erosion. We cannot pretend that pollution and erosion are not also major issues for our environment. Previous generations thought that coal was the only fuel for the generation of electricity, and clearly, they were wrong. Electric vehicles (EV) are truly visionary, and it would be narrow-minded to think that the use of electric cars and trucks, and the use of other green technologies are not a big part of the path forward for our future. I do not dispute that we need to have an increased use of electric vehicles in order to accomplish what is best for our environment. I have concerns with the timetable that has been proposed and with doing this through mandates rather than through incentives, that will be putting regulations in place to ban the use of gas cars and trucks altogether. I have concerns with the factors and variables that are still unknown. Every new technology involves an infrastructure build out. My concern is that because this technology is new, we still have no way of knowing the unintended consequences this build out will have on our state. We should slow things down and test the results under all the different circumstances and scenarios one could imagine, asking questions about if we have enough charging stations throughout the entire state, in all of our communities, and along all of our roadways, and questions about what that build-out cost us? We need to know what strain this could have on our energy resources, and what priority transportation for the public will be given when competing with other priority energy needs? Our energy needs and the available energy resources we have can greatly fluctuate given things like storms and natural disasters. We should be asking questions about what type of vehicles will be used by our cities and towns and the State Department of Transportation, for things like snow removal and questions about the capabilities of electric trucks to preform heavy-duty work. Will construction companies and contractors be forced to purchase what could potentially be a fleet of electric vehicles under these regulations, or will exemptions be granted based on the type of work the business entity preforms? Ultimately, we need to know and prepare for what could happen to electric-transportation and our energy grid under the worst possible conditions in order to proceed with these regulations. Environmental and infrastructure issues aside, these regulations and the proposed timetable will put undue stress of struggling families who are just barely able to afford their current bills. Connecticut's median income is \$40,000 yet the average transaction price for an electric vehicle is \$53,438 according to Cox Automotive, parent of Kelly Blue Book. The cost for expanding EV charging and the subsidies for EV home charging stations will all be covered by ratepayers through increased delivery rates at a time when Connecticut residents are already paying some of the highest rates in the country. The added financial stress this will cause for our struggling families will likely be detrimental to their health. Incentives or rebates should be offered to the public to help them offset this expense. For these reasons, I feel we need to take a step back and analyze exactly how we're going to implement these policies in a realistic timeframe. We should consider a multitude of different ways that we can make improvements to limit our carbon footprint, which includes the sale of electric cars without completely banning the sale of gas-powered automobiles as proposed by these regulations.

Comment ID: 588

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Sokoloski

Commenter Email: srsokomd@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None - private citizen

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 02:32:53 PM

Comment:

Name: Sokoloski, Susan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am in favor of the proposed legislation to ban sales of new gas-powered passenger cars by 2035. Although this may produce some challenges, those will be nothing compared to those that are occurring due to human-fueled climate change. Witness the many devastating wildfires this year, including the recent one in Lahaina Hawaii that essentially wiped out that town and many of its citizens. Water temperatures in Florida exceeded 100 degrees this summer, killing coral reefs and providing fuel for what is likely to be a season of severe tropical storms and hurricanes ahead. Similar events are taking place all across the globe. I want there to be a livable planet for my children, grandchildren and all the people of this earth. We must aggressively act to reduce production of greenhouse gases in any and every way we can. This bill is one of those very necessary actions.

Comment ID: 589

First Name: Corrie
Last Name: Blancato
Commenter Email: blancatocora@yahoo.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: n/a
Commenter Title: resident of CT
Posted Date: 08/21/23 02:42:09 PM

Comment:

Name: Blancato, Corrie Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Where is the DATA that supports SAFETY, security, reliability and resiliency of electric powered vehicles and batteries? What will INSURANCE COSTS be? What happens in the event of MASS EVACUATION? As for infrastructure and charging stations, what is the PLAN to ACCOMMODATE an apartment complex that houses as many as a couple hundred people? Is PURA investing in electric grid upgrades? There seems to be many more QUESTIONS than ANSWERS.

Comment ID: 590

First Name: Kimberley
Last Name: Giard
Commenter Email: kgiard265@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title: taxpayer
Posted Date: 08/21/23 03:00:58 PM

Comment:

Name: Giard, Kimberley Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The current manufacturing process of electric cars is much more hostile to the environment than gasoline powered vehicles. They are inefficient "fuel" wise, unreliable when traveling long distances and in hazardous conditions and can catch fire when the batteries are exposed to sea water (these fires also require specialized treatment to be extinguished). They do not have the capacity to be working vehicles (e.g. trucks). In addition, the batteries are not able to be recycled currently. Our tax dollars should not be used to offer rebates for some to purchase this technology which actually does more harm to the environment. Keep it available for those who wish but do not force the rest of the general public to buy into it.

Comment ID: 591

First Name: Ralph
Last Name: Martin
Commenter Email: martin99@comcast.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/21/23 03:17:33 PM

Comment:

Name: Martin, Ralph Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This regulation sounds nice, but will not have the intended effect on the global environment, due to its minuscule impact. It will serve merely to inconvenience the average citizen, increase his/her costs, and assure large, inappropriate profits for the electric car corporations. Note: I will watch the politicians who support this bill and vote against them in upcoming elections, due to their lack of concrete global evidence.

Comment ID: 592

First Name: Diane
Last Name: Minutillo
Commenter Email: flimbo_5@sbcglobal.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/21/23 03:19:02 PM**Comment:**

Name: Minutillo, Diane Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the Proposed Regulation
Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II. I question if Connecticut's Electrical Grid can accommodate the tens of thousands of both cars and trucks that will be plugged in on a nightly basis. Also, our electrical rates are among the highest in the nation!! How will the addition of a large number of EV's make an already bad problem worse? EV's cost much, much more than conventional vehicles! Will our state leaders be prepared to continue providing subsidies as very large numbers of people purchase electric cars?

Comment ID: 593**First Name:** Mitch**Last Name:** Saba**Commenter Email:** protect.yourself@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 03:42:24 PM**Comment:**

Name: Saba, Mitch Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 G. Mitchell Saba Willington, CT 06279 To: DEEP / Senate Hearing Committee Subject: Opposition to the Proposed Regulation to Ban the Sale of Gas-Powered Cars by 2035 Dear Committee, I write as a citizen deeply concerned about the proposed regulation to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles by 2035. This proposal, at its core, threatens Voter Freedom and Individual Rights. Our democracy is rooted in the principle of choice - in our beliefs, our words, and critically, in our actions and spending. If electric vehicles (EVs) truly outperformed gas-powered counterparts, wouldn't the market naturally shift without political interventions? The very need for such a ban underscores a potential shortfall in EVs, making me wonder if we're being denied the right to choose based on genuine preference, practicality, and budget. Our economy thrives on consumer choice. This regulation seems less about the public good and more like lobbying on behalf of the EV industry. It's essential to remember that by banning gas-powered vehicles, you strip citizens of their right to make decisions best suited to their unique situations. Beyond the infringement on personal freedoms, such a regulation could destabilize our state's economic future, compromise our environmental goals, and jeopardize our preparedness in emergencies. I implore the committee to reflect on these concerns during the public hearing. Instead of imposing regulations, why not build the infrastructure and let your voters guide the market based on their genuine preferences? Thank you for your time and consideration.

Comment ID: 594**First Name:** Annmarie**Last Name:** Saba**Commenter Email:** annmarie.saba@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 03:53:35 PM**Comment:**

Name: Saba, Annmarie Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No ban on gas cars. Keep your political hands off my right to choose!

Comment ID: 595**First Name:** Jonathan**Last Name:** Caranfa**Commenter Email:** jonathan.caranfa@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 04:04:39 PM**Comment:**

Name: Caranfa, Jonathan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Committee, I write as a citizen deeply concerned about the proposed regulation to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles by 2035. This proposal, at its core, threatens Voter Freedom and Individual Rights. Our democracy is rooted in the principle of choice - in our beliefs, our words, and critically, in our actions and spending. If electric vehicles (EVs) truly outperformed gas-powered counterparts, wouldn't the market naturally shift without political interventions? The very need for such a ban underscores a potential shortfall in EVs, making me wonder if we're being denied the right to choose based on genuine preference, practicality, and budget. Our economy thrives on consumer choice. This regulation seems less about the public good and more like lobbying on behalf of the EV industry. It's essential to remember that by banning gas-powered vehicles, you strip citizens of their right to make decisions best suited to their unique situations. Beyond the infringement on personal freedoms, such a regulation could destabilize our state's economic future, compromise our environmental goals, and jeopardize our preparedness in emergencies. I implore the committee to reflect on these concerns during the public hearing. Instead of imposing regulations, why not build the infrastructure and let your voters guide the market based on their genuine preferences? Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Jonathan Caranfa

Comment ID: 596**First Name:** Katherine**Last Name:** Ollodart**Commenter Email:** Ollodart_family@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 04:16:26 PM**Comment:**

Name: Ollodart, Katherine Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't think banning gas powered vehicles by 2035 should be done. There are many people who will be forced into buying a vehicle that is not proven to be successful. More research is needed before making this major change. This should not be voted in.

Comment ID: 597**First Name:** Lisa**Last Name:** Maloney**Commenter Email:** lmaloney6826@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 04:22:31 PM**Comment:**

Name: Maloney, Lisa Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed regulation concerning Advanced Clean Cars. As someone who runs a non profit the offers free services to so many in our state who are struggling, this is just another blow to so many who care unable to meet their basic needs. No on this.

Comment ID: 598**First Name:** Jeffrey**Last Name:** Harris**Commenter Email:** jthlax01@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** None

Commenter Title: None**Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Harris, Jeffrey Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 in response to the proposed regulation regarding the eventual banning of gas powered cars in CT, it's time to put on the brakes, no pun intended. There is more evidence coming to light that EV's are as harmful to the environment as gas powered cars. EV's are dangerous to human as they are subject to spontaneous combustion. We have been provided evidence by car manufactures that EV's are too costly to manufacture. Charging capabilities are ridiculously slow and the technology is just not there yet to make this drastic change. With all due respect, CT should not be adopting any CA standards and if anything should be developing our own as CA and CT are worlds apart in everything. There has been little thought given to how our electrical grid will be able to handle the increased need for power and there is no plan in place for addressing this. Gas vehicles in CT account for .004% of global emissions. Changing to EV's will have a negligible impact on climate change. "Man made" climate change is almost impossible to measure as it cannot be differentiated by natural climate change. CT should not jump on the bandwagon just because "everyone else" is. Let CT Be the leader and really do the research and the critical thinking to make the right judgement for what's the best course of action rather than rush to judgement.

Comment ID: 599**First Name:** Gwendolyn**Last Name:** Kohn**Commenter Email:** gwen.kohn@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 04:29:37 PM**Comment:**

Name: Kohn, Gwendolyn Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 ?NO to the ban on gas-powered CT cars!? Products "die out" when they are no longer necessary. Since when does the government decide to "get rid" of products?

Comment ID: 600**First Name:** CHARLES**Last Name:** Koons**Commenter Email:** kipkoons@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Taxpayer and Voter**Commenter Title:** Adult**Posted Date:** 08/21/23 04:33:47 PM**Comment:**

Name: Koons, CHARLES Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposed regulation will have no discernable effect on climate (has anyone ever read the writings of Steven Koonin?), will be unaffordable to most drivers even with outsized subsidies that all taxpayers must contribute to, will increase the use and cost of electricity for a state that has some of the highest electric rates in the nation, and will increase our nation's dependence on countries that supply critical battery materials who are adversarial to our interests. The WSJ recently carried a story demonstrating that a hybrid vehicle is by far the most effective when accounting for the full cost of a battery powered car. Also, why would Connecticut bind itself to California legislation? There is little to admire with their decisions and I can't vote in California.

Comment ID: 601**First Name:** Bruce**Last Name:** Ollodart**Commenter Email:** ollodart_bruce_e@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 04:39:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Ollodart, Bruce Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Vote no. Because inadequate power generation is available, EV technology not advanced enough and only useful for limited purposes, climate change appears overblown and very little debate regarding its causes has occurred in public forums due to cancel culture, EV very expensiv, rare earths required not readily available outside China, high costs hurts poorer people the most, global warming could reasonably be caused by normal temperature variances when historical data examined closely, evidence co2 is the cause of warming is not definitive and could be the result of other warming factors in the historical records because plants grow better with higher co2 and reduce atmospheric co2, usa is already very green compared to China and India and Africa- spending more now is futile as Germany is now figuring out, this policy will hurt food production and transportation by making fossil fuels and derived products more expensive thus putting everyone at risk, power grid loses 70% of electricity generated through distribution-a more important problem. let California be the guinea pigs and burn their voters hard earned money on wild goose chases - there will be better choices and times to address warming once the current politicized climate extremists stop canceling their opponents and allow a thorough scientific debate to proceed.

Comment ID: 602**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Morosani**Commenter Email:** jmorosani@outlook.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 04:49:09 PM**Comment:**

Name: Morosani, John Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose the proposed changes to CT's electric vehicle laws. The last thing that CT needs to do is to follow the crazy rules of California. Connecticut has some of the highest electric rates in the country and in my section of the state, there are very few chargers and lots of distance between locations. In addition, there is no public transportation to speak of. Vehicles are the way we get around, and limiting us to expensive electric cars is a horrible choice. California clearly has pollution issues which do not affect those of us in rural regions; so we should not be forced to follow their regulations.

Comment ID: 603**First Name:** Tobie**Last Name:** Meisel**Commenter Email:** tobiemeisel@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 04:51:47 PM**Comment:**

Name: Meisel, Tobie Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly oppose banning new gas powered cars by 2035. It is crazy and short sided. The electric grid cannot sustain a total switch to EVs; sales of EVs are down; and there is still a need for fossil fuels to sustain the electric cars. A balanced transition and use of ALL kinds of energy will make us energy independent- not dependent and vulnerable as this bill will do.

Comment ID: 604**First Name:** Thomas**Last Name:** Reed

Commenter Email: ohtaktegw@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Non Emergency Medical Transportation

Commenter Title: Driver

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:06:01 PM

Comment:

Name: Reed, Thomas Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 605

First Name: Daniel

Last Name: Dyer

Commenter Email: dyerdaniel1@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:07:21 PM

Comment:

Name: Dyer, Daniel Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 606

First Name: Margaret

Last Name: Gingolaski

Commenter Email: margeg4143@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:09:26 PM

Comment:

Name: Gingolaski, Margaret Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a very scary and short sighted proposal. We are nowhere near ready or able to supply all electric vehicles within that time frame. We do not have the capacity to recharge all electric vehicles by 2035. All service stations would have to replace their equipment with charging stations at prohibitively high costs per unit. People are not going to wait around for charging without something like restaurants or stores etc. to while away their time. That means more reconfiguring for the stations. Anyone who is driving long distances or hauling freight would need the country as a WHOLE to have recharging capacity. How many stations are going to be able to meet these and many more changes and costs to stay in business? Probably not many. How many businesses will have the knowledge, employees, and equipment to work

on these vehicles? We will still need gasoline for the public that would be using an older car, getting fuel for lawn equipment and other items. If there are fewer stations and limited fuel resources the old law of ?supply and demand? will make the costs unaffordable. The electricity has to be generated from something to supply these nice ?clean? cars and as we know from this past winter, and many reports all over the country, we have a very fragile electric grid. You would have to use solar, wind, diesel (a fossil fuel you are trying to eliminate before we have capacity to do so) or something to create all that additional electricity. How are we going to dispose of the spent batteries which are filled with polluting materials? Are you planning to store them with the spent nuclear fuel rods that we still do not know how to dispose of safely? The batteries are also a concern. Who and where are we mining all those polluting materials to build them? Is that equipment fuel or battery operated? My guess at this time is that it is going to run on fuel. If the batteries catch fire (which has happened many times) the fire departments do not have the ability so far, to extinguish the fires so they just have to burn themselves out. If it catches fire when your car is parked in your garage you will lose it and your house. I hope you will all see that this is something that we are just not ready to do yet. A lot more careful thought and planning is needed before we are ready to successfully convert all vehicles to electric. Please do not rush to mandate something that we do not have a full knowledge of all the steps and costs required to successfully implement it. Don?t put people out of business and bankrupt the public just so you can say ?See Connecticut one of the first in the nation and is doing its part.- That would certainly not be doing your job in serving the people in this state that elected you.

Comment ID: 607

First Name: James

Last Name: Nawracay

Commenter Email: jnawracay@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: none

Commenter Title: none

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:10:19 PM

Comment:

Name: Nawracay, James Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 i think the governor and his agencies are insane to follow CA. Banning gas powered transportation will do nothing but control the citizens and restrict their movement. another socialist move.

Comment ID: 608

First Name: Stephen

Last Name: Monks

Commenter Email: stephencmonks@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Rotary Club Of Madison

Commenter Title: Board Member

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:11:20 PM

Comment:

Name: Monks, Stephen Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I?am 75 years old! Last time I heard this is a free country.

Comment ID: 609

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Roland

Commenter Email: robert.roland@live.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:12:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Roland, Robert Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Before imposing this type of law, it might help to look at the true fossil fuel footprint of an EV. It would also be helpful for lawmakers to consider rare earth minerals from African mines and mines in other countries (needed to make EV batteries) that have inhumane working conditions and child labor practices that we would never accept in the US. Politicians should be shameful for pursuing "feel good" laws that result in working conditions no western country would ever accept.

Comment ID: 610

First Name: Anthony

Last Name: DeLucia

Commenter Email: anthony.d72@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:14:58 PM

Comment:

Name: DeLucia, Anthony Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 611

First Name: John

Last Name: Miller

Commenter Email: alisar@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Retired

Commenter Title: N/A

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:16:35 PM

Comment:

Name: Miller, John Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 ? Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. ? On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. ? Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. ? There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? ? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 612

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Furniss

Commenter Email: FURNISSRA@GMAIL.COM

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Retired

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:18:07 PM**Comment:**

Name: Furniss, Richard Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Banning gasoline automobiles is the silliest law I can imagine. In the future we may have the electricity system to support electric cars, or may not. The net impact at present is 0 including manufacturing, electric power generation, rare earth extraction, etc. It may get better, and I will then buy an electric car. But legislation to ban gasoline? A silly, feel-good law. Do something useful, not woke posturing.

Comment ID: 613**First Name:** Marisa**Last Name:** Manley**Commenter Email:** marisamanley@optonline.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** President**Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:18:24 PM**Comment:**

Name: Manley, Marisa Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Madame or Sir: I am writing to oppose the DEEP's proposed ban on the sale of new gas cars and trucks in Connecticut by 2035. The proposed ban would do little to affect worldwide carbon emissions and would impose serious burdens on Connecticut's citizens, on our infrastructure, and on the Connecticut economy as a whole. 1. The cost of electric vehicles is nearly twice that of gas-powered vehicles. The current average cost is more than the median salary of a Connecticut resident. To mandate that residents must spend more than a year's wages for necessary transportation is unreasonably burdensome and likely to cause more Connecticut residents to leave the state. 2. Shifting to all electric vehicles demands a massive increase in the amount of power generated in the region. There is no plan or logical path to so dramatically increase electrical production. 3. We also lack adequate charging facilities for the to-be mandated increase in electrical vehicles. 4. The manufacturing of electrical vehicles consumes substantially more energy than does the manufacture of gas-powered vehicles ? up to 40% more. There is no indication that DEEP's proposed regulation makes an informed assessment of these higher initial energy costs. Beyond these practical considerations, Connecticut residents should have serious concerns about our legislature abdicating its responsibilities and attempting to delegate the function to an outside body ? the current California legislature. Moreover, the attempted rush-rush passage of this regulation during the last weeks in August when so many people are on vacation is highly questionable. For all these reasons, I oppose the DEEP's proposal to ban the sale of new gas-powered vehicles in Connecticut. Marisa Manley Westport

Comment ID: 614**First Name:** Donna**Last Name:** Wiberg**Commenter Email:** auntdee@duck.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:18:40 PM**Comment:**

Name: Wiberg, Donna Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Do not ban the sale of gas powered vehicles in CT. HERE ARE REASONS WHY: Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to

build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 615

First Name: Drummond

Last Name: Bell

Commenter Email: Dbell1944@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: DCBIII ASSOCIATES, LLC

Commenter Title: President

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:19:36 PM

Comment:

Name: Bell, Drummond Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposal doesn't focus on the total population of or state. The cost to purchase EV are out of the ability for the majority to purchase. Prices will come down, but how will the grid be affected? It can't handle it. Where are the charging stations. How do they affect the grid? It amazes me that such a proposal comes forth at this time without the analysis that gives the public the facts. Take it off the table! Drummond Bell

Comment ID: 616

First Name: Chris

Last Name: Abbott

Commenter Email: abbott_cncd@msn.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Abbott, Chris Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't recall our legislators asking the public for their opinion on this proposed legislation. Last I looked they are supposed to represent the people of this state, not dictate to them. There is no CONCLUSIVE scientific research to substantiate this farcical piece of legislation and I am firmly opposed to it.

Comment ID: 617

First Name: Karen

Last Name: Klemyk

Commenter Email: klem2002@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:22:51 PM

Comment:

Name: Klemyk, Karen Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Excuse me but who died and left our Governor KING and the legislators his puppets to make that decision..... I resent the fact these elected officials feel the need to dictate to me what I can buy and cannot buy to fill their need to bend a knee to the fraudulent worst president and government ever in Washington to push a false agenda such a climate change. We don't listen to the WHO regarding our health and we don't listen to the World elite either.... we have a Constitution and freedom of Rights. We need leaders who love our country not those willing to sell it for their profit.

Comment ID: 618

First Name: Mary-Ellen

Last Name: Cortigiano

Commenter Email: mec543@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:** n/a**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:23:26 PM**Comment:**

Name: Cortigiano, Mary-Ellen Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 the CO2 emissions were lower 3 years ago than today with your EV's Let the consumer make the determination what is best for their businesses and families. I have reservations on this new green idea. Where are the windmills disposed of since they are not biodegradable, are they harming our fishes and whales? Where are the minings taking place for cobalt and lithium and what emissions do they cause if in a foreign country? Where are the peer reviewed studies that show EVs are more efficient and better for our atmosphere? Everything I have read is stating that CO2 emissions are increasing with volcanic eruption and the mining going on around the world. If you were really serious, the only way to go is nuclear energy. Aside from all I have posted, who can afford these electric cars?? Will ALL elected officials in the USA stop flying private, chartered airlines and use only EVs??

Comment ID: 619**First Name:** debi**Last Name:** kuchinski**Commenter Email:** sassy948@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:23:47 PM**Comment:**

Name: kuchinski, debi Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 and if we have another power outage that lasts 10 to 20 days how do we get to work... also electricity may be clean but making electricity isnt.. what do you do with an electric car when there are floods everywhere

Comment ID: 620**First Name:** Christopher**Last Name:** Sullivan**Commenter Email:** pinger1879@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:24:32 PM**Comment:**

Name: Sullivan, Christopher Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Secretary of State Thomas, I writing to you today to ask you to reject the proposed Advanced Clean Cars II regulation. Let me begin by stating that I do believe the State of Connecticut needs to be involved in moving toward alternative automotive fuel solutions. However, I feel that the approach some other states (California, Massachusetts, New York, Etc...) have taken with their regulations, is not in the best interest of their citizens. I believe that Connecticut has the ability to be different and take a more balanced approach. I do know that some of the automotive racing circuits are looking at Carbon Neutral fuels. This at a high-level will release as much carbon into the atmosphere as it takes to produce the fuel. This also doesn't require any enhancements to the existing vehicle. We have the ability to write the regulation in such a way that we diversify our automotive portfolio which will benefit the environment while still allowing the citizens of Connecticut freedom of choice. Thank you for your time and please be open to an alternate solution. Regards, Chris Sullivan Enfield

Comment ID: 621**First Name:** Jan**Last Name:** Schaefer

Commenter Email: jans2@optonline.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:28:57 PM**Comment:**

Name: Schaefer, Jan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing to express my opinion that we should not eliminate or ban the sale of gas powered cars or trucks by 2035 as proposed by the governor. There are many reasons why this is a bad idea. A few are the fact that we do not have the capability to produce the electricity needed to charge the cars, we also do not have the number of charging stations needed and the cost to the consumer and the tax payers of this state is undeterminable. We have people that can hardly afford a gasoline powered car and now we are going to ask them to pay three times more for their cars. In addition, we are not helping our environment as the raw materials for the batteries come from mostly China who is our adversary. This is a bad idea in California and Connecticut!

Comment ID: 622**First Name:** Bonnie**Last Name:** Clark**Commenter Email:** bgcfitness@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Concerned Citizen**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:35:54 PM**Comment:**

Name: Clark, Bonnie Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Banning gas cars has untold negative consequences for CT residents. Electrics can't be "filled" in a few minutes as gas. There won't be enough "charging stations".The cost to charge is so far unknown/unregulated.Car cost/repair/insurance will be higher. Prove me wrong!

Comment ID: 623**First Name:** Michelle**Last Name:** McKee**Commenter Email:** mmckee21@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:37:55 PM**Comment:**

Name: McKee , Michelle Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Gov. Lamont: we are tired of your lies about the climate. Your lies about masks/vaccines and covid policies ruined lives. Let the people decide what car to drive. As you fly around in your private jet and ride in your limo. You are a lying hypocrite. You were elected by the people twice. Do what the people of CT want, not what your talmud following contollers tell you to do. Stop being a puppet.

Comment ID: 624**First Name:** Robert**Last Name:** LOmbard**Commenter Email:** rlombard@lombardford.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Auto Dealer**Commenter Title:** President**Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:40:29 PM

Comment:

Name: LOmbard, Robert Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To all Personnel involved: I am a concerned person in Connecticut. We have all heard that CT is going to follow a few states and the Federal Government with an unattainable law that CT can eliminate the sales of new ICE vehicles by 2035. This is neither a sound nor beneficial law for the citizens of CT. Here are two important questions that must be answered before any such law should even be considered in CT and for that matter every other state in our vast country. 1) When will the power company that supply's our State with electricity be able produce enough electricity from a Carbon Free source? Example-- Nuclear. A carbonfree power source would require starting a major move to Nuclear Power. Unfortunately, the time to get approved from the EPA and the State DEEP would be an undetermined. It is widely known that to design/ build an operational Nuclear Power Plant would be a minimum of 7 years. The likelihood is that it would take 10 years or more. If the State of CT allows the power company to install Modular Mini-Nuclear devices,as is happening worldwide at this time, the time frame for this Nuclear Method could be cut to 4 years for each Plant built.However, CT would need many of these Modular Nuclear sources in our small State to accomplish this move, to reduce the carbon levels in the production of the electricity we will need. Other than Nuclear, there is no other reliable,viable clean power source that can be used to produce enough power to meet the requirements of our state, so that we could make the move to EV vehicles without a detrimental effect to the citizens and economy of Connecticut. 2) How long will it take the power company in CT to revamp the delivery methods and infrastructure to get the huge increase in electrical power to each and every CT resident and business throughout our state? Much of our small state is rural. The power lines in these areas can not handle the extra electrical load required to power our homes and charge our EV vehicles. This in my opinion,is as large a task as developing a Carbon Free Power Source. Do our representatives in CT truly understand the carbon footprint of our current EV's as compared to ICE's and Hybrids? I don't think they do. When you plug in your EV, what source is generating the electrical power currently? The answer is readily available. The majority our States power comes from Natural Gas, a? Fossil Fuel? and other sources of ?fossil fuels?. The smallest percentage comes from Hydro Power and Solar for our State. It is widely known that the mileage range of EV's is much less than the advertised range. I would recommend that you read the article in Automotive News and other investigative reporting of a few weeks ago, to see the deceptions used with Tesla owners, as the service centers were trained to deflect questions from Tesla owners not being able to get the advertised driving range they were sold on, before they purchased their EV. If you own a fuel-efficient ICE vehicle your MPG on the lower side would be 25 MPG,when taking into consideration the larger ICE vehicles on the road as well. When you look at Hybrid vehicles, many attain 40 MPG or more. If your fuel tank only holds 16 gallons, your range is approximately 400 miles with a standard powered ICE. The current cost to the consumer would then be \$60.00 per 400 miles per tank of fuel at the current price of 87 octane at many Gas stations throughout CT. An EV in our State will not average more than 225 miles between charges. You can't go below 10% and rarely can get your EV to 90% charge. The cost for the charge to the consumer with a ?Super Charger?, would be approximately \$55.00 to go 225 miles. That is only 55% of the ICE mentioned above. If you say that yes, it cost more to travel with EV's, but it is Carbon Free and I am saving the environment, that is a blatantly false statement, as the electricity to charge the EV comes from Carbon Producing Fuel at the power plant. By now you should be understanding what is fact. In conclusion, you should readily see, that legislaturer's here in CT and the Federal Government are way out over their skis if they believe we can eliminate ICE sales by 2035. We need to resolve the first two points I made earlier before we as a State or collectively as a Country can make a move to EV's in that short period of time. Let's embrace our current situation by producing more Hybrid-Powered Vehicles that don't require to be plugged in to a power source that is Non-Renewable. This issue can't be resolved in 13 years. We need you, as our representatives to fully understand the reality and not succumb to delusion. I urge you to think, really think about what is being proposed. Regards, Robert Lombard Lombard Ford Inc 385 New Hartford Road Barkhamsted, CT 06063 860-379-3301 Ext 107

Comment ID: 625**First Name:** Dan**Last Name:** Sieban**Commenter Email:** dsieban77@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 05:41:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Sieban, Dan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Bad idea With no REAL solutions

Comment ID: 626

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Delaney

Commenter Email: pdelaney06@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Delaney, Peter Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose any ban on sale of gas cars & trucks

Comment ID: 627

First Name: Steven

Last Name: Dick

Commenter Email: sbdick@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:44:37 PM

Comment:

Name: Dick, Steven Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm against this proposed regulation for the following reasons: 1. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. The necessary infrastructure for non-local driving is not likely to be in place until MANY years beyond the ban on the sale of new gas cars and trucks?in the state by 2035. Hybrid vehicles, especially plug-in hybrids, could be an allowed near term solution. 2. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will result in a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. How will it be paid for?

Comment ID: 628

First Name: Sean

Last Name: Cassano

Commenter Email: smc0317@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:46:01 PM

Comment:

Name: Cassano, Sean Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose any ban from this or any government. I will move out of this state before I let people in the gold dome tell me what I have to drive. Though I doubt anyone will actually read this. We are citizens not servants or slaves any lawmakers in this state have forgotten that.

Comment ID: 629

First Name: JO ANN

Last Name: MASSARO

Commenter Email: novellojoann@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:47:12 PM

Comment:

Name: MASSARO, JO ANN Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Where do you think you're going to get the cobalt and other minerals needed to manufacture EV batteries? Have you researched who is working in the cobalt mines? Can you name anything in an EV that doesn't rely on fossil fuels to manufacture? What about the extra vehicle weight that will damage our infrastructure? Where do the used batteries end up? Is the state going to have a grave yard of old solar panels, broken windmills and useless dead batteries? The residents of Ct. should dictate policy NOT politicians.

Comment ID: 630

First Name: Marie

Last Name: Urbanetti

Commenter Email: marie_ct@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:47:32 PM

Comment:

Name: Urbanetti, Marie Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Rather than banning gas-powered cars to force the adoption of EVs, how about a plan of real incentives to encourage their adoption? How does CT plan to manage the fire hazard EVs pose? Can our roads & bridges handle the extra weight of all these precious mineral-heavy cars? What is being done to ensure access to said minerals/elements long term? Will a replacement battery always cost almost as much as the car itself? What is the plan for mass transit improvements for all the people who can't afford EVs? Please reconsider this ban - we are not ready to manage EV car fires.

Comment ID: 631

First Name: Edmund

Last Name: Ryan

Commenter Email: edmundjryan@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:48:43 PM

Comment:

Name: Ryan, Edmund Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Do not ban or restrict the sale of new gas powered cars.

Comment ID: 632

First Name: David

Last Name: Gregg

Commenter Email: dgregg580@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:51:13 PM

Comment:

Name: Gregg, David Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Why on earth are you considering such crippling regulations on the average citizen? One, you do not have the electrical capacity to enact this legislation which will the following; cause electric rates to soar even more than they are presently, putting every citizen in jeopardy in this state. Who will be able to afford a car, less alone the electricity? The economy will tank in this state with jobs leaving left and right due to additional costs put on business and employees by this nonsense. Besides, as much as you people think you know so much the facts are; Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated

0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. Do you really want a state with the worst economy in the country? You are close if not dead last in many areas already. How can you be so foolish? I already know the answer. Maybe look deep in your mirror tonight and you can know why too.

Comment ID: 633

First Name: Kathy

Last Name: Buckbee

Commenter Email: Kbuckbee@ymail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:52:56 PM

Comment:

Name: Buckbee, Kathy Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 634

First Name: Charles

Last Name: Peabody

Commenter Email: Gerricharlie@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 05:55:28 PM

Comment:

Name: Peabody , Charles Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This I believe is unconstitutional.this countryhas always had choice. We do not want to follow California FAILED energy policies

Comment ID: 635

First Name: Ray

Last Name: Peters

Commenter Email: Rpeters1965@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Self

Commenter Title: Owner

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Peters, Ray Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This government should be pressuring China and India. They are by far and way the polluters. Our air and water quality improves every year. Why must we suffer the overwhelming burden

Comment ID: 636

First Name: Jstar

Last Name: Starz

Commenter Email: Js-money@outlook.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Payer

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:00:05 PM

Comment:

Name: Starz, Jstar Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 You fucking morons are too stupid and lazy to think for yourselves. Why are you following another state. Bring it up to a public vote not make your rulings behind closed doors. The tax payers do not support a ban on gas powered vehicles and equipment. Let the market decide not you idiots.

Comment ID: 637

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Vereneau

Commenter Email: 1974pontlamans@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:02:01 PM

Comment:

Name: Vereneau , Christopher Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't believe that our power grid would be ready for such an undertaking. It would create immediate price increases and availability issues for new and used vehicles. It seems not that long ago that we had issues here of supplying power just a short time ago . I wouldn't want see rolling black outs due to such a rush. Not many people I know believe our power would be able to handle this type of increase in demand.

Comment ID: 638

First Name: George

Last Name: Logan

Commenter Email: rema8@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Rema Ecological Services, LLC

Commenter Title: President/Co-owner

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:03:08 PM

Comment:

Name: Logan, George Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 A ban is not the answer and will have catastrophic effects for those who will not be able to afford electric vehicles, and will result in more environmental harm, in the long-run. The goal should be a gradual, well-thought out, transition, through plug-in hybrid cars, and gas-powered cars with very low emissions (that technology continues to emerge). The goal should be towards human flourishing for all, not just the more affluent. A ban is short-sighted at best. Clear rethinking is necessary.

Comment ID: 639

First Name: Russell

Last Name: Greenberg

Commenter Email: Rgreenberg@altuscapitalpartners.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Altus Capital Partners

Commenter Title: Managing Partner

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:16:31 PM

Comment:

Name: Greenberg , Russell Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 There are many reason not to ban gas cars including it will hurt poorer citizens and second it will increase the high state electric costs. Russell Greenberg

Comment ID: 640

First Name: Marc

Last Name: Lovejoy

Commenter Email: mlovejoy@performancees.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Sales

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:16:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Lovejoy, Marc Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Although, EV are great in a small-scale environment, the ability to scale for mass production and use is not feasible. This is never discussed and always put on the back burner. We barely have enough power for the current grid without adding millions of EV's . to the load and distribution. Also, The ability to mine and refine all the necessary materials is beyond the scope of current technology and far exceeds the power savings gained through EV's.

Comment ID: 642

First Name: Brent

Last Name: Wiltshire

Commenter Email: brent@ruddick.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:19:39 PM

Comment:

Name: Wiltshire, Brent Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric powered cars do not have the same capabilities as gas powered cars, do not limit or ban the use of gas powered cars.

Comment ID: 643

First Name: Nancy

Last Name: Marren

Commenter Email: nbmarren@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Commenting as private citizen

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:20:58 PM

Comment:

Name: Marren, Nancy Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 More information needs to be provided about the impact of electric car mandates, even if it's years from now. Socioeconomic impact and where are these batteries being manufactured, primarily? How biodegradable are batteries? The cost to replace and availability to replace car models that are older? The benefits of electric cars does not out weigh the cost and production issues. What happens if there's a hurricane, fire or other natural disaster? How are people to charge these cars? Hybrid is a possible compromise. Thank you

Comment ID: 644**First Name:** Thomas**Last Name:** Gaipa**Commenter Email:** Tjgaipa@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 06:23:06 PM**Comment:**

Name: Gaipa, Thomas Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While I don't disagree with promoting all electric vehicles I feel unless the state and federal government can guarantee a sufficient and reliable electric supply at an affordable price banning gas powered vehicles is unwise and may put our economy and nations defense at risk
From what I know of how fragile the current electric grid is now It does not appear it will be hardened sufficiently to be relied on Respectfully Thomas Gaipa Southbury

Comment ID: 645**First Name:** Susan**Last Name:** DeAngelis**Commenter Email:** suedangelis@live.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: DeAngelis, Susan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Gas Vehicle Ban - VOTE NO! The proposed BAN on the sale of new gas cars and trucks by 2035 is not a well-thought-out concept and extremely burdensome to ALL Connecticut residents! - Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. - On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. How are we to afford transportation? - Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. - There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? - Upgrading to a dedicated home car charger is another added expense to the average homeowner. - How are CT residents who don't have a garage or driveway supposed to charge their vehicles at home? - What about renters and landlords? A landlord with 2-3 or more renters would have a burdensome cost to supply charging stations. - Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. Again, more costs for the overburdened taxed CT residents. - How is the average CT taxpayer (in the low and low middle class incomes) supposed to afford an EV? Our incomes are not going up. Inflation has taken a hold and we have less in our pockets. - We live in an area where there are a lot of classic cars. My husband owns one. This proposed ban would crush the many classic car enthusiasts in our state. These cars are Sunday drives and it would devastate an entire hobby industry. PLEASE DO NOT BAN GAS VEHICLES. DON'T TURN US INTO CALIFORNIA!

Comment ID: 646**First Name:** Jason**Last Name:** Van Czak**Commenter Email:** Jvanczak@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:**

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:28:34 PM

Comment:

Name: Van Czak , Jason Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Requiring electric vehicle sales is a poorly thought out strategy. Electric vehicles do not have the infrastructure, are incredibly expensive, a cost burden on top of home costs to upgrade charging, and are unproven regarding battery life in cold conditions. All this will do is make owning a vehicle unachievable for middle or lower classes in this state. Not everyone can afford a 40k vehicle. You people are wildly out of touch. If you think California is some sort of model to follow, just ask them why everyone is leaving. Wake up

Comment ID: 647

First Name: Maria

Last Name: LoRusso

Commenter Email: October26th@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:35:49 PM

Comment:

Name: LoRusso, Maria Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. EV also do hold their value because of the expense of replacing batteries.

Comment ID: 648

First Name: Nancy

Last Name: Johnston

Commenter Email: jnancy599@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Johnston, Nancy Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We do not need or want electric cars and trucks.... Mr Lamont.....maybe you can afford them ... we don't want this thank you.....!!!

Comment ID: 649

First Name: Dale

Last Name: Bennett

Commenter Email: drbenn1776@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:44:25 PM

Comment:

Name: Bennett, Dale Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is not a good solution to any problem, perceived or real, for several reasons. We do not have an energy grid to support the huge energy demands of a large fleet of electric vehicles. CT, as well as other states, have often had "rolling blackouts", especially in the summer, because we can barely support the existing demands of business and industry, as well as CT residents. Even if we had a huge increase in electricity production, we don't have the infrastructure to deliver it, as existing power lines have been pushed to the maximum. And where would a huge additional increase in electricity come from? Solar power? Seriously? Energy can't be created, only transferred. It has to come from somewhere. And in New

England there is hardly the energy density from the sun under the best conditions. And finally, it will hurt the middle and lower classes the most, as they can not afford electric vehicles, or the inevitable costs of maintenance, like replacement batteries.

Comment ID: 650

First Name: Linda

Last Name: Iazzetta

Commenter Email: lindajoyceiaz@aim.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:45:04 PM

Comment:

Name: Iazzetta, Linda Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 What's the situation with bidirectional charging batteries? Are we getting set up to have our every move be controlled? Is this the end plan? Excerpt in brackets: (Not only does California want to require that all new vehicles sold in the Golden State are electric by 2035, it also wants all light-duty vehicles and school buses sold there to have "bidirectional charging" by model year 2030. Bidirectional charging means that while your electric vehicle is plugged in to charge, if California needs it, it can take the energy stored in your battery and return it to the electrical grid. Imagine the surprise when you go to bed thinking your electric pick-up truck will be fully charged for a long-haul business trip the next day, only to find when you wake up that the government has taken your electricity back. Some people think that California's blackout problems mean that it should not require EVs, as they just drain more power from an already overtaxed grid. But State Sen. Nancy Skinner, D-Berkeley, is sponsoring a bidirectional charging mandate bill because she believes that energy stored in Californians' batteries will solve the state's energy shortage. Skinner said, "The battery capacity in today's electric vehicles give them the potential to be mini power plants on wheels. That's crucial as California continues to face unprecedented impacts from climate change, including record heatwaves, wildfires, and destructive storms that can lead to power outages." Some vehicles, including the Nissan Leaf, the Hyundai Ioniq 5, and the Ford F-150 Lightning, already have such bidirectional charging systems. Skinner's bill has passed the Senate and three committees in the State Assembly. If it passes the State Assembly, Gov. Gavin Newsom will likely sign it into law. Last September, he called the technology a "game changer" and said that "this is the future." The bill also includes the ability for the state to require other types of vehicles to have bidirectional charging systems at the discretion of the California Air Resources Board without the passage of a new law. If the state's power problems are not solved with electricity from cars and school buses, it can draw down electricity from tractors, public transit buses, and trucks. Carbuzz has calculated that "a 60 kWh EV battery [a typical electric vehicle battery] can provide backup power to the average US household for two to three days." But that doesn't absolve the state's largest power company, Pacific Gas and Electric, of the responsibility to provide power to homes. People should not have to choose between transportation needs, such as going to work or taking someone to the doctor, and keeping their refrigerators and home heating operating. Bidirectional charging changes the concept of the right to personal mobility and property rights. If EV owners in California must return the electricity in their car batteries to the grid during power shortages, they don't truly own the energy in their EVs. In essence, the state has the power to tell them when to travel. It also has the power to tell them where to travel, because the state is setting up the network of electric charging stations. This vast attempt at industrial regulation is meant to reduce global temperatures. But even getting rid of all American fossil fuel emissions would only reduce global temperatures by 0.2 degrees Celsius by 2100, according to government models, because increases in emissions are coming from China, Russia, India, Africa, and Latin America.) Diana Furchtgott-Roth The Daily Signal

Comment ID: 651

First Name: Carolyn

Last Name: Gerrity

Commenter Email: cmgerrity@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:52:43 PM

Comment:

Name: Gerrity, Carolyn Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No to Proposed Regulation Concerning:
 Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The grid will not be ready for all electric vehicles in 2035
 and electricity relies on fossil fuels.

Comment ID: 652

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Morin

Commenter Email: Jennmbean@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:57:54 PM

Comment:

Name: Morin, Jennifer Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm all for saving the environment but banning the
 sale of gas cars is insane. Firstly, there are almost no places to charge electric vehicles. Secondly, we do not have
 enough strength in our electricity grid to deal with all the power needed for so many electric vehicles! We still have
 brown outs and issues many times during the year! I can see having privileges transportation and maybe school
 busses be "green" but removing all gas cars sales will hurt not help. They are crazy expensive!? Even adding
 "incentives" to help with costs won't be enough. How will did that work with solar panels? They are still struggling
 to get people to sign up for that. And the ebikes? Please, we are already paying so much in electrical costs. Stop
 adding to it

Comment ID: 653

First Name: Erin

Last Name: Jones

Commenter Email: ejones14@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Owner/operator of home remodeling company

Posted Date: 08/21/23 06:58:58 PM

Comment:

Name: Jones, Erin Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposal is riddled with problems. First,
 majority cannot afford electric vehicles. Second, we do not have the infrastructure in place to meet demand if this
 were to happen as well as most homes/residences are not equipped with appropriate equipment nor required power
 in their homes. This doesn't even begin to address apartments, etc.. And lastly, I should have the freedom to
 purchase whatever vehicle I see fit for myself or my business, not have it dictated to me!!

Comment ID: 654

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Morus

Commenter Email: morus.michael@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 07:04:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Morus, Michael Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I find the idea of forcing citizens of this state to
 buy electric cars after 2035, to be outrageous. We already have some of the highest utility costs in the country, and
 they will only go up. I also think that no one is taking into account the costs of making sure individuals have the
 infrastructure in their personal homes to support fast charging. How are we supposed to buy a vehicle for
 \$60,000.00, which is the cost of one that has 300 miles in range, and then spend an additional \$6000.00 to \$8000.00

for the fast charging system? That cost does not include the price of upgrading your electrical panel if it's needed. How are people who live in rural areas supposed to afford a car that can serve them well, based on the distances they must drive daily? Should we all be punished for not living in an urban setting? We should stop trying to mimic other states, and consider the needs of our citizens.

Comment ID: 655

First Name: Hope

Last Name: Maruzo

Commenter Email: nadiezhda@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 07:05:08 PM

Comment:

Name: Maruzo, Hope Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 656

First Name: FAITH

Last Name: HAM

Commenter Email: FAITHHAM@OUTLOOK.COM

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 07:08:14 PM

Attachments:

dr-evil-mini-me.pdf

Comment:

Name: HAM, FAITH Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Between 2001 and 2013, I, a Connecticut native, lived in California. Somewhere along the way, I began noticing a most disturbing phenomenon. Connecticut, like a fawning, obsequious little sibling, started copying California in everything it did. The corollary was so uncanny, I started laughing with friends and family that California and Connecticut had become the states' version of Dr. Evil and Mini Me. Thank you, Ned Lamont, Katie Dykes, DEEP, and our General Assembly, for underscoring my point. Your proposal to curb and then ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles smack of the worst excesses of Totalitarianism. You have yet to made a case to the general public that electric cars are the smart choice for the environment or for their pocketbooks. Had you, we all would have made the switch by now and would not have needed to have our wills twisted to accommodate your altruistic fantasies. Consider this: in the past week, we've learned that CT has lost 41,000 from the workforce between 2020 and now, and its own homegrown telecommunications company, Frontier, has announced it's joining the legions of major corporations saying, "Sayonara, CT! We're outta here." Good job, folks! A pat on the back to all of you! I love my home state. It is beautiful. But it cannot compare to California. People will forever flock there, if for nothing more than the gorgeous, seemingly infinite coastline or awe-inspiring mountains. Connecticut's only attraction to the outside world -- once -- was its favorable economic environment that lured business and their employees, who eventually came to see what a gem this state is. If you insist on following the Golden State on its suicidal road to ruin, you will succeed in destroying your middle class who depend on those reliable, easily filled gas-guzzling clunkers to get to the jobs that drive our economy. Do you really want that as your legacy? Oh, but wait. You, by pushing these deadlines well into

the future, will be enjoying your retirements in sunny, free-market Florida when these roosters come home to roost. Nice.

Comment ID: 657

First Name: Sean

Last Name: McDonough

Commenter Email: seantmcdonough40@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Pratt Whitney

Commenter Title: Inspector

Posted Date: 08/21/23 07:12:50 PM

Comment:

Name: McDonough, Sean Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Plenty of ways to make all gas powered vehicles zero emissions instead of overly expensive electric vehicles with batteries you can never get rid of and are 1000 times more hazardous to the planet. I see trillion dollar lawsuits written all over these proposals. Not to mention the irreversible damage to the planet.

Comment ID: 658

First Name: Kenneth

Last Name: Brandon

Commenter Email: Kenbrandon@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Design

Commenter Title: Director

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Brandon, Kenneth Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am reaching out to express concern and displeasure regarding any legislative action that prohibits or limits the freedom of choice in the 'constitution' state. Not only is this governmental action unconstitutional, it is also unrealistic and frankly a move for the uneducated in both the electrical industry, auto industry and economics 101. There is a mountain of problems you are setting up to collide with. The grid doesn't even come close to handling that kind of electrical demand. It cannot handle 5% of all cars nevermind 100%. The electric cars are inferior in a multitude of ways including bad for the environment. The research, published in Nano Energy, identified more than Research has shown around 100 toxic gases released by lithium-ion batteries including carbon monoxide. The gases are potentially fatal and can cause strong irritations to the skin, eyes and nasal passages and harm environment. And we all know about spontaneous fires from the batteries (Remember the buses?) What about the batteries when they are past their re-use? Landfill. My message is the technology is not there yet, and honestly far from it. Performance is inferior (runs out and you are stuck), charging takes way too long (hours for 80% charge), costs are high (9-12k for a charge unit in your garage, oh and would if you don't have a garage?), the grid cannot support it, what could go wrong here? Economy would be at serious risk and CT would be the laughing stock right behind California. Actually, they are having major issues as it is, we should be careful of what state we mentor. The only thing worst than making the obvious mistake with all this information, would be seeing it fail in another state and doing it anyway. #1 economical reason: MAJORITY OF PEOPLE DO NOT WANT EVs! CT is simply too smart for this type of shallow thinking.

Comment ID: 659

First Name: Neil

Last Name: Ballotte

Commenter Email: neilballotte@msn.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Ballotte, Neil Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Let the free market decide what kind of car or truck that we want to drive. Thank you.

Comment ID: 660

First Name: Raym

Last Name: Mugno

Commenter Email: mugnor1@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Mugno, Raym Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not enact this "legislation." It will do almost nothing to help and much to hurt the citizens of Connecticut. In addition to the economic hardship it will cause, especially to those struggling financially, it will drive others away from the state. How is it possible that in a ?democracy? this decision is left to a non-elected official?

Comment ID: 661

First Name: Stephanie

Last Name: Edmonds

Commenter Email: sreddie19@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Edmonds, Stephanie Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The idea that electric vehicles are ?zero-emission? is rooted in a deceptive narrative that ignores all pollutants which don't come out of a tailpipe. Assessing the environmental impacts of energy technologies requires measuring all forms of pollution they emit over their entire lives, not a narrow slice of them. To do this, researchers perform ?life cycle assessments? or LCAs. As explained by the Environmental Protection Agency, LCAs allow for: the estimation of the cumulative environmental impacts resulting from all stages in the product life cycle, often including impacts not considered in more traditional analyses (e.g., raw material extraction, material transportation, ultimate product disposal, etc.). By including the impacts throughout the product life cycle, LCA provides a comprehensive view of the environmental aspects of the product or process and a more accurate picture of the true environmental trade-offs in product and process selection. LCAs are subject to multiple levels of uncertainty, but an assessment published by the Journal of Cleaner Production in 2021 shatters the notion that electric cars are cleaner than conventional ones, much less ?zero emission.? The LCA found that manufacturing, charging, operating, and disposing of electric vehicles produces more of every major category of pollutants than conventional cars. This includes: An increase in fine particulate matter formation (26%), human carcinogenic (20%) and non-carcinogenic toxicity (61%), terrestrial ecotoxicity (31%), freshwater ecotoxicity (39%), and marine ecotoxicity (41%) relative to petrol vehicles. Foreshadowing that result, a 2018 report by the European Environment Agency warned that studies on the ?human toxicity impacts? of electric vehicles were ?limited? and that electric cars ?could be responsible for greater negative impacts? than conventional cars. Similarly, a 2018 article in the journal Environmental Research Letters stated that a failure to account for the ?environmental implications? of mining lithium to make batteries for electric cars ?would directly counter the intent? of ?incentivizing electric vehicle adoption? and ?needs to be urgently addressed.? The 2021 paper in the Journal of Cleaner Production has now addressed this issue, and it shows electric cars emit more toxic pollution than gasoline-powered cars. switching to electric cars transfers pollution from urbanites in wealthy nations to poor countries that mine and manufacture their components and to communities with power plants and disposal sites. In the words of the 2021 paper in the Journal of Cleaner Production, this ?transfer of environmental burdens? causes ?workers and ecosystems in third countries? to be ?exposed to higher rates of toxic substances.? China dominates the global supply chains for green energy components not merely because of cheap labor but because they have lax environmental standards that tolerate the pollution these products create. Thus, China supplies

78% of the world's solar cells, 80% of the world's lithium-ion battery chemicals, and 73% of the world's finished battery cells. Highlighting the implications of China's role in supplying critical minerals for the global energy transition, a 2022 study by the Brookings Institute found that continued reliance on China will increase the risk that sourcing of critical minerals will cause or contribute to serious social or environmental harms. It also documents that the U.S. and other wealthy nations have been unwilling to accept these harms on their own soils. Electric vehicles emit pollutants from road, tire, and brake wear, and these forms of pollution are worse in electric vehicles than standard cars. Per a 2016 paper in the journal Atmospheric Environment, Electric vehicles are 24% heavier than their conventional counterparts, and this creates more non-exhaust emissions like tire wear, brake wear, road surface wear and resuspension of road dust. Carbon dioxide (CO2) is the primary greenhouse gas emitted by human activity, and the 2021 paper in the Journal of Cleaner Production found that electric cars emit 48% less CO2 than gasoline-powered ones. Although this is lower, it is still far from zero-emission. Moreover, a study published by the Ifo Institute of Germany in 2019 found that an electric Tesla Model 3 emits 11% to 28% more CO2 over its lifespan than a diesel Mercedes C220D. Again, LCAs are subject to uncertainty, and no single study is an end-all, but this clearly proves that electric vehicles are far from emission-free. With no regard for those facts, Gavin Newsom asserts that California now has a groundbreaking, world-leading plan to achieve 100% zero-emission vehicle sales that will help solve this climate crisis. Contrary to Newsom's claim of a climate crisis, a wide array of environmental and human welfare measures related to climate change have stayed level or improved for more than three decades. This includes foliage productivity, extinction rates, forest cover, agricultural production, coastal flooding, rainfall and droughts, hurricanes, tornadoes, and extreme weather fatalities. These empirical facts refute more than 30 years of failed predictions by global warming alarmists. Newsom then adds another layer of deception by stating that the plan reduces dangerous carbon emissions that pollute our communities. This misportrays CO2 as a toxic, dirty substance. In reality, it is an organic, colorless, non-carcinogenic gas that has no toxic effects on humans until concentrations exceed at least 6 times the level in Earth's atmosphere. Referring to CO2 as carbon is also unscientific. That's because CO2 is not carbon, just like H2O (water) is not hydrogen. There are more than 10 million different carbon compounds, and calling CO2 carbon conflates this relatively innocuous gas with highly noxious substances like carbon monoxide and black carbon. In summary, there is no reliable evidence that greenhouse gas reductions from electric cars will benefit anyone. This move to ban the sale of gas-powered cars will benefit only those in the electric car industry and sew more distrust among the people of this state.

Comment ID: 662

First Name: Hugh

Last Name: Schoelzel

Commenter Email: aerohugh@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Schoelzel, Hugh Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Get a grip, the average person kn CT cannot afford this. Those who can will have sacrifice other spending, which will crash our economy. Why are you not taking intermediate steps until we have the grid to support this? A far better idea is something like hybrids or plug-in hybrids.

Comment ID: 664

First Name: anne

Last Name: defusco

Commenter Email: bdefusco007@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: defusco, anne Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 eliminated gas engine cars will not have any

material effect on the global climate, most middle class americans cant afford a electric vehicle, electricity in CT is powered by natural gas so we will just need to burn more natural gas to meet this increased demand. I dont agree that any taxpayer money so go towards improving the electric vehicle infrastructure

Comment ID: 665

First Name: Friso

Last Name: Hermans

Commenter Email: hermans4@earthlink.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Citizens Climate Lobby

Commenter Title: Liaison

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Hermans, Friso Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am very much in favor of legislation that encourages the green energy transition, and makes the move to electric vehicles happen more quickly. Connecticut is out of compliance with the clear air standards, and also with the climate goals that the state of CT itself has set. This bill is a step in the direction of meeting those commitments. The health of our citizens depends on it, both in terms of clean air and in terms of our long-term climate.

Comment ID: 666

First Name: Christa

Last Name: Berthold

Commenter Email: christaanna@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Berthold, Christa Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Who can afford an electric car? Who has the time to charge one? How can our electric grid support all those cars and trucks? When we have a power outage how are we going to function without any electricity? How are EMTs or Firefighters going to charge their vehicles? What are you planning to do with the old batteries? We are supposed to go green but you don't care about the children in China and other countries who are mining the minerals needed for the batteries. Bureaucrats and environmentalists have all these great ideas but do not consider the consequences. Windpower and solar cannot supply all the electricity needed in this country and China is very busy building new coal plants. We will be getting poorer and poorer but the ones up on top will get richer and richer. It is disgusting what you are trying to do to us taxpaying citizens.

Comment ID: 667

First Name: William

Last Name: Donahue

Commenter Email: wmdonahue5@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Donahue, William Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not ban gasoline powered vehicles, this will put an undue burden on middle class earners. We cannot afford an electric car. Plus Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan

to create this energy. Plus as it is right now when we have really hot days you tell us not to use energy and turn our A/C off because the grid cannot handle the high demand/use. What do you think will happen when everyone is charging their cars? There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. Plus they catch fire and will burn your garage and house down. Think people think!

Comment ID: 668

First Name: Irene

Last Name: Borton

Commenter Email: irenelborton@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Borton, Irene Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 CT has done well with emissions; we have improved over the years, we live or thought we lived in a free country. We don't even have the infrastructure to support electric cars. Why are we supporting CHINA with lithium batteries, which uses slave labor from Africa (as young as 5 year old) to mine for cobalt, which is needed to make lithium batteries in CHINA. I just don't understand why we are selling out our own country. Still haven't even figured out the fires that are related to electric buses and cars to put them out? Where do these poisonous batteries go once, they die. What happen to our personal freedom? This is a disaster waiting to happen. We need a government in CT that thinks for themselves, stop copying NY and CA. NO to electric cars being the only option. t

Comment ID: 669

First Name: Rick

Last Name: Aiello

Commenter Email: rick_aiello@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: N/A

Commenter Title: N/A

Posted Date:

Attachments:

NO to the ban on gas-powered cars.pdf

Comment:

Name: Aiello, Rick Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I say ?NO to the ban on gas-powered cars?. See the attached.

Comment ID: 670

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Jochim

Commenter Email: robert.jochim@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Jochim, Robert Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered

cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 671

First Name: Laura

Last Name: DePonte

Commenter Email: Laraka9@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: East Haven Teacher Union

Commenter Title: Teacher

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: DePonte, Laura Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against banning gas cars. Not everyone can afford to change.

Comment ID: 672

First Name: david

Last Name: mazzei

Commenter Email: davewhcl@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: mazzei, david Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Limiting the sale of gas powered vehicles without sound scientific proof of the efficacy of such a ban is unwise. Increasing the population dependency on the Electric Grid which is an unknown quantity at this point, not to mention the effects of attacks by bad actors is foolhardy. The Economic impact on those of limited or fixed Incomes will be catastrophic.

Comment ID: 674

First Name: William

Last Name: Byrne

Commenter Email: wilbot@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:14:10 PM

Comment:

Name: Byrne, William Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello, The consideration of banning the sale of fossil fuel automobiles is insane. Fossil fuels provide reliable and a relatively cheap energy source for internal combustion engines. All electric vehicles are not reliable, they have no real range, they are expensive as is the electricity to power them. The batteries are expensive and the components required to make them are located in places not friendly to the USA. The environmental impact in the lithium mining process is terrible, and there just aren't enough lithium deposits known to exist worldwide to create even a fraction of the required batteries to power even a US fleet of all electric vehicles. Disposal of worn out batteries is yet another hazardous task. Our power grid is laughable as it is presently, with natural gas and coal power plants being phased out and destroyed, what is to take the place of generated electricity - wind and solar? Two more expensive, unreliable, unpractical and toxic designs that will never come close to filling the staggering increase that will be required for the dramatic increase in

generation that will be required for all electric vehicles. No new nuclear or hydroelectric plants are even considered yet they are the only other practical and effective options for generation. Our air quality is better than ever yet the goalposts for clean air are pushed farther and farther continuously. The cry of late is that we have too much carbon dioxide in the air, a byproduct of all animals. Allegations of "global warming" (aka "the weather") are a result of this supposed crisis. Higher co2 levels in the air fuel growth of all plant life which in turn produces more oxygen for us to breathe. If co2 is such a terrible gas, why has the federal government mandated every person who drives a vehicle built after 1974 to pump co2 into the air? The use of catalytic converters does this very thing to our air to date. Lastly, has anyone looked into the massive lithium ion battery failure and fire rate? People in many locations are not allowed to park them in garages out of fear of spontaneous battery combustion. The amount of water required to put these fires out is staggering, I read recently a fire in Massachusetts recently required 11,000 gallons of water! Isn't water a precious commodity? How can dictating electrical power only to power our vehicles on a presently marginal power grid that is currently being weakened by mandates which are stifling our generation capabilities benefit anyone in the real world? The cost of electricity will skyrocket unlike never before because there will be NO hope of generation ever coming close to the requirement of an all electric fleet. This shameless attempt to BAN fossil fuel appears to be a deliberate attempt to destroy the USA in every way. We will become a 3rd world nation following this path while China, the country who presently has influence over most of the lithium deposits worldwide builds new coal power plants to meet their needs, laughing at us while we, the greatest, most prosperous and free society commits suicide. Is this the ultimate goal in the name of "global warming?" Thank you for your time, William Byrne

Comment ID: 675

First Name: Theresa

Last Name: Burzawa

Commenter Email: Tburzawa@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:14:17 PM

Comment:

Name: Burzawa, Theresa Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No to electric cars!!!!!! I rather have hybrid cars which I have one now doesn't use much gas and it charges the batteries as the car brakes, also the motor shuts off when I stop.

Comment ID: 676

First Name: Maureen

Last Name: Boylan

Commenter Email: mboylan52@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:14:37 PM

Comment:

Name: Boylan, Maureen Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Enough is enough what maybe right for California doesn't mean its right for CT. Big brother needs to stay out of the personal lives of everyday Americans

Comment ID: 677

First Name: Jose

Last Name: Niell

Commenter Email: jniell@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:19:03 PM

Comment:

Name: Niell, Jose Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to this blatant interference of the government in the decisions of the people. Such a mandate will have bad consequences for the people. The costs to carry merchandises from producer to consumer will increase. The safety of the electric vehicles is not proven. There are reports of spontaneous explosions with no clear evidence of cause. Electric vehicles consume energy that has to be created from fossil fuels. The manufacture of those vehicles use rare materials, some of them hard and expensive to obtain. It is a bad idea and totally against the individual rights of a free people. Even more, it is a dictatorial idea.

Comment ID: 678

First Name: Don

Last Name: Watterworth

Commenter Email: 4stringbassmonster@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:19:34 PM

Comment:

Name: Watterworth, Don Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly urge you to reconsider banning gas powered vehicles in CT. It seems preposterous that CT would simply follow CA direction on a matter of this importance. It makes our grand state appear to be child like in aping its west coast sibling. No matter what the rational is for mimicking CA, CT needs to look to its own uniqueness and the needs of its citizens on a matter of such significance. Banning gas powered vehicles will have a monumental effect on the people of our state, raising prices for consumer goods to levels unaffordable for many of our citizens. You should also be more transparent about the process and provide for a full, unrestricted public hearing. The current plan seems restrictive and designed to limit public input. This matter is too important not to give our citizens and business community all the opportunity they deserve to voice their opinions.

Comment ID: 679

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Rohland

Commenter Email: chris.rohland@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:26:47 PM

Attachments:

Testimony regarding Proposed Regulation Concerning Advanced Clean Cars II.pdf

Comment:

Name: Rohland, Christopher Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please find the attached PDF file with written comments regarding Proposed Regulation Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II.

Comment ID: 680

First Name: Jack

Last Name: Potter

Commenter Email: jack_potter@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:27:42 PM

Comment:

Name: Potter, Jack Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a constituent with asthma, I believe it is

important that we do what we can to lower greenhouse gas emissions as soon as possible. To not do so would be negligent to everyone, especially communities that are already disproportionately impacted by emissions. Not addressing this issue would also likely result in much more money spent addressing the health consequences than if the issue were dealt with prior. As someone who has asthma, I do not want to know what having an emissions-induced asthma attack would be like. Thank you for your time.

Comment ID: 681

First Name: Carolyn

Last Name: Woodberry

Commenter Email: cwoodberry@icloud.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:30:47 PM

Comment:

Name: Woodberry, Carolyn Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly against the limits being placed on gas powered vehicles that is proposed by this regulation. This form of government intrusion into private industry should not be allowed. In addition, such regulations will only increase the cost of purchasing an automobile by hard-working people who are already strapped for funds.

Comment ID: 682

First Name: Catherine

Last Name: Vlasto

Commenter Email: cvlasto@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:47:17 PM

Comment:

Name: Vlasto, Catherine Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose the proposed regulation concerning Advanced Clean Cars II. There has not been sufficient and effectively proven alternatives to electric powered cars. The state and our country are not putting enough alternatives in place in order for people to feel comfortable choosing those options. How are electric car batteries recycled? We need more safety studies. How is the lithium mined? Why is it a better option? How do we charge electric cars when we have power outages in our state for days on end? We simply do not have the infrastructure in place for electric cars yet. Spend time and energy in putting those in place instead of creating fear in the public. We need to have a choice of what kind of car we can use. As a social worker, I also find this proposal in direct competition with the notion of creating equality for all as far as affordability is concerned. How is a teenager, a legal immigrant, a retired senior on a fixed income, and many others supposed to be able to afford buying an electric vehicle? How can they afford that car insurance?

Comment ID: 683

First Name: Lisa

Last Name: Cocco

Commenter Email: equimarc@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:50:28 PM

Comment:

Name: Cocco, Lisa Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Nothing like putting the cart before the horse. 1 - you have allowed the electric companies to rape the consumers to the point of not being able to afford their electric bills. 2 - now you want to ask them to purchase a vehicle that is significantly more expensive than a gas version. 3 -

then you want them to pay the additional electricity to charge this vehicle. 4 - what happens then when our already overtaxed electric grid crashes leaving millions with no power??? 5 - then you want to install charging stations, at the expense of the taxpayer who already can't afford the above. 6 - what do you think is going to happen to all those batteries when they don't charge any more? You are cutting off your nose to spite your face and don't even see this. All these questions need to be addressed and solved before you require everyone to purchase these vehicles. Otherwise you are just creating a bigger problem than the one you think you are solving. I believe any intelligent person can see this. Can this really be beyond the intelligence of our governor? And other elected officials?? If so, you all need to be removed from your positions because you are clearly not acting in the best interests of the citizens of CT.

Comment ID: 684

First Name: Carl

Last Name: Bristol

Commenter Email: Carlwbristol@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:53:09 PM

Comment:

Name: Bristol, Carl Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I don't want to be limited in my choice of vehicle. And I don't think the State will be ready and willing to spend the money to support the infrastructure required.

Comment ID: 685

First Name: Joseph

Last Name: Wierzbicki

Commenter Email: joewierzbicki516@icloud.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 08:54:56 PM

Comment:

Name: Wierzbicki, Joseph Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Credit goes to Mr. Boudreau for the following: I strongly urge you to reconsider banning gas powered vehicles in CT. It seems preposterous that CT would simply follow CA direction on a matter of this importance. It makes our grand state appear to be child like in aping its west coast sibling. No matter what the rational is for mimicking CA, CT needs to look to its own uniqueness and the needs of its citizens on a matter of such significance. Banning gas powered vehicles will have a monumental effect on the people of our state, raising prices for consumer goods to levels unaffordable for many of our citizens. You should also be more transparent about the process and provide for a full, unrestricted public hearing. The current plan seems restrictive and designed to limit public input. This matter is too important not to give our citizens and business community all the opportunity they deserve to voice their opinions. Credit for talking points go to Yankee Institute: Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 686

First Name: antonia

Last Name: pike

Commenter Email: tpike101941@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:01:24 PM

Comment:

Name: pike, antonia Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am AGAINST a ban on any vehicle that runs on gas. Forcing people to purchase only electric vehicles by 2035 is imposing unwanted government regulation on anyone opposing the ban.

Comment ID: 687

First Name: Stewart

Last Name: MacMillan

Commenter Email: stew86@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:11:42 PM

Comment:

Name: MacMillan, Stewart Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please, we will not have enough charging facilities or economical vehicle choices to adopt such a ban. The legislature should make these decisions, not the executive branch of government

Comment ID: 688

First Name: Sandy

Last Name: marek

Commenter Email: e51rm1@msn.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:15:56 PM

Comment:

Name: marek, Sandy Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am very much against this

Comment ID: 689

First Name: Douglas

Last Name: Wenz

Commenter Email: dwenz17@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Wenz, Douglas Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be

spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. As elected officials it is not your job to control every aspect of our lives. This is sickening and it continues to happen with the same left winged officials in this state. At what point do you stop this nonsense?

Comment ID: 690

First Name: Bill

Last Name: Flenke

Commenter Email: retire1@duck.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: N/A

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:20:49 PM

Comment:

Name: Flenke, Bill Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Low income and middle income residents can not afford the cost of an electric vehicles. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? The power grid will have difficulty supporting the demand created by electric vehicles. Look at California right now with rolling black-outs. Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 691

First Name: Dan

Last Name: Zaborowski

Commenter Email: dzaborowski@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Zaborowski, Dan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This government has yet to find out why EV's are catching fire and I for one would never own one I do feel Ct is doing its best with emission checks which would enable those vehicles that are polluting the air to be removed from the road

Comment ID: 692

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Lundy

Commenter Email: ehutchine@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:27:49 PM

Comment:

Name: Lundy, Elizabeth Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose the passing of any regulation concerning the Advanced Clean Cars II legislation. Gas-powered cars have been the backbone of the automotive industry for over a century, and they continue to offer numerous advantages that make them a viable and valuable option for consumers. While electric vehicles (EVs) have gained prominence in recent years, gas-powered cars still have

several strong points that make them a worthy choice for many individuals: Infrastructure and Convenience: Gasoline refueling infrastructure is well-established and readily available in most parts of the world. This makes it convenient for drivers to refuel their vehicles quickly and easily, without having to worry about finding charging stations or the time required for electric charging. Range and Long-Distance Travel: Gas-powered cars typically offer longer driving ranges compared to many electric vehicles. This is crucial for people who frequently engage in long-distance travel or live in areas with limited charging infrastructure. Gas-powered cars are better suited for road trips, vacations, and rural areas where charging stations might be scarce. Quick Refueling: Gasoline refueling is a relatively quick process. It takes only a few minutes to fill up a gas tank, whereas charging an electric vehicle can take significantly longer. This is advantageous for individuals with busy schedules or those who rely on their vehicles for work-related tasks. Vehicle Variety and Choice: The automotive industry has invested decades in developing and perfecting gas-powered vehicle technology. This has resulted in an extensive range of vehicle types, sizes, and models that cater to different preferences and needs of consumers. From compact cars to heavy-duty trucks, there's a gas-powered vehicle for nearly every purpose. Affordability: Gasoline-powered cars often come with a lower upfront cost compared to their electric counterparts. While EV technology is advancing, it can still come with a higher price tag due to the cost of batteries and electric drivetrain components. Gas-powered cars offer an affordable option for consumers who might not be ready to make the switch to electric due to budget constraints. Technology Improvements: Gasoline-powered cars have not stood still in terms of technological advancements. Many modern gas-powered vehicles feature improved fuel efficiency, reduced emissions, and innovative features like hybrid technology that combines gas and electric power to achieve better efficiency. Performance: Gasoline-powered cars continue to offer high-performance options for enthusiasts and individuals who prioritize acceleration, top speed, and handling characteristics. While electric vehicles have made great strides in terms of acceleration, gas-powered cars still dominate in certain performance-oriented segments. Transition Period: As the automotive industry transitions toward cleaner technologies, such as hybrids and hydrogen-powered vehicles, gas-powered cars can serve as a bridge. These transitional technologies offer reduced emissions and better fuel efficiency without requiring the complete overhaul of existing infrastructure. In conclusion, gas-powered cars remain a practical and viable choice for consumers due to their well-established infrastructure, convenience, long driving ranges, quick refueling, vehicle variety, affordability, technological improvements, performance offerings, and their role as a transitional solution toward greener alternatives. While electric vehicles are becoming more popular, gas-powered cars continue to meet the needs of a diverse range of drivers and play a significant role in the global automotive landscape.

Comment ID: 693

First Name: Anthony

Last Name: Cardinale

Commenter Email: tonyc1791@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:29:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Cardinale, Anthony Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a drastic totalitarian step.

Comment ID: 694

First Name: Mary

Last Name: Juber

Commenter Email: maryjub@juno.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:47:08 PM

Comment:

Name: Juber, Mary Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello, The proposal to ban the sales of gas-powered cars is poorly thought-out and premature. Even if gas-powered vehicles contributed to so-called "climate change," it is not possible to restrict Connecticut residents to unaffordable and problem-ridden EV's. This decision

would punish the average citizen. EV's are impractical to operate and recharge. Please do not follow the radical and ill-conceived agenda of California, a state in desperate financial straits, unless you wish Connecticut to fail as well. This will be yet another reason for many of us to decide to leave Connecticut for states with sane policies.
Sincerely, Mary Juber, D.V.M.

Comment ID: 695

First Name: Polly

Last Name: Bader

Commenter Email: pjbader@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:57:06 PM

Comment:

Name: Bader, Polly Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not support this proposed regulation: Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars and will require costly resident upgrades to accommodate charging. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy needed in the state and region. There is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? The product is not good enough and the benefits too small in CT to warrant such coercive intervention in the marketplace and people's lives. When it is, it will sell itself. Please think what this will do to people already financially hurting in this state. It is not a safety issue like wearing a seatbelt.

Comment ID: 696

First Name: Joe

Last Name: Parisi

Commenter Email: joe.parisi62@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 09:59:17 PM

Comment:

Name: Parisi, Joe Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed regulations that would ban the sale of new gas-powered vehicles and trucks by 2035 and 2045, respectively. These regulations are not only unnecessary and impractical but also unconstitutional and detrimental to the rights and interests of Connecticut residents. First of all, these regulations are unnecessary because Connecticut already has some of the strictest emission standards in the nation, following California's lead. According to a law passed in 2004, Connecticut must implement California's vehicle emission standards, which are stricter than the federal government's. This means that Connecticut drivers already have access to some of the cleanest and most efficient vehicles on the market, without resorting to a blanket ban on gas-powered vehicles. Secondly, these regulations are impractical because they do not take into account the reality and challenges of transitioning to a fully electric or hydrogen vehicle fleet. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, there are only 1,118 electric vehicle charging stations and 18 hydrogen fueling stations in Connecticut as of August 2023. This is far from enough to meet the demand and convenience of millions of drivers who rely on gas stations for their daily commute and travel. Moreover, electric and hydrogen vehicles are still significantly more expensive than gas-powered vehicles, making them unaffordable for many low- and middle-income families. The median income in Connecticut is \$40,000 and yet the median cost for an electric vehicle (EV) is \$53,000. How can you expect people to switch to EVs when they cost more than their annual income? Thirdly, and most importantly, these regulations are unconstitutional because they violate the rights and freedoms of Connecticut residents. The U.S. Constitution grants the power to regulate interstate commerce to Congress, not to individual states or agencies. By banning the sale of new gas-powered vehicles, which are produced and sold across state lines, you are interfering with the federal government's authority and creating an unfair trade barrier. Furthermore, you are infringing on consumers' personal choice and preference,

who should have the right to decide what kind of vehicle they want to buy and drive. You are dictating to people how they should live their lives, without regard for their needs, circumstances, or opinions. Therefore, I urge you to reconsider and withdraw these proposed regulations that would ban the sale of new gas-powered vehicles and trucks in Connecticut. These regulations are not in the best interest of Connecticut residents or the environment. They are simply an overreach of your regulatory power and a violation of our constitutional rights. Sincerely, Joe Parisi

Comment ID: 697

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Baccaro

Commenter Email: Baccarosusan12@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:00:13 PM

Comment:

Name: Baccaro, Susan Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against this regulation. Buying an electric vehicle should be a choice by residents, they should not be forced into it. I believe this is a premature decision that will end up hurting Connecticut residents and businesses financially. People are already struggling, why do you want to make it harder and more expensive to live here? Please reconsider this decision!!!!

Comment ID: 698

First Name: Deborah

Last Name: Reed

Commenter Email: Debskireedski@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:01:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Reed, Deborah Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 With all due respect, there is no benefit to banning new gas power cars and trucks. Connecticut has extremely high electricity prices. Connecticut's electric consumption is low, but electric cars will cause that to rise dramatically. Natural gas and nuclear power account for 95% of Connecticut's electricity generation. Natural gas mostly comes from Pennsylvania's Marcellus Shale. Will they be able to produce enough electricity to keep up with the demand? With inflation adding an additional \$7,400 burden per family this year, the extremely high cost of an electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars making the electric vehicles unaffordable for most. Many families are already struggling to pay their bills. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? To run, electric-powered vehicle require six times the mineral input by weight of conventional vehicles making them heavier which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. Most of the cobalt used in batteries is claimed by China from mines in the Democratic Republic of Congo, where extraction has come with human rights abuses and environmental degradation. (therevelatory.org) These minerals, including cobalt, nickel, lithium and manganese are finite resources. Mining and processing them can be harmful for workers, their communities and the local environment. The 900 pound battery has a life maybe 8 years and a replacement battery will cost you up to \$20,000. In cold weather one must pre-heat the battery before charging \$\$ additional electricity cost to the car owner. In the hot months, take measures like parking in the shade to reduce battery heat. It is also a good idea to pre-heat or cool the interior of the car while it's still plugged into a charging station to avoid sapping battery power to use those systems! (Howtogeek.com) What about battery fires? Look at the fires that happened with the hoverboards. At least 19 killed in 2022 and more than 20 sent to hospital emergency rooms in 39 states according to the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission. Please leave the freedom of choice up to the consumer.

Comment ID: 699

First Name: stephen
Last Name: job
Commenter Email: info@jobcycle.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:11:47 PM

Comment:

Name: job, stephen Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the proposed new law banning the sale of gasoline powered cars in CT based on the California model! This will do nothing to help the environment and will only contribute to an exodus of families leaving the state. My family and business will be one of them. The entire idea of electric vehicles is a farce and doomed to failure. The evidence is out there for everyone to see but for some reason our politicians are blind to it! I will be moving to a more sensible state if this bill passes!!

Comment ID: 700

First Name: Walter
Last Name: Kupsik
Commenter Email: firefly639@yahoo.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:14:27 PM

Comment:

Name: Kupsik, Walter Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly urge you to reconsider banning gas powered vehicles in CT. CT needs to look to the needs of its citizens on a matter of such significance. Banning gas powered vehicles will have a monumental effect on the people of our state, raising prices for consumer goods to levels unaffordable for many of our citizens. The recent experiment with electric powered busses was a disaster. The prohibitive cost and lack of supporting infrastructure appear to have been ignored when creating this called for ban. There is little or no scientific, or economic evidence that support the need for such ill thought out political direction. You should also be more transparent about the process and provide for a full, unrestricted public hearing.

Comment ID: 701

First Name: Sherry
Last Name: Shamash
Commenter Email: shrpsh513@yahoo.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: Retired State Worker
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:25:58 PM

Comment:

Name: Shamash, Sherry Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a retired person I am already suffering from the high cost of living in CT. Dictating to me that I must purchase an expensive electric vehicle is an intrusion into my freedom that is not warranted by the claim of energy savings. The energy needed in order produce the lithium battery for an electric car out weighs any savings in fuel costs. If I supported the laws in CA, I would live there. Please do not ruin our state with the importation of onerous laws from such a poorly run state like CA.

Comment ID: 702

First Name: Julie
Last Name: Kieras
Commenter Email: jkrs01@comcast.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/21/23 10:28:43 PM**Comment:**

Name: Kieras, Julie Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against this regulation concerning banning gas fuel powered cards in CT for the following reasons: 1. This change will NOT impact global climate. Since emissions from CT vehicles account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, this ban will have little to no overall effect on a global scale. 2. Significant cost increases to residents and businesses. Electric-power cars cost about 2x as much as gas-powered. The price to purchase is MUCH higher and then the price to replace batteries is astronomical! Our residents cannot afford this change. 3. The legislature has NO plan to create the extra energy needed to make this shift to all electric vehicles. Moving to all electric will require a drastic increase in energy creation, but there is no clear plan for how to DO that. This proposed bill radically puts the cart before the horse. Or the car before the... horsepower? 4. CT lacks infrastructure. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? 5. MORE emissions will be created by electric powered vehicles because they have heavier batteries. Therefore, they will create more emissions from tire, road, and brake wear (over the life of the vehicle. I could go on about the human rights issues involved in strip mining the cobalt needed for the batteries in these cars. Or the dangers of one of these cars catching fire in someone's driveway, b/c there is no way to extinguish a fire from one of these vehicles - it will just burn and burn and spew toxic waste into the air, while endangering all the cars and buildings nearby. But I hope you get the point that CT is not ready for and does NOT NEED and cannot afford this proposed change to our transportation. These bill proposals are dangerous and irresponsible to our safety and our economy. Please vote against moving these proposals forward.

Comment ID: 703**First Name:** James**Last Name:** Wilcox**Commenter Email:** Ecbroncos@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 10:30:14 PM**Comment:**

Name: Wilcox, James Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 704**First Name:** Joshua**Last Name:** McMahon**Commenter Email:** joshua.mcmahon@att.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 10:40:42 PM**Comment:**

Name: McMahon, Joshua Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please, please, please - I beg you. Do not pass this unnecessary bill banning gas powered cars. CT residents are very fast adopters of electric vehicles, and the market should be left to naturally evolve and innovate without complex regulations which will hurt our

constituents. Please vote no. Our car emissions in CT are already very low with no discernible environmental impact. This is overreach, and will cause prices to increase. MORE IMPORTANTLY- the energy infrastructure in our state does not have the capacity to fuel the number of electric vehicles that this would introduce. Our electric grid would fail. The energy grid needs to be nuclear powered for this to be anywhere near practically feasible. This is a bad idea, please vote no.

Comment ID: 705

First Name: Joseph

Last Name: Hoydilla

Commenter Email: xallidyoh@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:49:13 PM

Comment:

Name: Hoydilla, Joseph Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 If there is ever something for the Republicans and the Democrats to work together for, it is tackling the climate emergency! As someone who has followed the science relating to the climate for the last twenty years, I am so worried about how we are leaving the planet for future generations! I am asking with the sincerest of intentions for the Republicans to back Governor Lamont's plan to phase out gasoline powered vehicles by 2035. EV vehicles are becoming as affordable as regular gasoline vehicles and renewables keep growing creating good paying jobs. The infrastructure will not change unless we have clear cut goals in sight. The fossil fuel industry has benefited to the detriment of society for decades with subsidies and have paid off politicians to support their insane intentions to drill beyond what is reasonable for humanity and sentient life on this planet. We are sadly witnessing coral bleaching, forest fires on the Canadian East coast, heat records being broken daily and more intense storms. We now need a World War 2 effort of mobilizing all of our resources and need compassionate Republicans to listen to the climate scientists. We don't have time to wait for Red States to do this. The auto manufacturers are already committed to this. I think it's sad that the Republicans have tried to turn this into an environmental justice argument when there is no talk about what highway emissions are doing to poor and marginalized communities. Many folks in those communities are relying on public transportation which we should be improving and making this even a higher priority. The bottom line is to drastically cut back on our emissions for the benefit of all people and life including poor and disadvantaged people who contribute the least to global warming but are the first in many cases to suffer the consequences.

Comment ID: 706

First Name: Maryann

Last Name: Santos

Commenter Email: Msantos3@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None

Commenter Title: None

Posted Date: 08/21/23 10:57:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Santos, Maryann Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly urge you Vote NO and to not move forward on banning the sales of new gas-powered passenger cars (beginning in 2035) and another that would gradually prohibit the sale of new gas-powered trucks that are used to ship goods and provide essential services. Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate.? I have deep concerns about the consequences of DEEP's proposed bans. ?Impact on businesses, residents, landlords, and municipalities (fire engines, ambulances, police cars). ?Impact on personal finances of many who are already struggling with costs associated with living in one of the nation's most energy-expensive and highly taxed states in the nation. ?Not enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How would that be managed in a city with multiple highrises? How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Connecticut is in no position to follow California's lead. Be independent by redirecting efforts towards our forests and parks. It is there we can provide clean and fresh air for the environment; for all people and wildlife.

Comment ID: 707**First Name:** Rosemary**Last Name:** Meinert**Commenter Email:** Rosesandthornes59@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Meinert, Rosemary Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I say NO to the ban on gas-powered vehicles in CT.

Comment ID: 708**First Name:** Gina**Last Name:** Wangrycht**Commenter Email:** gwangrycht@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/21/23 11:26:02 PM**Comment:**

Name: Wangrycht, Gina Submission Date: 8/21/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To Whom It May Concern: I'm writing today to express my strong OPPOSITION to Governor Ned Lamont's ban on gas-powered vehicles in the state of CT. This is an impractical ban that targets anyone who cannot afford an electric vehicle. Moreover, a complete changeover to electric vehicles of this magnitude will put a huge amount of stress on the state's power grid -- not to mention the fact that these vehicles have been bursting into flames due to the harmful effects of their lithium-ion batteries that are prone to combustion. Additionally, replacement parts for electric cars cost THOUSANDS of dollars. This is not only cost-prohibitive for most people in the state of Connecticut, it is also completely unrealistic. Many people are struggling to afford basic groceries right now and this ban will only add to the current financial hardships of the majority of families in this state. Please do NOT allow this ban on gas vehicles to pass. While there may be a time in the future when electric vehicles are considered an economical mode of transportation, now is NOT that time. Sincerely, Gina M. Wangrycht New Britain, CT

Comment ID: 709**First Name:** Louise**Last Name:** Barnes**Commenter Email:** louise.50@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 12:15:32 AM**Comment:**

Name: Barnes, Louise Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please don't ban gas cars! Electric cars are expensive and they are dangerous in certain situations. If a person gets into a car accident and the electric car catches fire, it is impossible to put the fire out, because the lithium keeps re-igniting even if the fire is temporarily put out. It is also inconvenient to have to stop to charge a battery, since it takes much longer to charge the battery, as opposed to a few minutes at the gas station. Thank you.

Comment ID: 710**First Name:** ROBERT**Last Name:** RUSSO

Commenter Email: robertrussoct@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 01:38:08 AM

Comment:

Name: RUSSO, ROBERT Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please note Carbon Dioxide, Co2, is a ?TRACE element? in the atmosphere. Co2 is a naturally-occurring gas. Co2 is present in the respiration of mammals. Co2 is present in carbonated drinks. Earth?s Atmosphere: 78.084 % Nitrogen 20.946 % Oxygen 00.934 % Argon 00.040 % Trace Elements (like methane, nitrous oxide, ozone and Carbon Dioxide) 100.000 % Earth Atmosphere The atmosphere is 78.084 percent Nitrogen, 20.946 percent Oxygen and 0.9340 percent Argon. Methane, nitrous oxide and ozone make up the remainder. With Co2 a minuscule 0.03 percent of the atmosphere (Co2 a ?TRACE? element?look it up!). Co2 is measured in Parts per Million. Because it is a TRACE element. Please do not regulate TRACE elements. ?Trace? elements do not drive changes. In layman terms they are Zero percent. Please do not be deceived by the media which generates ratings based on reporting on tons of CO2, as a unit of measure, while ignoring the overall picture that CO2 is a trace element. In layman?s terms, If you were to measure the air outside basically you would come up with Zero percent CO2. Further, Connecticut vehicles only produce an amount estimated 0.04 percent of global carbon dioxide emissions. Again CT vehicles are a tiny amount that has little to do with the total carbon dioxide produced in the world. These draconian and massive changes proposed apparently with little analysis or detail, and providing the populace next to little time to respond, have massive economic consequences mentioned below. The Federal government uniformly regulates such matters, has trained technical staff, so they apply uniformly across the country. It would be Complete CHAOS to have all 50 states with their own separate, peculiar rules on commerce that go between states. Hence, the Federal government forbids it. The Federal Government learned this many years ago and created the COMMERCE Clause to stop such an event. Connecticut should not destroy its economy nor get involved in matters by politicians not trained nor staffed in such affairs. Connecticut should not follow California emissions. Connecticut is its own state?we do not vote for the Governor of California. The Governor of California greatly overstretched his authority and banned gasoline autos and trucks via Executive Order (N-79- 20). No authority gives a State Governor to direct the automotive and trucking industry via executive order. Connecticut absolutely should not follow what was done illegally in California. Many people live in apartments, condos, shared living environment. There is no land for all of these ugly and very expensive chargers. Anyone consider the cost to install all of these charges. For example, A 300-unit condominium complex could be a \$2 million or much more charge, to rip up the ground and install chargers. Assuming it could even be done, who is going to pay for this? What about the carbon dioxide for that? What about trucks that move most of our products. Again trucks move between states, and Connecticut should not be regulating interstate commerce, that is the Federal Govt. task not individual states per Federal law. An electric truck is \$450,000, versus a diesel truck at \$150,000. This is a giant cost increase will ultimately have to be pushed through to the consumer substantially increasing the cost of most products. Also, a 10-truck electric fleet, uses the same electricity as 1000 homes. We are talking about a massive amount of power plant construction. What about the carbon dioxide for that? Or, the staff to install 1.4 million of chargers (number of registered vehicles in CT) at many people homes. Most likely would like chargers at home, if they can afford, or have space for them (apartments may have no space for chargers). And the carbon dioxide produced manufacturing and installing and 1.4 million chargers? Do we even have enough electricians to do this work? What about the vanishing gasoline tax revenues of the State? gas stations like Exxon, Shell, Mobil, Sunoco, Citgo, Cumberland Farms car service stations (local auto mechanics, Firestone, Midas, Meineke, Valvoline quick oil changes) all likely to undergo drastic financial changes; most will go out of business. Jobs, people?s franchise, family life savings gone. Any consideration, or study, onto this? People travel between states in cars. The federal government The "Commerce Clause" regulates interstate commerce, not states. It is illegal for states to regulate interstate commerce per the federal government. The state has no legal authority, to force electric cars. Not all the states are doing this. Cannot force us to buy a product most of do not want. Range anxiety. Electric vehicles do not have the same range. The technology is not there. No capacity. I travel sometimes 500 miles a day. I can fill up a gas tank in minutes, stay at a hotel and get on with my business with gasoline cars. Electric cars can?t. Parking garages and other infrastructure were not engineered for the added weight of these, bloated, on average, 1000 pound heavier electric vehicle versus gasoline car. A significant number of these heavy electrical vehicles can have a serious impact on infrastructure not designed to handle the added weight. What about the costs to upgrade this infrastructure to make them safe for the heavier electric vehicles and that added carbon dioxide to do that? Electric vehicles produce More Co2. Studies

have shown the heavier, high torque (high power) electric cars are rapidly wearing out tires. Studies show 3000 percent increase in Co2 for Electric cars over internal combustion due to rapid tire wear out!. It is not unusual for an electric vehicle to require new tires at 20,000 miles, or even much sooner. While gasoline vehicle may need tires at 55,000. Car tire manufacturing is extremely Co2 producing. Mining process of lithium and cobalt for electric vehicles batteries produces more Co2: around 80 percent more Co2 than an internal combustion, gasoline car. We do not have the power grid infrastructure for the added power load. Upgrades will be extremely expensive and will cause electric rates to soar. We are talking a very significant upgrade and addition in power plants. Each 70,000 additional electric cars could require an additional new powerplant. Electric rates are going to skyrocket (in an attempt to build additional power plants), and blackouts can happen due to inadequate supply. Most current electric car owners are dissatisfied will certainly not purchase another electric ?manufacturer exaggerated ranges, long charge times, limited number of charge stations, poor cold weather performance / range. Connecticut absolutely does get cold weather. Pedestrian-to-vehicle accidents will increase due to less noise of the electric vehicle and pedestrians unintentionally walking in front of electric vehicles. Electric vehicles cost more (median electric car price \$53,000, versus median Connecticut income of \$38,865 in 2020), have limited choices, generally have extremely poor towing capacity for those that tow, and require additional expensive electrical charge station installs. Electric car manufactures have exaggerated the range of their vehicles. There is a shortage of Lithium raw mineral for mining electrical car batteries. There might not even be enough lithium available under current conditions for that many electric cars. Electrical vehicles can have really bad fires that even the fire department cannot extinguish. Electric vehicles will require additional processing at the end of their lives to deal with the flammable batteries. Run out of fuel in a gas-powered car is an easy fix with a gas vehicle. Just show up with a gallon of gas. Not so easy with an electric. At best it will cost an expensive tow. Electric vehicles often use proprietary low-roll resistance tires (due to their limited range) that owners often do not like the low-resistance tire performance; however, owners have limited tire selection due to the need for low-resistance tires on electric vehicles. Furthermore, and Most importantly, -- God controls the weather--- Politicians should Focus on the morals of Connecticut and line them up with God?s laws. For example, eliminate Connecticut?s abortions and stop making the state a giant marijuana dispensary. --Abortion and drugs are Not God?s ways--. Abortion and Marijuana are Sins. Worry about Connecticut citizens? eternal souls. This is what the CT politicians need to prioritize (for example, eliminating abortion and marijuana drug dispensaries in the state of CT); not managing Trace atmosphere elements, Co2, which they have no training in. We need to BAN these onerous ELECTRIC vehicles and educate the uninformed who try to use fear about the environment as a tool. We cannot have untrained regulate something they do not understand nor have legal authority to do so. The Federal government regulates cars uniformly across the country with trained personnel. Through many, many years of experience the FEDERAL government learned that it was necessary for the FEDERAL government to make the uniform standards especially in things that go between states (interstate commerce, such as cars and trucks, and passed Federal Commerce Clause laws) Absolutely no electric Co2 polluting, fire-prone, expensive, low-range, long charging time, poor cold weather performing, business bankrupting, manufacturer exaggerating, power grid and capital-intensive, gas tax eliminating Electric cars. Do not follow the illegal Executive Order of California; no such authority exists for a governor to direct the entire automotive and trucking industry by executive order. Certainly do not force us in CT to buy electric cars and trucks most do not want. The free market economy speaks most do not want, nor buy them for good reason.

Comment ID: 711

First Name: Eric

Last Name: Belko

Commenter Email: eric@msn.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 02:43:05 AM

Comment:

Name: Belko, Eric Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car

charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 712

First Name: Amanda

Last Name: Craven

Commenter Email: amanda.craven413@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 02:48:28 AM

Comment:

Name: Craven, Amanda Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello, electric cars are not good for the environment or for consumers. Banning gas powered vehicles is about control and nothing else. Our infrastructure cannot handle the load, either. Do not pass this bill. Amanda

Comment ID: 713

First Name: Ariana

Last Name: Fine

Commenter Email: arianarawls@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 04:59:23 AM

Comment:

Name: Fine, Ariana Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly oppose these new regulations starting in a couple years on new gas-powered cars and trucks and the outright ban on gas vehicle sales in 2035. Not only are non-gas-powered vehicles out of my and so many others' price ranges, but EVs are not as environmentally friendly and easy to upkeep as you make them out to be on multiple levels, including manufacturing, maintenance, charging, disposal and even suppressing EV fires. Although your reasoning to ban gas-powered vehicle sales may come from a place of trying to make the world and the environment better, it is not that cut-and-dry. Allow us to make the decision that makes sense for us, for our budgets and for our research on whether EVs are really sound. You will be out of office by the time this is fully enacted. Don't leave us with your bad decision. There are far more important other priorities you should be focused on...and not on one that we don't need or want.

Comment ID: 714

First Name: Jonathan

Last Name: Clarke

Commenter Email: jcee4242@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 05:19:24 AM

Comment:

Name: Clarke, Jonathan Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly urge you to reconsider banning gas powered vehicles in CT. It seems preposterous that CT would simply follow CA direction on a matter of this importance. It makes our grand state appear to be child like in aping its west coast sibling. No matter what the rational is for mimicking CA, CT needs to look to its own uniqueness and the needs of its citizens on a matter of such significance. Banning gas powered vehicles will have a monumental effect on the people of our state, raising prices for consumer goods to levels unaffordable for many of our citizens. You should also be more transparent about the process and provide for a full, unrestricted public hearing. The current plan seems restrictive and designed

to limit public input. This matter is too important not to give our citizens and business community all the opportunity they deserve to voice their opinions.

Comment ID: 715

First Name: Roger

Last Name: Heine

Commenter Email: Raheine@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Private citizen

Commenter Title: Private citizen

Posted Date: 08/22/23 05:53:23 AM

Comment:

Name: Heine, Roger Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure?

Comment ID: 716

First Name: Lonnie

Last Name: Bossie

Commenter Email: lonne.bosse@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Micro Precision Group

Commenter Title: Quality Assurance Inspector

Posted Date: 08/22/23 05:59:37 AM

Comment:

Name: Bossie, Lonnie Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not want Connecticut officials to follow California laws.

Comment ID: 717

First Name: Travis

Last Name: Serrine

Commenter Email: madredcoat@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 06:06:07 AM

Comment:

Name: Serrine, Travis Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To whom it may concern. I believe that a ban on internal combustion cars is wrong. The electric vehicle technology is not affordable or sustainable enough for CT. residents to be forced to purchase. Thank you, Travis Serrine

Comment ID: 718

First Name: Joel

Last Name: Leneker

Commenter Email: JLeneker@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Lenecker, Joel Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 719**First Name:****Last Name:****Commenter Email:****Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 07:16:10 AM**Comment:**

Name: , Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not support the proposed regulations of PR2023-023 for the State of CT. 1). The overwhelming majority of emissions in CT come into our state from other states on the prevailing west to east winds. Even we had no emissions from vehicles in CT - we would not improve CT's air quality unless all the states west of us eliminate all fossil fuels. There is no evidence that will be occurring in states west of us. 2). Electric vehicles are significantly more expensive to purchase and CT has very high electricity generation costs - there will not be any cost savings to our state residents. Our transportation expenses will be higher. 3). CT does not have adequate electrical generation sources to supply the increased electricity needs for these proposed regulations nor do we have the transmission infrastructure to bring in 'acceptable' low emission generated electricity to meet those needs from outside of our New England region. 4). Electric powered vehicles are significantly heavier than fossil fuel ones - leading to increased wear & tear on all our roads. Who will pay for those increased costs & how will the funds be raised? The State of CT would no longer be collecting taxes on fossil fuels (diesel & gas) which are used for road improvements and maintenance. These proposed regulations will be financially costly to all state residents with minimal improvements in our air quality & health. These proposed regulations should be defeated and should not be put into effect.

Comment ID: 720**First Name:** Peter**Last Name:** Scharfglass**Commenter Email:** pscharfg@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 07:29:07 AM**Comment:**

Name: Scharfglass, Peter Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly disagree with banning gas powered vehicles. However, I am very much in favor of providing incentives for moving away from fossil fuels. Having a lot of experience with the technology, there are still too many negatives (environmental impact of manufacturing and disposal, time to charge while in transit, waiting at charging stations, value of vehicle over time, fires are difficult; if not impossible, to put out if battery should be compromised or in a motor vehicle accident).

Comment ID: 721**First Name:** Toni Ann**Last Name:** Lupinacci**Commenter Email:** tonilup@optonline.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 07:39:05 AM**Comment:**

Name: Lupinacci, Toni Ann Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We are not California! Governor Lamont, please think independently! Not everyone can afford expensive electric cars. This is a very short sighted view. Or do you want 15 minute cities in CT? Hello New Hampshire, I'm happy to send my tax dollars there.

Comment ID: 722**First Name:** Alex**Last Name:** Carros**Commenter Email:** acarros203@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 07:48:28 AM**Comment:**

Name: Carros, Alex Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Any ban on internal combustion engine cars would be one of the most wrong-headed policies in CT history. It will severely restrict economic mobility for working class people, especially those living in apartments. How will they afford or charge their EVs? There is no way in twelve or even twenty years that power generation will accommodate such a policy. Power output in the US would have to double to do so nationally. What happens when the power goes out? I've never seen such idealistic elitism in my whole life. History will judge the supporters of such policies harshly. Avoid shame and end this nonsense before you drive all the hardworking taxpayers out of our state.

Comment ID: 723**First Name:** Randolph**Last Name:** Dill**Commenter Email:** randolph.dill@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Cloverdale Farm**Commenter Title:** Managing Partner**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 08:13:17 AM**Comment:**

Name: Dill, Randolph Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in CT will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles will lead to significant cost to residents and businesses like our family farm. Shifting to all electric vehicles in CT will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. If off-shore wind farms are part of such plan, then our marine life will suffer from the effects of such. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road and brake wear over the life of the vehicles. As a family operating farm, the cost of doing business, in CT, is already difficult. We cannot afford to move to electric vehicles.

Comment ID: 724

First Name: Tessie
Last Name: Zaczek
Commenter Email: tessie.zaczek@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 08:21:53 AM

Comment:

Name: Zaczek, Tessie Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The wind doesn't always blow for wind energy and the sun doesn't always shine for solar. Until you have a reliable, functioning source of energy for all the EV's you want to advance, talk to us then. Most people charge their EV's at night. What are your plans for taxing the grid in this manner without having actual power behind it? Connecticut needs more dependable sources of power than what's available in the foreseeable future. How and when will these sources appear? Magic? Please.

Comment ID: 725

First Name: Thomas
Last Name: Torelli
Commenter Email: tom@alliedpropertygp.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 08:40:23 AM

Comment:

Name: Torelli, Thomas Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please look at the market in China where they have imposed similar requirements. The EV market is crashing and manufacturers are pulling as they cannot make money selling at reduced prices.

Comment ID: 726

First Name: Phil
Last Name: Peterson
Commenter Email: ppeterson@ctwater.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 08:42:21 AM

Comment:

Name: Peterson, Phil Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposal to ban gasoline powered cars is a terrible idea. The Connecticut economy will contract even further as people flee this state especially talented young people. This proposal will do NOTHING to increase air quality as most of the air that flows over Connecticut comes from other states (NY, NJ, PA, MA). This idea follows California which is the worst state to even try to make a living in. Why follow a loser? Follow states that allow their residents to live in freedom by reducing your urge to control the citizens of CT by issuing costly unnecessary regulations like this one. We should be doing everything we can to attract people into CT and not drive them away. These comments are respectfully submitted.

Comment ID: 727

First Name: Nancy
Last Name: Jefferson
Commenter Email: njeff@att.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 08:44:45 AM

Comment:

Name: Jefferson, Nancy Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Just say NO to banning gas driven vehicles. The people have a right to decide, not be regulated by a government decision

Comment ID: 728

First Name: Dennis

Last Name: Noel

Commenter Email: dennisjnoel@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Connecticut Resident

Commenter Title: Voter

Posted Date: 08/22/23 08:47:54 AM

Comment:

Name: Noel, Dennis Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly urge you to reconsider banning gas powered vehicles in CT. It seems preposterous that CT would simply follow CA direction on a matter of this importance. It makes our grand state appear to be child like in aping its west coast sibling. No matter what the rational is for mimicking CA, CT needs to look to its own uniqueness and the needs of its citizens on a matter of such significance. Banning gas powered vehicles will have a monumental effect on the people of our state, raising prices for consumer goods to levels unaffordable for many of our citizens. You should also be more transparent about the process and provide for a full, unrestricted public hearing. The current plan seems restrictive and designed to limit public input. This matter is too important not to give our citizens and business community all the opportunity they deserve to voice their opinions.

Comment ID: 729

First Name: Nicholas

Last Name: Coppola

Commenter Email: ncoppola@geteverest.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Coppola, Nicholas Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 If we have learned anything, it is that the State of Connecticut's legislators and regulators in their commitment to a particular ideology see no problem in subjecting the state's citizens to rules that do not materially improve the lives of the citizens and wind up costing those citizens far more. Some examples, include our electric power source commitment and related consumer costs, as well as the cost of forcing changes in the types of bulbs consumers may purchase. How about the bag ban, which only banned the bags that made it convenient to carry goods and left all sorts of product packaging untouched. Each time there is an attempt to address climate change, it is not in small manageable ways. Rather, it is in ways that can only be classified as self-sacrificial and why not, the zealot believes that's the only way to see positive change - no pain no gain. The problem I see with that is such regulations and legislation often have winners, i.e. those who will benefit from such regulation and again, it is not the citizen. If we are still thinking of moving this forward, then I would draw your attention to California and how its rules have made the cost of goods to citizens across the country largely unaffordable, and whether its economy without outside assistance is sustainable. I suspect it is not. If we still think using California as a model makes sense, and only someone committed to the idea versus the objective truth could think so, I ask you to trace the amount of elemental resources necessary to fuel/construct a world of EVs where once again citizens will pay more for less. Currently, EVs represent the highest price segment of the auto market. For those who are so concerned about equity, just how does that reconcile for our citizens who live at or near the poverty line? This is not whether we believe there is something to be done about how we treat the climate. There clearly is. However, that something is not about creating new industries, reassigning wealth, or forcing citizens to further depend upon government whose regulations ultimately serve that precise purpose. Connecticut needs to be smarter than what it appears and has demonstrated itself to be. I believe its citizens are, but those making the rules have a different agenda.

Comment ID: 730**First Name:** Susan**Last Name:** Olson**Commenter Email:** olson.susan6@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Citizens Climate Lobby**Commenter Title:** member**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 08:49:35 AM**Comment:**

Name: Olson, Susan Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Thank you for the opportunity to testify regarding the good affordability of driving a hybrid electric vehicle. My name is Susan Olson and I grew up in Weatogue CT. I have never owned a new car and the car I now drive is a 2012 Chevy Volt. My husband also has a plugin car and we charge them at home using our solar panels. Last month our total electric bill for a household of 3 with two plugins was \$10.62. I never get tired of driving by gas stations! I do not plan to again own a non-electric car. We found our last car in Framingham, Mass. I hope to find our next electric car in CT. I support expanding the availability and supporting infrastructure for electric vehicles in CT. Thank you for considering my testimony.

Comment ID: 731**First Name:** Alex**Last Name:** Zawadzki**Commenter Email:** alz-man@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 08:49:52 AM**Comment:**

Name: Zawadzki , Alex Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Their isn't enough positive information out about battery life, cost of having to replace a battery pack and environmental impact on disposal of the used batteries. The used car market for electric cars doesn't exist. If you can even buy a used electric car, the battery life will be at its end. The cost of replacing the batteries will be more then the value of the car. The lower income people can barely afford today's used cars, but can at least get one for a few thousand dollars. What do you expect them to do ? They represent the bulk of used car ownership. These are just a few things, their are hundreds of more unawerered questions I'm sure.

Comment ID: 732**First Name:** Greg**Last Name:** Hollingsworth**Commenter Email:** gregkarenh@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 08:51:48 AM**Comment:**

Name: Hollingsworth, Greg Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Let me begin by stating that I believe EV's have a definite role to play in reducing emissions. I currently own an EV and charge at home. I also have solar which further reduces my cost and environmental impact. However before mandating that all vehicles be electric, there are several obstacles that must be overcome. First and foremost is the charging infrastructure must be improved. There are simply not enough charging stations both private and public to support widespread EV use. Public stations are expensive. At \$0.48/kw it is almost twice as expensive as it would be to charge at home, and actually would cost more to operate than a gas-powered vehicle. Also, there are many people who do not and probably never will have the option to charge at home. Consider the thousands of people who live in multi-family

homes or apartments. Secondly the grid as it stands will not be able to support the tens of thousands of people plugging in at the same time to charge. More emphasis needs to be placed on solar/battery storage options. This allows power generated during the day to be fed back into the grid during periods of high demand. Finally, there are some instances where an EV is not suitable, and people should be mandated to purchase them. Thank you.

Comment ID: 733

First Name: Kelly

Last Name: Kennedy

Commenter Email: kelly.kennedy@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 08:53:21 AM

Comment:

Name: Kennedy, Kelly Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I write to note my overwhelming support for the Proposed Regulations Concerning Advanced Clean Cars II. It is long past time to end the foot dragging, obstructionism, and excuses that are consigning all of us to a dangerous, destructive, and uninhabitable climate. These proposed regulations are one shrewd step in the right direction, strategically addressing Connecticut's greatest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions: motor vehicles. Those who complain that change is hard and/or too expensive clearly ignore the cost of doing nothing. As just one example, Barrons reported on July 23 that "Natural disasters, including earthquakes and severe storms, caused global economic losses estimated at \$194 billion in the first half of 2023, with only 27% covered by insurance ... Relentless severe storms in the U.S. were the biggest driver of insured losses." <https://www.barrons.com/articles/catastrophes-insurance-weather-disasters-5cf0ba4d>
 Adopting California's MHD emission regulations, including the Low NOx Omnibus and ACT Rules, will significantly reduce harmful emissions that impact public health and contribute to Connecticut's intractable ozone problem as well as make significant progress towards meeting GHG reduction targets under Connecticut's Global Warming Solutions Act. Like Nero fiddling while Rome burned, we've squandered too much time already. We must stop letting ourselves be paralyzed by fear of change and meet the moment that climate change demands. Instead, let's seize the idea that "necessity is the mother of invention," get on with solving the climate problem, and position Connecticut as a leader on climate solutions. I urge you to approve the proposed regulations.

Comment ID: 734

First Name: Carolyn

Last Name: Baeder

Commenter Email: criolo@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Baeder, Carolyn Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do NOT put this law of EV by 2035 in affect. In New England it is not a practical idea at this time. Not enough study has gone into whether we have the necessary amount of source of energy needed for the amount of vehicles people drive. Also trips would take way TOO MUCH time to make. We live in hilly mountainous areas where it may be possible to only travel 125 miles at a time. This would effect people working, not only their leisure time enjoyment. Safety is another issue. Do not feel these cars have been tested enough and I am afraid of fires. We havent even addressed the cost of such cars. Let us be leaders and not followers and do as NY MA and CA have done. NO to this BILL.

Comment ID: 735

First Name: James

Last Name: Phelps

Commenter Email: phelps239@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Attachments:**

Letter to Donna Veach about EV.pdf

Comment:

Name: Phelps, James Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 James R. Phelps 177 Windy Knoll Drive Berlin, CT 06037 (860) 798-4217 State Representative Donna Veach, 30th August 22, 2023 300 Capitol Avenue Legislative Office Building, Rm. 4200 Hartford, CT 06106 RE: Proposal to Ban Gas Vehicles State Representative Veach, I am against proposed legislation to Ban Gas Vehicles in 2035. We must address the following issues logically before bringing this proposal to bear upon CT: 1. Business Costs Increasing ? EV units have decreased electrical output during cold weather resulting in increased charging times and less vehicular use. Businesses will suffer a decrease in productivity and revenue. To make up for this downtime customers will be forced to pay more. 2. Cost of Operating an EV ? 40% of CT energy comes from natural gas. With increased electrical demand our corresponding electric rates will increase. 3. Insurance cost increase - Damaged electric vehicles will have to be stored at repair shops lots 50 feet away from other vehicles to prevent fire damage. Storage costs and insurance costs will increase. 4. Electric charging stations - Where will all the electric charging stations be for apartment building occupants in our municipalities? 5. Increased infrastructure changes ? EV's weigh 2-3 times more than cars so roads will be damaged quicker than normal, therein increasing replacement costs. Will parking garages be able to withstand the increased weight of the EV's? 6. Cost of EV's? ? How will a person who is barely able to pay for housing, food, normal necessities be able to afford a vehicle which is 2-3x more in price than a new or used vehicle? How do our lower-income residents afford this? 7. Mileage Tax - What changes will be made to charge people for road repairs and improvements since there is no gas tax? If you want me to appear before a hearing on this issue or send a letter to the lead person of a hearing, I would be more than glad to do that. Hope your knee surgery goes well this week. Sincerely, James R. Phelps JRP/jrp

Comment ID: 736**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Souza**Commenter Email:** johnpsouza88@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** citizen**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:01:57 AM**Comment:**

Name: Souza, John Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 #1) We Do NOT have the infrastructure nor can we afford to upgrade. #2) Only the rich will have cars. Electric cars are 50% more expensive than conventional cars. #3) The metals and materials used to make batteries are often mined by the dirtiest methods that poison the local environment and often by slave labor. #4) Electric cars are unreliable during emergencies like evacuations or long power outages.

Comment ID: 737**First Name:** Shellie**Last Name:** Lee**Commenter Email:** leems2891@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:03:58 AM**Comment:**

Name: Lee, Shellie Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against this proposed regulation to make all vehicles, electric by 2035. As we see in California, the infrastructure is not capable of handling, then increased use of electricity. People cannot afford to buy new cars or the increase in their electric bill. It is difficult for the elderly

to adjust to the change. We do not have the proper means of disposing of lithium batteries and cars, lithium mine do way more damage to our environment. The fire departments are not equipped to deal with putting out electric car fires and other such emergencies. The technology is just not there yet and the safety of our community is much more important.

Comment ID: 738

First Name: Pamela

Last Name: Lavery

Commenter Email: lavery57@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:07:41 AM

Comment:

Name: Lavery, Pamela Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is insanity, pure and simple!! There is zero evidence that CT can accommodate a ban on the sales of all gas powered passenger vehicles by 2035!!!! Our electrical grid cannot accommodate this ridiculous mandate. Rate payers for electricity will be UNABLE to afford this!!! So it will NOT work!!! In addition, CT should NOT be following CRAZY CA... We do NOT want our state to adopt these absurd regulations and suffer the consequences these bans will have on all the residents and businesses in this state. The financial implications will crush us all!!! I am not sure who is proposing these regulations on passenger vehicles and trucks, but these would bring MAJOR change to our quality of life and our survival. How could this pass without major communication from our legislators to the people you supposedly represent. There should be public hearings, all over the state, the news media should be covering this non stop every day!! There is not ONE PERSON I have spoken to about these regulations that was aware at all!!! If you truly believe this is the way CT should go, get before the people you represent and try to SELL THE CONCEPT.. I am urging all representatives of our state to VOTE NO on both of these regulations being proposed.

Comment ID: 739

First Name: virginia

Last Name: maillet

Commenter Email: vmaillet3974@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:08:05 AM

Comment:

Name: maillet, virginia Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 no, this is not reasonable

Comment ID: 740

First Name: Ben

Last Name: Strenkowski

Commenter Email: benjamin.strenkowski@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Tri-County Machine, LLC

Commenter Title: Owner, Engineer

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:16:01 AM

Comment:

Name: Strenkowski, Ben Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Good morning, I am here to address my concerns regarding the proposed regulation. As a business owner, and resident of the state of Connecticut, we are constantly bombarded with regulations, especially in the automotive industry. Our government, continues operating under the premise that they are in charge to control the people in which they govern. Terms such as "ban" and "regulate" are all too common among new legislation, limiting our freedoms on a monthly basis, at the expense of the taxpayer.

The intentions of these proposed laws may be well, but the effects of them are suffered by the people, mostly felt economically. Your proposal in essence, bans the sale of new gasoline powered cars in 12 years. We have had gasoline powered cars in this country for over 100 years, and nothing has replaced them since. The idea that electric cars are a suitable replacement, is incorrect. Our electricity production in this state is not sufficient to support it, neither is our charging infrastructure. Things like cold weather, power outages, and Eversource nonsense, will again effect the ability for people to use these cars as a reasonable day to day freedom, equivalent to a gasoline powered car. Not only is the state not ready to adopt this technology on a large scale, but the offset of emissions isn't worth the changeover (at least not yet). According to a few studies, and some quick research done on most environmental agencies sites, it takes 8-10 years to offset the carbon emissions of buying a new electric car. This seems like a reasonable timeframe, however the lifecycle of the batteries barely outlives that. Now the recycling and environmental impact of old batteries must be taken into consideration. Obviously, electric cars aren't the only solution, and should not be treated as such. Alternative fuels have a lot of promise, such as synthetic gasoline, hydrogen, or hydrogen fuel cells. However these technologies haven't been proven to be scalable or economic for the masses so far. The government also does not have a great track record with their "green initiatives". How long did the push for natural gas last? Here we were with tens of thousands of homes putting in natural gas for heat, cooking, etc. and now we are supposed to get rid of it all? We must all convert to electric, which puts us at the mercy of the all of the price hikes from just one company (Eversource)? Another example are the wind turbines. How many more of them need to be installed until we address the environmental concerns from them? The same skepticism we have from the historical failures and experiences dealing with these initiatives should be applied to this proposal. How many Li-Ion battery packs will stack up in junkyards until the next environmental concern is electric cars? We must look at this process as a whole, and not just a target of "zero tailpipe emissions" (which is misleading in its very basis). What concerns me the most, is the way in which agencies such as the DEEP or EPA govern. These are agencies which we do not vote for, do not elect any representation for, yet pay for. However, we have to abide by rules and regulations they put forth. They provide no solutions, only rules in which their reasoning has to be taken as "gospel" and cannot be challenged by the average resident. These changes or rulings are always felt by the resident, whether it is a fee at the DMV, or forcing people to adopt a sewer network and pay for the changeover themselves. We must get out of the mindset that these agencies can just keep forcing regulations on the residents that we do not agree with, instead of providing solutions that actually help the residents, and they adopt the solution voluntarily because it is truly works for them. Somewhere in history the government forgot that they work for us, the people, and we do not work for them. I believe it is time for our government, here in Connecticut, to decide they will change this narrative. A change that returns to the very fabric of this country, where the government is there FOR the people. A government that listens to the people, and isn't going to rule by "bans" and "regulations" but spends their time and resources to help the free market develop the solutions necessary to move forward. If gasoline cars aren't the future, then let's work to bring a better solution to people that helps them. Thank you.

Comment ID: 741

First Name: John

Last Name: Morosani

Commenter Email: john@lrgfb.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Laurel Ridge Farm LLC

Commenter Title: President

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:19:53 AM

Comment:

Name: Morosani, John Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose the proposed change in regulations regarding the elimination of internal combustion vehicles. As a farmer, I am very dependent on the use of a pick up truck on the farm. The electric pick up trucks have no where near the range or duration of our existing diesel truck. It would be an economic hardship to impose this draconian solution on CT farmers. Just say no. John Morosani

Comment ID: 742

First Name: Chery;

Last Name: Reynolds

Commenter Email: carser@mindspring.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Reynolds, Chery; Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am concerned that the electric only vehicles are very dangerous. They catch fire and revery difficult to extinguish. We do not have the charging stations or the electrical grid capacity to support them. The time necessary to recharge the batteries makes electric cars impractical for most people. The extra weight of these cars may be a concern in multi-story parking garages. The immorality of the child slavery necessary to obtain the materials for the batteries is a concern to me. The carbon footprint, during manufacture, of each electric car is far higher than a gas powered vehicle. The atmosphere does not respect state or national borders. If we promote greater pollution and suffering in other parts of the nation or world, we will not have done much for clean air in Connecticut.

Comment ID: 743**First Name:** Kathryn**Last Name:** Chester**Commenter Email:** chesterk28@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Chester, Kathryn Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am apposed to the Proposed Regulation Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II, Tracking Number PR2023-023 because it is not practical for everyone to buy EVs when we do not have adequate electricity to support such a program. Furthermore EVs are not always predictable in heat/cold weather. They are also extremely expensive. Batteries alone are expensive.

Comment ID: 744**First Name:** Susan**Last Name:** King**Commenter Email:** Thorjoey60@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:23:10 AM**Comment:**

Name: King, Susan Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO! NO! No! NO! to electric car mandates in Connecticut. Obviously, how the batteries are made don't faze Connecticut's officials-how about the countries that are paying the price by descimating their lands to extract the required minerals. How about the men, women and children in those countries who are digging out those minerals-many times by hand. Someone forgot to tell our elected officials that climate change has happened throughout the world's history! Sadly, our elected officials are only listening to the corporations, etc who will greatly benefit from making this change. SHAME ON ALL OF YOU!!!

Comment ID: 745**First Name:** Melanie and Vincent**Last Name:** Attwater-Young**Commenter Email:** melanie.a@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:24:33 AM

Comment:

Name: Attwater-Young, Melanie and Vincent Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 August 22, 2023
 Testimony in strong OPPOSITION to both DEEP Proposed Regulations: ? Low Emission Vehicle IV Program and Advanced Clean Cars II? and ?Advanced Clean Trucks, and Medium and Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emissions and Warranty Standards.? Right around the year proposed (2035) our current ?light duty truck? (not readily defined for public consumption; i.e reference to California?s Code of Regs.) our truck and our passenger vehicle will have completely aged out. We will be in need of a new or used vehicle(s). We do not want to buy an electric vehicle. Period. ?We are on fixed income and will not be able to afford said vehicles. In addition, there have been issues with EV buses catching fire, an EV company recently going bankrupt. The rare earth minerals that must be mined does environmental damage, sometimes in other countries that use labor practices that are counter to our nations?s belief in fundamental human rights. In addition, charging stations are not readily available and charging can take hours. Regarding the ?Gross Vehicle Weight Rating? on trucks, we have serious concerns about the cost and even delivery of ESSENTIAL goods (food, medicines, etc.) increasing should this DEEP?s proposed TRUCK regulations pass. Bad ideas. These PROPOSED regulations should never see the light of day. Melanie and Vincent Attwater-Young Montville, CT

Comment ID: 746

First Name: John

Last Name: Dunn

Commenter Email: jt@thedunnfamily.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None

Commenter Title: N/A

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:26:00 AM

Comment:

Name: Dunn, John Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello, I would like to add my comment to this idea of banning gas powered cars in Connecticut. It is symbolic and not realistic. The average citizen of Connecticut can't afford it. We do not have the energy generating infrastructure to support the demand required to supply the chargers. The chargers themselves do not exist. The financial burden on the vehicle owners is extensive. Has any of the legislators googled how much a replacement electric car battery is? Also in times of evacuation for hurricanes or storms how will these cars get people away in the long lines of traffic without adequate charging. If CT law makers REALLY cared about the environment and climate change you would be planting trees all over the state and opening up new nuclear power plants. Making grandiose laws to symbolize your commitment to your political party at the detriment of every day Connecticut residents is a sad reality here.

Comment ID: 747

First Name: Dario

Last Name: Quiros

Commenter Email: rdquiros@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: HFM Wealth Management

Commenter Title: Chairman

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:28:02 AM

Comment:

Name: Quiros, Dario Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposal is ridiculous and should be abandoned. It does not serve the needs of our citizens.

Comment ID: 748

First Name: Nicholas

Last Name: Oliveri

Commenter Email: oliverinick@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:28:46 AM**Comment:**

Name: Oliveri, Nicholas Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a CT citizen I am not subject to CA law. This is a simple issue. I will not comply with your non-laws.

Comment ID: 749**First Name:** Mark**Last Name:** Temple**Commenter Email:** mtemple@haleyard.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Lenard Engineering, Inc**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:29:04 AM**Comment:**

Name: Temple, Mark Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposed regulation is a huge tax on the middle class. It will force seniors and others to purchase expensive EVs. How many homes are equipped with 400 Amp electric services so that a fast charger can be installed? The cost to upgrading a 200 Amp service to a 400 Amp service and to purchase and install a fast charger is 10's of thousands of dollars. Please kill this proposed regulation.

Comment ID: 750**First Name:** Dario**Last Name:** Quiros**Commenter Email:** rdquiros@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** HFM Wealth Management**Commenter Title:** Chairman**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:32:54 AM**Comment:**

Name: Quiros, Dario Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 751**First Name:** Gerald**Last Name:** Shultz**Commenter Email:** nslcommish@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:34:40 AM**Comment:**

Name: Shultz , Gerald Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 752

First Name: Benjamin

Last Name: Kehl

Commenter Email: lifeman98@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:34:51 AM

Comment:

Name: Kehl, Benjamin Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Good Morning, Please do not ban or regulate further gas powered vehicles. This is yet another attack on the hard working people of Connecticut. Furthermore, it seems to target the working poor who may not be able to afford an electric vehicle. The ban also seems to ignore the issues of where we expect to get all the minerals etc. needed to make the batteries for electric cars. Thanks,
 Benjamin Kehl

Comment ID: 753

First Name: Richard

Last Name: Holton

Commenter Email: rholton@enterpc.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:39:16 AM

Comment:

Name: Holton, Richard Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing to express my opposition to your proposal to ban the sales of new gas powered trucks and cars in Connecticut. I believe that this proposal is misguided and would have a number of negative consequences for our state. First, I do not believe that banning gas powered vehicles would have any significant impact on the global climate. According to the Environmental Protection Agency, emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut would only reduce these emissions by a tiny fraction. Second, I am concerned about the cost of this proposal. Electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gas powered vehicles would force many people to buy more expensive electric cars, which would put a significant financial burden on them. Third, I am worried about the impact this proposal would have on our energy grid. Shifting to all electric vehicles would demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region. There is no reasonable plan to create this energy without significantly increasing our reliance on fossil fuels. Fourth, there is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars would be spent to build this infrastructure? Finally, I am concerned about the environmental impact of electric powered vehicles. Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles. This results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. For all of these reasons, I urge you to reconsider your proposal to ban the sales of new gas powered trucks and cars in Connecticut. I believe that this proposal is not in the best interests of our state. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Comment ID: 754**First Name:** joely**Last Name:** antoci**Commenter Email:** joelyantoci@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: antoci, joely Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Banning gas powered vehicles to be replaced by electric vehicles is an impractical choice that does not benefit the residents of CT. The electric cars are double the price of a gas car. There are not enough charging stations. If you travel a distance your battery needs to be recharged. It is not as quick as a fill up of gas. It could be dangerous for people like me; who drive all day and don't have 45 minutes to charge my battery between appointments. Just say NO to banning gas powered vehicles

Comment ID: 755**First Name:** Susanne**Last Name:** West**Commenter Email:** suetwest@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:41:37 AM**Attachments:**

Princeton, MIT Scientists Say EPA Climate Regulations Based on a 'Hoax'.pdf

Comment:

Name: West, Susanne Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposed regulations will do nothing to positively affect the climate and will be a massive burden on the residents of CT. Even if there was infrastructure in place (charging stations, etc.) our electrical grid is insufficient to sustain the additional load of all transportation (personal as well as food and other goods) necessary for a functioning community. The increased financial burden will be unsustainable for most residents and many businesses, and will likely result in their exodus, further reducing the tax base needed to support the state's budget. Furthermore, even if CT reduced its "carbon footprint" to zero, it would not make a dent against the emissions of China and India. These are punishing regulations serving only to make the lives of CT citizens worse, while doing nothing to help the environment. I implore you to consider the facts presented in the attached article regarding the testimony of a physicist and meteorologist that the climate agenda is "disastrous" for the US. It explains far better than I can the dangers of continuing down this "net-zero" road.

Comment ID: 756**First Name:** Donna**Last Name:** Barent**Commenter Email:** Beads.avon@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:44:36 AM**Comment:**

Name: Barent, Donna Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not ban gas powered cars. What did the people in Florida do after the Hurricane hit? We should have hybrids but those aren't cheap! How long do the batteries last? And what do you do with the batteries when they stop recharging? And what are they made of hazardous material, right?

Comment ID: 757**First Name:** Joe**Last Name:** Latt**Commenter Email:** Joe.latt64@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:48:54 AM**Comment:**

Name: Latt, Joe Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The electric car proposed mandates are absolutely ludicrous. The very nature of electric vehicles is more taxing on our environment that you lead the public to believe. There is no known process for recycling the lithium batteries, not to mention the limited resources available for mining new lithium. Forget our electric infrastructure, it is not equipped for this proposed monumental demand. I oppose any further changes to current policy unless someone can intelligently explain how this will work seamlessly and affordable for our citizens.

Comment ID: 758**First Name:** Ron**Last Name:** Boucher**Commenter Email:** smoothoperator196@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Strictly Business LLC**Commenter Title:** Managing Member**Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Boucher, Ron Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.

Comment ID: 759**First Name:** Kerry**Last Name:** Szych**Commenter Email:** kerryszych@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** NA**Commenter Title:** NA**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:50:12 AM**Comment:**

Name: Szych, Kerry Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Until the state can ensure we have the proper transmission lines, a push to all electric vehicles is short-sighted and premature.

Comment ID: 760**First Name:** Lisa**Last Name:** Lear**Commenter Email:** learlisa@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:53:17 AM**Comment:**

Name: Lear, Lisa Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Connecticut Government: Please take some time to research the impact of making such a ban on gas vehicles. Will we have the energy capabilities and infrastructure in place to do so by 2035? Do we have enough research on the EV, battery, and costs to know the average citizen would easily be able to afford the vehicle. What are the other impacts to our environment that will occur with the increased use of electric vehicles? Please do not compete with California in making hasty decisions, trying to look as if we are on the cutting edge. Please look to the experts and your constituents in making proper decisions. Sincerely, Lisa Hines Lear Griswold, CT 06351

Comment ID: 761

First Name: Thomas

Last Name: Kenney

Commenter Email: Tkkenney08@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Resident

Commenter Title: Energy Specialist

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:54:00 AM

Comment:

Name: Kenney, Thomas Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Greetings everyone, I'm deeply involved in the energy efficiency and renewable energy domain, spearheading sales for projects spanning residential, commercial, and utility-scale scopes in Connecticut and beyond. It's worth noting that the adoption rate of EV chargers is relatively sluggish, with Eversource/UI often struggling to allocate funds for incentives on level 3 and level 2 chargers. Additionally, when we delve into the numbers, an interesting facet emerges. While the allure of full electric vehicles (EVs) is evident, the transition to EVs isn't without challenges. The production of EV batteries requires considerable energy and resources, and the disposal of spent batteries poses environmental concerns. Furthermore, the charging infrastructure itself demands attention. While EV chargers are pivotal for fostering electric mobility, the process of generating electricity to charge EVs has its complexities. Depending on the energy sources powering the grid, a full-scale switch to EVs could lead to an increase in carbon emissions, especially if the grid relies heavily on fossil fuels. As we navigate the landscape of sustainable mobility, it's crucial to consider the multifaceted implications of our choices, keeping the broader sustainability picture in mind.

Comment ID: 762

First Name: DAVID

Last Name: LANDAU

Commenter Email: davidlandau@remax.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:58:06 AM

Comment:

Name: LANDAU, DAVID Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 DEEP Banning the sale of fossil fuel propelled cars and trucks without a viable substitute is a misguided solution. Please do more research on the harm electric vehicles do to the environment.

Comment ID: 763

First Name: Donna

Last Name: Hemmann

Commenter Email: hemmann@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Hemmann, Donna Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against the ban of gas powered cars period. Transportation must be affordable, and for many, gas powered vehicles are the only alternative. We are not all able to afford not only the electric vehicles, but the electricity it takes to charge them, and run our homes. Our electric grid is not sufficient to handle this.

Comment ID: 764

First Name: RONALD

Last Name: GRAVELLE

Commenter Email: drgravelle@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: PRESIDENT

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: GRAVELLE, RONALD Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please stop trying to follow other states. We are CT we can think for our self I do not want an electric car or truck that after 8 to ten years we have to scrap with no way to recycle and if the battery dies be for it is to expensive to replace say NO TO THIS MANDATE Ronald Gravelle

Comment ID: 765

First Name: Linda

Last Name: Smith

Commenter Email: lasmith99@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Smith, Linda Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the state mandating electric vehicles as of 2035 and banning gas powered vehicles. It is far too expensive for most people to purchase an electric vehicle and then to buy batteries when the battery is no longer useful. Electric vehicles, when charging the battery, will tax the electricity system and may cause brown-outs and higher rates. We live at a time of high inflation which already makes it difficult for many people to manage their finances. It is not really environmentally sound as the batteries require rare earth minerals, the mining of which is not good for the environment. Further study is needed. It is impractical, as I understand that the batteries do not work as well in freezing temperatures and as the electric vehicles are very heavy, the vehicles could pose potential collapse of parking garages, for example. Again, more study needs to be done on this. The world- many countries of which use fossil fuels for their economy- and many states in the union will probably not ban gas powered cars so any potential environmental benefit will be limited at best. This so-called benefit will be off-set by the economic hardship for the citizens of this state. Other than this proposal being trendy environmentally and providing profit for those who are the manufacturers of these electric vehicles, I do not see that this proposal is worth the potential problems. I believe all that I have said here is the same for the proposal for all trucks to be electric rather than gas powered.

Comment ID: 766

First Name: Jonathan

Last Name: Johnson

Commenter Email: info@ctliberty.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 10:32:24 AM

Comment:

Name: Johnson, Jonathan Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We don't need any more regulations that will affect families and businesses detrimentally in Connecticut. There are thousands of factories in China, India, and in developing countries spewing toxins into the atmosphere daily and will not cease. The emissions from cars in Connecticut is a drop in the bucket. If and when electric cars actually become economical to produce and consume, then the markets will decide and no new environmental mandate such as this will be necessary. Our power grid infrastructure would not be able to handle every car currently driven to be electric at this point. It seems more advisable to slowly transition our economy to more efficient autos in a market-driven action, then the passing new laws because they sound good, and disenfranchising thousands by forcing changes who do not have the equity needed to keep up with these technological changes being mandated by the state.

Comment ID: 767

First Name: james

Last Name: welsh

Commenter Email: welshje@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 10:35:43 AM

Comment:

Name: welsh, james Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Let's slow down the rush to technology is not mature, we don't need to be California east.

Comment ID: 768

First Name: Ann

Last Name: Giuliano

Commenter Email: Anncarlenegiuliano@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 10:35:51 AM

Comment:

Name: Giuliano, Ann Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The DEEP proposed ban on the sale of new gas cars by 2035 is the most ridiculous, pathetic and disgusting action which is totally NOT a well thought out concept and crippling to CT residents and businesses! This is definitely an example of ? the cart before the horse?. There is not enough infrastructure available, nor do we want taxpayer dollars thrown at this ill-conceived plan! Banning gasoline powered vehicles will not have an effect on global warming and we all know it! Additionally, this plan will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and region with no reasonable plan to create this energy. Electric cars cost more and will put more than a burden on residents and businesses! This is an attempt to reduce our choices AND freedoms! NO AND NO AGAIN to this proposal of banning the sale of new gas cars & trucks by 2035!!!

Comment ID: 769

First Name: Douglas

Last Name: Van Veldhuisen

Commenter Email: douglasvanv@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: First Congregational Church

Commenter Title: Pastor

Posted Date: 08/22/23 10:36:16 AM

Comment:

Name: Van Veldhuisen, Douglas Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Questions that I believe need to be

asked. 1. How are you expecting to charge electric cars without putting a huge stain on our electrical grid that is already full? 2. When the batteries no longer work, how are you proposing to discard them? 3. If the electric cars only run so long before they need to be recharged, how will this impact our tourism as many people come to vacation here in the summer and travelling will be impacted as people will not be willing to travel long distances as they will have to start adding hours to their travel time to have to recharge their car? 4. How will this then impact our economy in the long run? 5. How are they expecting families to purchase new electric vehicles when they cost so much more than what they can purchase another vehicle. 5. Right now we produce our electricity with coal, how much more coal will need to be burned to produce a greater demand on electricity? 6.

Comment ID: 770

First Name: Jack

Last Name: Corroon

Commenter Email: Jackcorroon@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Corroon, Jack Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please consider cancelling these proposed regulations to force consumers and businesses into EVs prior to development of a natural market and broader support services for such vehicles. In addition to there not being enough grid infrastructure and charging networks, this regulation itself will drive costs for EVs higher. It will artificially increase demand for EVs, the production volume of which is not certain at the moment or profitable without government subsidies. It will significantly increase electricity costs in CT, currently the 4th highest in US right now! And, what about all the collateral economic damage to dealers, mechanics, consumers, etc. We need growth in CT, not the government working against its citizens and local economy with regulations that force an outcome that would more likely happen by itself over time. Let market economics guide the conversion to EVs. Please either cancel this proposed new section 22a-174-36d - my first choice - or modify it to make it more CT citizen friendly. Thank you.

Comment ID: 771

First Name: Joseph

Last Name: Romano

Commenter Email: jromano258@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 10:52:46 AM

Comment:

Name: Romano, Joseph Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is with much concern that we, the people, continue to have to deal with the ongoing authoritarian actions of state agencies who operate without the required oversight of the legislature (who also may be derelict in this function). The move to ban the future sale of gasoline powered cars by 2035 could not be more exemplative. Consumers, through the free-market process should drive the need/desire for any product, let alone one as game changing (and miss-promoted) as EVs. Besides the basic injustice of such an action, it would not serve the intended purpose. At the current stage, and for the foreseeable future, of EV evolution, this plan will cost consumers more, endanger the environment on a global scale, harm the economy, and put us into dependency of foreign powers - some hostile to our best interests. For example: 1. obtaining raw materials is via major earth-excavating mining done virtually all overseas and mainly in China or Chinese influenced countries. The process involves the usual environmental pitfalls of the mining process- e.g. air and ground pollution and land scarring. 2. The present electric grid cannot handle the projected increase in demand and there are no reasonable, effective plans to create the new energy needed (in fact, CT is doing the opposite). Brown outs, reducing recharging capabilities, can be expected as was recently mandated in CA. 3. The median priced EV is far more expensive than its gas powered counterpart. 4. EVs are much heavier than size comparable gas powered cars. They are inherently more dangerous in road accidents and will increase road wear and tear. Also they pose a hazard to first responders (and riders) in road accidents due to the voltage running through the system. 5. Battery

technology is currently such that battery life can decrease by as much as 10%/year, reducing max charging levels and reducing range. Couple this with even new car overlong charging times and the effects on mobility are negatively impacted. 6. Outside of costs necessary to increase grid capacity, how much will the additional cost to the taxpayers be to develop and implement the necessary infrastructure of charging stations. We are light years away from something similar to the current filling station population. Finally, gasoline emissions have been reduced over the years in the states, including in CT, to a negligible level vis a vis global emissions. The evolution of the automobile has taken over 100 years in developing the supply chains, efficiencies, fuel economy, safety and infrastructure to get to today's safer, fuel efficient, reliable and destination accessible product. DEEP's plan is like designing and building an airplane while it is flying. Please reconsider this drastic, and unnecessary action. Thank you.

Comment ID: 772

First Name:

Last Name:

Commenter Email:

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 11:03:12 AM

Comment:

Name: , Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 How is DEEP constitutionally authorized to implement these regulations, and by extension, enforce them? Where is the express grant of authority from the legislature? Simply because DEEP is the "eyes and ears" of the Connecticut environment does not mean it is implicitly authorized to enact such regulations particularly when they will have an impact on interstate and intrastate commerce. Setting aside the green environment narrative and political agenda for a moment, at issue here is whether an agency such as DEEP is constitutionally authorized to engage in rulemaking of this type simply by relying on the broad public policy considerations of the enabling legislation as a basis for implementation, or whether that decision is better left to the legislature.

Comment ID: 773

First Name: Caron

Last Name: Bott

Commenter Email: Caronbott@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Association of Realtors

Commenter Title: Realtor

Posted Date: 08/22/23 11:04:53 AM

Comment:

Name: Bott, Caron Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 How is Connecticut planning to mandate all cars purchased prior to the proposed all electric vehicle law by 2027? How will the gasoline vehicles be retrofitted to comply? I'm against this all electric vehicle proposal, forcing people to comply is not only prohibitively expensive but unconstitutional.

Comment ID: 774

First Name: John

Last Name: Aliberti

Commenter Email: eden1@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: citizen

Posted Date: 08/22/23 11:11:43 AM

Comment:

Name: Aliberti, John Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please take 59 seconds and watch the YouTube video entitled "The True Cost of Electric Car Batteries. What you are proposing is NOT a good thing. Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. Any items as important as this should be voted on by the citizens of the state. Thank you for considering our thoughts. Kind regards, John T. Aliberti

Comment ID: 775

First Name: Edward

Last Name: Wachowski

Commenter Email: edwwc@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 11:12:44 AM

Comment:

Name: Wachowski, Edward Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am submitting written comments regarding the proposed band being considered by the DEEP on gas powered vehicles by 2035. I am writing in opposition to this proposal for several reasons. First, we as citizens of the United States and Connecticut, living in a free market economy, should have the opportunity to purchase whichever type of vehicle we choose. To be forced to purchase an electric vehicle as part of a mandate by the government is un American at the core. Second, a large sector of our economy and many jobs within our own state are centered on the oil and gas industry. So abruptly shut down that industry will not only cause individual harm to these folks, but will also create a huge ripple within our economy as a whole. We do not need self-imposed, economic pain in Connecticut or elsewhere. Thirdly, proposing such a began to take affect within 12 years is startling, given the fact that Connecticut does not seem to possess the infrastructure and the preparation necessary for a full transition to electric vehicles. How are folks supposed to charge these vehicles as they travel? As I am driving along or highways or local streets, I see occasional stations for charging, but certainly not enough to handle the majority of the population driving an electric vehicle. What is Connecticut's plan for improving that infrastructure? Fourth, have we considered the cost to the average individual of such a change. Electric rates are certainly not cheap and to add in nightly charging of a motor vehicle or two or three, depending on the household is going to make one's electric bill go up to thousands of dollars per month. I don't think this is fair for the average citizen of Connecticut. Connecticut already is one of the most expensive states to live in. We have multiple taxes that many other states don't have including sales tax, income tax, and car tax just to name a few. Now to add in the monthly electric bill going into the thousands of dollars doesn't seem to make a lot of sense. Finally, I have serious concerns about the safety of not only electric vehicles, but also of the charging of them at home. There are documented cases of house fires that are caused by vehicles being charged at home. I am very concerned about having to have such a connection set up in my home when there is not any guarantee of its safety. This is a serious concern! While I certainly support having our energy and our environment be as clean and healthy as possible, we can't just set arbitrary dates and lofty goals without having a concrete organized plan that will allow for a slow transition to a different type of vehicle with minimal effect and minimal economic pain to the average taxpayer. What would probably make more sense would be to encourage more hybrid vehicles, something I am certainly supportive of and considering for my next vehicle. There are just too many uncertainties and concerns with a full transition to electric vehicles within 12 years. I encourage the DEEP, the CT legislature, and the governor to seriously consider my testimony, as well as that provided by others, and scale back this idea to make it more manageable for the residents of Connecticut. Thank you.

Comment ID: 776

First Name: K.

Last Name: F.

Commenter Email: friendfromchurch554@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 11:22:02 AM

Comment:

Name: F., K. Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To whom it may concern, I am reaching out today to request that this ban on gasoline cars be discarded. As an American and native Nutmegger, I am voicing my concern as well as the concern of all those who are not aware of this bill and hearing. Personally, I like the idea of both gas and electric vehicles coexisting. However, I disagree with removing one to favor another. This will greatly impact the automotive communities and companies, not to mention those that reside in this state alone. Gasoline cars have been tried and true for over a century and have been modified extensively through the years for less emissions. ?Directing exhaust fumes through a metal housing coated with the catalyst can remove up to 98% of pollutants from them, and regulations requiring the installation of catalytic converters on cars and smokestacks have helped dramatically improve air quality in cities around the world since the 1970s.? as stated by Brownell. It is important that we not discard the intense work done by so many so that we can have a cleaner atmosphere with the use of catalytic converters. Technology is not simply the realm of electronic devices as we see it as today, it is humanity?s attempt at using tools to better our existence. Tools of all kinds, not only electronic. Today?s technology changes at an exciting rate. Gordon E. Moore, who cofounder Intel, stated that he noticed that computer chips accelerate at a rate of twice the power every two years. ?Moore?s Law is not a law of nature, but an observation of a long-term trend in how technology is changing.? said Roser, Ritchie and Mathieu. This is applicable to general technology as well. All other technology will accelerate just as fast as computers. This includes gasoline cars. All in all, I myself would love to continue seeing gasoline cars on our roads. I also am an automotive enthusiast and would greatly enjoy passing that passion down to my children and grandchildren. I personally would prefer to be given a choice on what type of car I drove and I do prefer gasoline engines to electric motors. I also am considerate of our environmental factors and don?t believe that further use of fossil fuels will be detrimental to our air and environment. Technology is adapting fast and emission prevention technology will supersede the already effective technology we have now. Please give these thoughts consideration. Thank you for your time. Sources: Brownell, Lindsey; The department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology at Harvard University; ?Cooler catalytic converters: Cleaner air for all.? Roser, Ritchie and Mathieu; OurWorldInData.Org; ?What is Moore?s Law??

Comment ID: 777

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Paulin

Commenter Email: christopherspaulin@paulinpermaculture.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 11:27:16 AM

Comment:

Name: Paulin, Christopher Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No person shall ever force me to buy a new non-gasoline-engine car from 2027 or from any other date, or else that person shall leave America, a free land under God, to go to a communist country, under Satan, where one can practice one's communism. Henry Ford's Model T car was the peak of car design, simplicity, and beauty. It did not need a computer. It is not outdated. The legislators worship technology and the 2015 Catholic Jesuit Laudato si' climate-change encyclical, from that non-biblical church in the city of Rome in Revelation 17 in the King James Bible, and abandon their American past of liberty, for which was fought in the American Revolutionary War. A simple catalytic converter can be added to the exhaust pipe of a non-computer Ford Model T, and it is a perfect car. Dr. John Christy of the University of Alabama-Huntsville testified before the Natural Resources Committee on May 13, 2015, that carbon dioxide emissions have no significant impact on climate change. There is no link. This is a scam. There is no emergency. There is no virus that was purified to study it. That was a scam. The so-called authorities create the problem, the reaction, and the solution. They use that technique again and again to scam Americans, based on false crises. The government is criminally involved in geoengineering the sky, as seen almost every day by its chemtrails, and they

escape punishment for that crime. Trees consume carbon dioxide and make oxygen to give us life, and trees moderate the climate. Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant. Revelation 17 is written about Rome, which is the woman, and its seven hills or mountains, which are Aventine Hill, Caelian Hill, Capitoline Hill, Esquiline Hill, Palatine Hill, Quirinal Hill, and Viminal Hill. [9] And here is the mind which hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. [18] And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth. Revelation 18 is being fulfilled, about fornication with Rome, which is the woman, [3] For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. The so-called representatives of this legislation are representatives of Satan and Rome. They must repent and stop problem, reaction, solution.

Comment ID: 778

First Name: Anna

Last Name: Moschella

Commenter Email: annr5@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 11:31:23 AM

Comment:

Name: Moschella, Anna Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 You cannot kill existing widely adopted technology BEFORE you have effective infrastructure in place. Let people adopt the "better" technology when it gets better and cleaner or a new one is developed, not because you think you're going to save the planet. Promote a better environment in more effective ways like discouraging private jets, outlawing pesticides, stopping over development, improving public transit including metro north (which is horrible), etc. - Our electric grid is outdated and cannot support electric cars - Not everyone wants an electric car. California had issues with meeting demand when they had brown outs, leaving EV owners stranded. - Electric cars and especially electric car batteries are extremely expensive and many people can't afford the high cost. - Charging stations are not widely available- many people live in apartments - you would make it extremely inconvenient by forcing them to charge their cars at a charging station. Wait for the technology to improve and let demand for EVs grow naturally. - You're trading car fossil fuel emissions for electrical plant fossil fuel emissions. - The raw materials to build EVs and mining for lithium (for batteries) are a huge environmental pollutant and human rights disaster. EVs are not the golden ticket to a cleaner environment and not everyone wants or can afford EVs. Fine to promote them but don't force it. You are not solving any problems, only creating new ones.

Comment ID: 779

First Name: George

Last Name: Winter

Commenter Email: gdwinter@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Attachments:

EV Concerns.pdf

Comment:

Name: Winter, George Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 See Attached File

Comment ID: 780

First Name: Paul

Last Name: Faulkner

Commenter Email: pfaulkner2727@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Attachments:**

Short Circuit The High Cost of Electric Vehicle Subsidies .pdf

Comment:

Name: Faulkner, Paul Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 There are reasons to be skeptical of banning gas powered vehicles. Proposals to eliminate gas-powered automobiles are likely to win politicians media coverage and cheers at town hall meetings, but the actual environmental impact of such policies remains unclear. It's important to remember that CO2 emissions are not just about what comes out of vehicles, but also what goes into vehicles. Electric vehicles might not emit emissions through exhaust pipes like gas-powered cars, but they expend tremendous amounts of CO2 during their production and charging cycles, and require numerous elements such as lithium, cobalt, and manganese that must be mined from the earth. While conventional wisdom says electric vehicles are more environmentally friendly and an effective tool to fight climate change, research suggests electric vehicles may have environmental costs that actually exceed those of internal combustion engines when the full cycle of production is included. Jonathan Lesser of the Manhattan Institute, for example, has published research showing that electric vehicles are worse for the environment than modern gas-powered vehicles. Using the Energy Information Administration's long-term forecasts for the number of electric vehicles through 2050, Lesser estimated how much electricity these vehicles would require. He then broke down the effects on three key pollutants that are regulated in the US Clean Air Act: sulfur dioxide (SO2), oxides of nitrogen (NOX), and carbon dioxide (CO2). What I found is that widespread adoption of electric vehicles nationwide will likely increase air pollution compared with new internal combustion vehicles. You read that right: more electric cars and trucks will mean more pollution, Lesser wrote in Politico. The fact is, modern gas-powered vehicles are not what your granddaddy was driving. Today's vehicles emit very little pollution, Lesser concluded, about 1% of what they did in the 1960s. Lesser's findings are not isolated. The World Economic Forum has also called attention to the "dirty secrets of electric vehicles," which includes both adverse environmental impacts and children as young as seven working in cobalt mines in places like the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where more than half of the world's cobalt is produced. Raw materials needed for batteries are extracted at a high human and environmental toll. This includes, for example, child labour, health and safety hazards in informal work, poverty and pollution, the World Economic Forum's Global Battery Alliance notes. A recycling challenge looms over the eleven million tonnes of spent lithium-ion batteries forecast to be discarded by 2030, with few systems in place to enable reuse and recycling in a circular economy for batteries. Recycling is not the only environmental problem facing the lithium-ion batteries used in electric cars. The bulk of these batteries are manufactured in places such as Japan, China, and South Korea, where generation of electricity remains heavily dependent on fossil fuels, including coal, which increases the carbon footprint of electric car batteries. For this reason, Amnesty International is calling on nations to disclose the carbon footprint of electric car batteries, so their environmental impact can be accurately assessed. While it's difficult to gauge the environmental costs of these batteries with precision, one German study found that every Tesla battery requires between 23,000 pounds and 32,000 pounds of carbon emissions. Considering that Tesla produced 368,000 cars in 2019 alone, that's up to 11.8 billion pounds of carbon dioxide emissions in just Tesla batteries in a given year.

Comment ID: 781**First Name:** Randy**Last Name:** Aey**Commenter Email:** randolph_c_aey@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 12:10:56 PM**Comment:**

Name: Aey, Randy Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I wish to address several points regarding electric vehicles(EVs). To start, most electric vehicle batteries are lithium based and rely on a mix of cobalt, manganese, nickel, graphite, and other primary components. Some of these materials are harder to find than others, though none should be classified as "rare earth metals." Countries that have access to these elements have very poor track records

regarding child labor and human rights in general. America does not have an abundance of these elements, so acquiring them means importing and not creating jobs for America. Whereas there are small recycling facilities currently in operation, there is nowhere enough to handle recycling on a mass scale. Seed money (taxpayer dollars) is required to jump-start these programs, with no guarantee of a return for the taxpayers. As this is a new technology, essentially in its infancy, we really need to investigate the normal and widespread use of E.V. Perhaps, on a State level, have DAS purchase a small number of E.V. to have various Depts use them on a daily basis to determine real-life viability. In closing, I believe we are jumping the gun into this new technology without having any supporting infrastructure needed to make this change sustainable. We are simply implementing one proven technology for one yet-to-be-proven. Both require mining resources from a planet (our planet) with a finite supply of materials. Personally, I prefer the devil we know.

Comment ID: 783

First Name: David

Last Name: Emberling

Commenter Email: david@emberlingstudio.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Volunteer

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Emberling, David Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm David Emberling, from Newtown Ct, a 30 year Ct resident, and one of the 200,000 members of Citizens Climate Lobby, a non profit climate advocacy organization To answer some of the objections to the proposed regulation: 1. EVs have overall far lower total emissions than IC vehicles, including mining & manufacturing 2. California is losing population primarily because of housing costs, not regulation 3. It is critical that CT build the necessary charging network to make EVs practical 4. My son grew up in Fairfield County and developed asthma, and the air quality there was a likely contributing factor 5. I would suggests that adding subsidies and increasing gas and diesel taxes may be necessary to enable enough people to purchase the EVs that manufacturers would be required to sell-there's no point in mandating the sale if people don't buy them. 6. I would request people who object to this measure to offer an alternative that would equally reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions 7. In order to achieve the emission goal, it will be necessary to significantly increase the production of electric power from renewable and possibly nuclear sources in order to meet the needs of the new EVs expected 8. EVs statistically have fewer fires per mile driven than gasoline cars 9. This rule does not force anyone to buy EVs-it just makes the manufacturers make more of them, which they're doing anyway 10. Batteries are lasting longer than the average life of the car, so there will not be a severe cost involved in replacing them. 12. According to the NOAA and the US Dept of Energy, there is no know connection between wind turbines and whale deaths 14. With regard to EV fires, We can do some reasonable extrapolation, given that only about 1 percent of all vehicles on the road are EVs. Further, Tesla, which is responsible for more than half of U.S. EVs, reported roughly five car fires per billion miles driven compared to 55 fires per billion miles driven among all cars

Comment ID: 784

First Name: Bradford

Last Name: Parsons

Commenter Email: bradparsons@cambridgeresource.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Individual - Concerned CT Taxpayer

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 12:23:19 PM

Comment:

Name: Parsons, Bradford Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly opposed to PR2023-023. The State of Connecticut is in dire economic straights due from terrible legislation produced by the legislature and poor vision from the governor. This is just another piece of 'feel-good' legislation designed to follow the misguided Executive Orders at the federal level, that have the country racing in the wrong direction. No one in Hartford is capable of commissioning a balanced study to chart a better course for CT.

Comment ID: 785**First Name:** Stephen**Last Name:** Schroeder**Commenter Email:** skrich_2000@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 12:23:43 PM**Comment:**

Name: Schroeder, Stephen Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 786**First Name:** Rick**Last Name:** Aiello**Commenter Email:** rick_aiello@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** N/A**Commenter Title:** N/A**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 12:32:12 PM**Attachments:**

NO to the ban on gas-powered cars #2.pdf

Comment:

Name: Aiello, Rick Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Another set of comments in opposition to this bill. See attached.

Comment ID: 787**First Name:** James**Last Name:** Coffin**Commenter Email:** james-coffin@att.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** RTX**Commenter Title:** Principal Engineer, Power Transmission Group, Pratt & Whitney**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 12:44:24 PM**Comment:**

Name: Coffin, James Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 When you can demonstrate that the fire safety and total environmental cost of EVs and their charging systems are at least as good as ICEs, then restriction of ICEs will be warranted. Preemptively banning ICEs without first demonstrating that EVs meet these basic criteria will not only serve to erode the safety of the residents of CT, but will also cause a backlash against public acceptance of EVs as a viable component of a fact based response to global warming. EVs may be a good solution for some consumers, but for many they present cost barriers and safety risks that are unacceptable.

Comment ID: 788

First Name: James
Last Name: Flood
Commenter Email: jflood53@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 12:48:31 PM

Comment:

Name: Flood, James Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. Ethanol in gas reduces efficiency by 10% and increases emissions by a similar amount. STOP SELLING GAS WITH ETHANOL IN CONNECTICUT!!!

Comment ID: 789

First Name: Suzanne
Last Name: DiBiase
Commenter Email: sldibiase@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 12:56:53 PM

Comment:

Name: DiBiase, Suzanne Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am NOT in support of a ban on gas - powered cars. In other words, I do not think we should get rid of vehicles that run with gasoline. It is crazy expensive to expect everyone to go out and purchase electric cars. What happens when the electricity goes out? (which it does do.) Once again I am not in support of PR 2023-023. I like my gas powered car, motorcycle and lawn mover. Thank you.

Comment ID: 790

First Name: Rory
Last Name: Ronan
Commenter Email: rronan@kohlerronan.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 01:06:31 PM

Comment:

Name: Ronan, Rory Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Do make changes to car emission standards until all buildings are electric and there is spare capacity to charge all electric cars. These changes will hurt the state and make us less competitive. Buildings are stationary and are better candidates for converting from fossil fuel to all electric. The grid capacity is not even ready to do this, never mind all the cars too. We need more base load generation before we can convert. Nuclear power would show that the state is serious. Wind and solar are not stable enough sources.

Comment ID: 791

First Name: Jared
Last Name: Lewis
Commenter Email: kleeblattst@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 01:39:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Lewis, Jared Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to express my support for the ACC II legislation. It would support reduced CO2 emissions, improved air quality, potentially reduce noise pollution and overall support a more sustainable future. While listening to the public hearing, I was I persuaded by arguments against the regulations. Models show even worst case scenarios with EV efficiency and electricity generation type show a reduction in CO2. Concerns regarding mining and raw materials are potentially legitimate, but can certainly be overcome. The loss of the tax revenue from a gas tax are already being worked on by the state. Arguments about personal freedom seem overwrought. Infrastructure concerns do seem valid, but I am confident can be overcome. My understanding is that ICE technology has about reached its efficiency limits, while battery technology is in its early stages so leaps in improvement and cost would be the expectation. With this said, I am in full support of adopting these regulations. Regards, Jared Lewis

Comment ID: 792

First Name: Harold
Last Name: Finer
Commenter Email: harryfiner@cox.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 01:54:36 PM

Comment:

Name: Finer, Harold Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Lithium Batteries Explode, Fies can't be hosed down, Disposal of dead batteries are going to be dumped where? Gas Cars are reliable, go further distances don't require charging in between long trips. Ok they can be an option, as long as Gas is an option. Politics plays too much a role in Gas prices, we have more than we need for our consumption if we don't sell gas out of the country. Open up Alaska and Canadian oil lines, bring prices down. Our Air is cleaner but Forest fires and Chinese pollution is the issue. Don't stop selling cars! Let the consumers decide what to buy.

Comment ID: 793

First Name: Peter
Last Name: Lombardozzi
Commenter Email: Lombo299@aol.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/22/23 02:16:58 PM

Comment:

Name: Lombardozzi, Peter Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a older citizen I am totally against this regulation and I speak for many of my friends, colleagues and family. I cannot afford a ev, the battery xout, cost of vehicle, tires, and maintenance. If this passes gas prices will skyrocket. I totally believe in climate change but 10 yrs is not enough for change, please bump it to 2040 or beyond, please, please halt this regulation and say no. Thank you

Comment ID: 794

First Name: Adam
Last Name: Haims

Commenter Email: Adamhaims@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: H&L Chevrolet

Commenter Title: Vice president

Posted Date: 08/22/23 02:17:32 PM

Comment:

Name: Haims, Adam Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 On average you have only 1 qualified EV mechanic per every 20 combustion engine mechanics. And this ratio is getting worse. If you pass this bill it will lead to customers waiting months to get their vehicles repaired.

Comment ID: 795

First Name: Ann

Last Name: Walsh

Commenter Email: signwal@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 02:31:26 PM

Comment:

Name: Walsh, Ann Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am totally against banning gasoline cars. You cannot ban China's emissions & their pollution is worse than America's. I can not afford an electric vehicle. The battery replacements alone make the vehicle unaffordable. Air pollutions come from other countries as well. Continue to OFFER EV's but let the taxpayers decide for themselves what they can & cannot afford. MY VOTE IS NOT TO BAN GASOLINE VEHICLES. Please stop

Comment ID: 796

First Name: John

Last Name: Bradley

Commenter Email: ChevroletServiceManagers@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Chevrolet Service Managers Club - Connecticut Chapter

Commenter Title: President

Posted Date: 08/22/23 02:42:24 PM

Comment:

Name: Bradley, John Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While Electric Vehicles are an interesting technology their use should be determined by consumers and NOT mandated by the State of CT. Where are the realistic economic studies? Most CT taxpayers cannot afford an EV. The State funded subsidies, State mandates, and compliance costs will be inflationary, place additional tax burden, and potentially break an already fragile power grid in this and other states. The additional time wasted recharging during longer travel vs refilling fuel will detrimentally affect businesses both small and large and will be economically detrimental to our citizens. Additional hazards associated with EVs such as fire (thermal event) potential, battery disposal, and safe handling by first responders is critical. 300v DC will kill you quickly if accidentally contacted. Overall, considering a multitude of factors, EV technology is not beneficial to the environment of the USA considering the methods of manufacturing (strip mining minerals) and power sources. Not commonly noted is the fact that EV batteries have both heating and cooling systems that run continuously to keep battery temperature in an ideal range. This occurs when the vehicle is parked 24/7 or operating. Thus, the demand for power is constant whether being driven or not. In winter, this particularly reduces effective range. This proposal should be rejected based on my 45+ years of experience in the automotive industry.

Comment ID: 797

First Name: Thomas P.

Last Name: Ganley

Commenter Email: thomas-ganley@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: concerned resident/taxpayer

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Ganley, Thomas P. Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 For the record, I, as well as my family, are 100% totally against this latest inane proposed legislation. The science doesn't support it and neither do our over-strained wallets. If it hasn't occurred to you, not everyone wants to be stuck in some liberal hell hole like CA or NY with their hair-brained laws and half-baked ideas. I do not need any more over-regulation. And I am very tired of democrats thinking that the solution to all the world's problems is my wallet. We already have the highest electric rates in the country and now you want to make us even more dependent on the electric companies. I think a much better question is how much stock or personal investments our CT legislators have in electric company stocks. Now there is a very compelling question....

Comment ID: 798

First Name: Donna

Last Name: Crowley

Commenter Email: durendaldogs@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Crowley, Donna Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Why is the CT DEEP dictating the elimination of gas powered cars? Why is it enacting electric auto policy without fixing and upgrading the CT electric grid first? CT bureaucrats make policies without thinking of consequences. It appears they don't give a hoot. Laws are made by the legislator not the unelected. This policy can be considered racist too Do you think low income and the middle income class residents can afford these vehicles, or even the costs associate with charging? Many get their electric bill subsidized now because electricity costs are so high here. Is the CT Tax Payers to foot the bill for their vehicle charging costs? Is CT DEEP hoping to keep its citizens locked in their homes as they was during the COVID10 debacle? Research and see the consequences of the decision. Do not push for this before the electric grid is stronger, protected and able to handle the energy demand Thank you.

Comment ID: 799

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Levy

Commenter Email: peter@kamberllc.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Kamber Management Co.

Commenter Title: GP

Posted Date: 08/22/23 02:51:20 PM

Comment:

Name: Levy, Peter Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 A ban of gas-powered cars in Connecticut will have no effect on global climate, reducing pollution, saving energy, but will make living here more expensive for everyone. A ban will create a hardship for a majority of residence and businesses because electric cars are substantially more expensive than gas engine cars, electric usage would increase measurably which also increases everyone's electric bills. Shifting to all electric cars not only increase electric usage, but also infrastructure costs and taxes that would ultimately be levied, with no State plan to mete these impractical demands. Other unintended consequences of such a ban, including higher emissions from tire, road, and brake wear, plus the toxic waste of spent batteries over the life of the vehicle, need a great deal more vetting. I urge you to reconsider this hasty move to electric cars and better research the dire consequences of a ban.

Comment ID: 800**First Name:** James**Last Name:** Downey**Commenter Email:** jedowney1953@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Tax Payer**Commenter Title:** Tax Payer**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 03:17:57 PM**Attachments:**

Don't ban gas powerd vehicles.pdf

Comment:

Name: Downey, James Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I believe this is another example of government over reach. There is a slow but steady infringement on the rights of the citizens/tax payors of Connecticut. How I spend my money is my business alone. I also believe that solar and electric vehicles have future but it takes time to develop them and also the infrastructure, 12 years is not enough. The State has bigger priorities. Let's solve those problems first.

Comment ID: 801**First Name:** Elizabeth**Last Name:** Mondello**Commenter Email:** Elizabeth.mondello@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 03:41:49 PM**Comment:**

Name: Mondello, Elizabeth Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To the State of CT, DEEP and Governor Lamont- First, are you all insane? I do not want Connecticut to ban gas automobiles. Electric vehicles are terrible for the environment, they are unusable any sort of emergency, they are financially impossible for the working class without socialist subsidies, and are not wanted by a majority of the population. They wear out in less than 10 years, they cause dangerous fires, they are a disposal disaster, they use questionably sourced materials, they are not practical for any cold or wet climate, and their range restrictions are pathetic. Now, if you are trying to be massively unpopular politically and a creepy controlling freak, sure try this. It's just virtue signaling by people who believe they won't have to deal with the real-life consequences that will ensue as you try to cram this horrible idea onto people. What is this- Soviet-cut? We only get the car that we are allowed? Go try to sell this garbage somewhere else, we are Connecticut Yankees, and proud to be independent and free.

Comment ID: 802**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Dinius**Commenter Email:** dinius@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** N/A**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 03:43:17 PM**Comment:**

Name: Dinius, John Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I write in opposition to the adoption of this proposed regulation. Given the high cost and operational disadvantages of electric vehicles, it is heedless to enact a regulation now that will burden Connecticut residents financially and logistically without knowing whether the proposed requirements will become manageable in the time frame that the regulation specifies. Because electric vehicles are heavier than gas-powered vehicles, the increased wear on tires (and other car components) and on the

state's roads would result in significant increased costs, in addition to the higher initial cost of the vehicles, thus further burdening Connecticut residents. The additional electrical energy required to operate all-electric vehicles would require additional generating capacity. The only environmentally responsible means to meet this demand would be nuclear plants, which should be planned very soon, and even then could not be online in time to meet the increased demand. Bottom line: This plan was a bad idea in California, and it is a worse idea for Connecticut or other states to follow this impractical idea.

Comment ID: 803

First Name: Kenneth

Last Name: Case

Commenter Email: krcdac@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 03:50:12 PM

Comment:

Name: Case, Kenneth Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I find that this proposed regulation is in keeping with the historical practice of regularly updating standards for vehicle emissions in our state. While the provision to phase out certain vehicles by 2035 has caused hand-wringing among a small minority, this "target date" needs to be set. Movement toward any goal is not motivated unless a firm schedule is implemented. In my opinion, we are a couple decades behind as it is. So I am 100% behind this proposal as well as PR2023-020. These need to be implemented. I'm proud to be resident of a state that is among the most forward thinking in the nation.

Comment ID: 804

First Name: Theresa

Last Name: Kaiser

Commenter Email: tshea4010@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 03:55:42 PM

Attachments:

DEEP.pdf

Comment:

Name: Kaiser, Theresa Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Public Comment in support of phasing out the sale of new internal combustion engines by 2035. Please see attached file.

Comment ID: 805

First Name: Mary

Last Name: Ruszkowski

Commenter Email: Cruisecouple99@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 04:27:34 PM

Comment:

Name: Ruszkowski, Mary Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While I am not against electric cars I am Against the government telling me that is my only option. We're following other States as California. They had a dream and don't make it our nightmare. Of course for the wealthy money is no object. As a middle class citizen of our country and again it is our country. Don't make it a take it or leave option. You want your electric buy one. The government is getting wealthy off the backs of the hard working American citizens. My family came here from Italy to free dictatorship.

Comment ID: 806**First Name:** Patricia**Last Name:** Bruhn**Commenter Email:** peb65peb@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Na**Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Bruhn, Patricia Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Good day, As someone who will be in there late 60's at that point, I will not be able to afford the car or have a way to charge it. There is no current infrastructural to support this mandate. Who is going to pay for it? We should be working on mass transit and improving our rail roads while making it more cost effective. Today in CT history, Theodore Roosevelt rode in one of the first electric cars in 1902. We are looking backward instead of forward. Find and invest in new alternative ways throughout Rand D. I have struggled for years to live in CT, and I will never be in a position where an electric car will be an option I can afford. One last thought what about trucks and snow plows?? I object to this proposal.

Comment ID: 807**First Name:** Paul**Last Name:** Hurlbut**Commenter Email:** pwspaul@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Business Owner**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 04:43:06 PM**Comment:**

Name: Hurlbut, Paul Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I hope someone has looked at the amount of money the state will loose by not selling gas powered vehicles in our state. Instead of forcing people to buy a vehicle they don't want, give them a better incentive to buy an electric vehicle. Lets also not forget the cost we will have to retrofit our homes to charge a vehicle faster than 12 hours. I run a fleet of 15 work vans. How am I supposed to charge those vans every night? Lets use some common sense. Electric vehicles make sense in certain applications but it will be impossible to have every vehicle be electric.

Comment ID: 808**First Name:** Vincent & Janet**Last Name:** Giuliano**Commenter Email:** vince.giuliano@ymail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Senior VP Government Relations**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 04:44:55 PM**Comment:**

Name: Giuliano, Vincent & Janet Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm writing to SAY NO to the proposed ban on the sale of new gas powered autos & trucks by 2035. Battery powered vehicles are inefficient for New England weather as cold temperatures reduce battery charging efficiency & range of travel. This ?feel good? proposal lacks a sensible plan to create & support the electric infrastructure needed. Absent a reasonable plan, a ?feel good ban? will lead to the wasteful use of scarce resources. Batteries are too heavy & emit harmful radiation. Banning gasoline emissions in Connecticut will have no incremental effect on the global climate. State policies must complement America's Foreign policy. Absent a strong comprehensive Federal Foreign China Policy, the creation of State bans on gas vehicles will have a serious detrimental effect that empowers & enables the domination of

China over the US. This Connecticut Ban will prove to be UnAmerican. Vincent & Janet Giuliano Windsor CT 06095

Comment ID: 809

First Name: Ginger

Last Name: Betti

Commenter Email: gbeti30@outlook.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 04:57:41 PM

Comment:

Name: Betti, Ginger Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Good evening - I respectfully request that the State of Connecticut NOT adopt regulations restricting the sale of gas-powered vehicles. While I understand the thinking that electric vehicles are cleaner, it should be the consumers choice to purchase whichever vehicle they need. I drive 80 miles a day (round trip) to work, while that is not an impediment to driving an electric vehicle...the remoteness of my residence is. I have lived through NUMEROUS power outages at home (some over a week in length), but yet I still need to go to work. The expectation that I will have to take ADDITIONAL time out of my commute to charge a vehicle (off of my property) is completely unreasonable. In addition, having to incorporate additional time into vacation or business trips for charging is asking way too much of the population. Other points to note are: 1) Extinguishing a fire on an electric vehicle is not safe for the firefighters or those in the vehicle. Many fires just need to burn out... this closes down roads and can take hours before the vehicle can be touched. 2) What happens to a battery after it's useful life ends? How do you dispose of those chemicals? 3) What about the generating of the electricity to charge the vehicles - doesn't that pollute our air? Also how is all of this additional requirement of electric power generated? I thought the heat waves already tax the power grid. Extremely disappointing that the State of Connecticut does not seem to be taking all of the State's residents into consideration when developing this plan. I can see the benefit in a city, but those of us who live in the rural/country areas of CT should always have the option of gas-powered vehicles as their primary mode of transportation. Thank you, Ginger Betti

Comment ID: 810

First Name: Stephen

Last Name: Shealy

Commenter Email: srsheal@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 05:08:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Shealy, Stephen Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am adamantly opposed to following California's lead in banning the sale of gasoline powered cars by 2025. The cost of electric power has already risen a great deal recently. Adding all these cars to the grid will only raise the cost of electricity that much more, while also making the grid more prone to brown outs. Plus the cost and maintenance of electric cars is much higher than gasoline cars. Connecticut is already becoming an increasingly unaffordable place to live. If this law passes it will result in increased expenses for cars and electricity. People and businesses will therefore be forced to leave the state.

Comment ID: 811

First Name: Frank

Last Name: Sannicola

Commenter Email: f527@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 05:21:55 PM**Comment:**

Name: Sannicola, Frank Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is utterly nonsense. You are limited to the distance you can travel. There are not sufficient charging stations across the United States, which severely limits travel options. Currently these cars are cost prohibitive to the average person. I feel that it is not right that anyone should be forced into purchasing something that they don't want and that economically not feasible as it puts an unfair burden on most people.

Comment ID: 812**First Name:** Frances**Last Name:** Morlino**Commenter Email:** franmorlino@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 05:37:59 PM**Comment:**

Name: Morlino, Frances Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not adopt this rule. People are hurting economically and this will only make it harder for regular people to get to work and live their lives. EVs are not practical for most people. There are many concerns such as their tendency to burst into flames, the batteries are made with precious resources which are mined under very questionable circumstances, like child labor. We do not have the infrastructure to support this. Fossil fuels in this country are plentiful and cheap. Vote NO on banning gas powered vehicles. Don't turn Connecticut into California.

Comment ID: 813**First Name:** Roger**Last Name:** Tarre**Commenter Email:** tarre.roger@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 05:45:29 PM**Comment:**

Name: Tarre, Roger Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. The proposed regulations on requiring EV sales only have me concerned. EV technology, while growing quickly, is not even close to the reliability of gas vehicles. The infrastructure just isn't there, and won't be by the proposed timeframe. EVs must be affordable, and able to be charged in the same amount of time to fill up a gas car. Otherwise it is a forced inconvenience on the citizens of CT. I also am concerned about something that is not often brought up, and that is the horrible environmental effect from mining lithium and other metals for the batteries. Lithium ion batteries also are dangerous in fire situations, and require a considerably larger amount of water to extinguish than a normal car. I believe these regulations and requirements must be moved ahead until the infrastructure and technology had surpassed the regulations. Thank you for your time Roger Tarre Wolcott CT.

Comment ID: 814**First Name:** Laura**Last Name:** Volk**Commenter Email:** Dragonsprit@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:**

Comment:

Name: Volk, Laura Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 So what happens if all the cars are all electric and there is a natural disaster in your area and the power is going to take days to fix and get up and running. Now no one will be able to drive anywhere because there is no charging stations with power to charge your car.

Comment ID: 815

First Name: Laurie L

Last Name: Bostiga

Commenter Email: bostigarnl@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 05:48:12 PM

Comment:

Name: Bostiga, Laurie L Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I hope you vote no to this mandate for all electric vehicles only to be sold in CT by 2035. There are various reasons for my thinking this way. One is that the infrastructure is not in place and more importantly a cost effective plan for the infrastructure is not here. How can we plan on doing something if there is no real plan?!? Another reason is where is the electricity going to come from to charge these cars? How much will it COST?!? Insurance rates for auto and homeowners insurance will be sky high as who will cover a potential explosion and fire at your home? What quality control is in place? I regard to manufacturing all these vehicles? Who will pay for the one ton replacement battery for large SUVs or are we all supposed to drive little cars that hold a couple people? What about the cost to the trucking industry for their trucks and whose costs will be passed onto us? Where are all the components coming for the batteries? It is a laudable but totally impractical idea until we have all the pieces in place. Please listen to your CT residents not just the few. I will be leaving this state that is too expensive to live here if these laws just keep making all of us pay more! There has to be a process and a cost benefit analysis not just a good intention!

Comment ID: 816

First Name: RAYMOND

Last Name: HOUGHTON

Commenter Email: raymondhoughton@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 05:53:53 PM

Comment:

Name: HOUGHTON, RAYMOND Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 the replacing of gas powered vehicles is pure nonsense The emissions affections is almost none. You democrats are trying to shove this baloney down Ct. peoples throat Here you politicians are trying to enforce some hair brain scheme on the general public is wrong. I lived in Calif. during my military service and that state has been going down the dump for years.

Comment ID: 817

First Name: Scott

Last Name: Amann

Commenter Email: samann@cox.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Amann, Scott Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric cars are an impracticable, politically

inspired, and government forced solution that does little to change the natural change in the climate. There are many flaws in mandating a switch to electric only cars: ? Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. ? On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. ? Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. ? There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? ? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 818

First Name: Carolyn

Last Name: Behre

Commenter Email: aklabear@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 06:08:07 PM

Comment:

Name: Behre, Carolyn Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO TO GOV. LAMONTS EV MADATE. I am 100% AGAINST an EV Mandate for CT Vehicle Owners. When manufactured, EV's leave a HEAVY carbon dioxide footprint as they source energy from non-renewable sources such as fossil fuels (eg. more than 50% from coal or around 20% nuclear power.) EV Batteries require Rare Metal Extraction: Lithium via ore mining with environmental impact (water contamination); Biodiversity loss CO2 emission; air contamination and water loss. Don't most of these metals come from Chile Patagonia region? What are you thinking. For every ton of lithium ore, 15 TONS of CO2 are released into the atmosphere (per MIT). Cobalt and Nickel Metals are also contaminants with high CO2 emissions. How are you bettering the planet. What about the Battery Disposal Cost and Effects? What is the plan? Have you ever replaced your leaf blower battery? \$\$\$\$ Have you thought about a battery dying in the bumper to bumper traffic of our highways? I mean the governor doesn't use the Merritt—he has a helicopter to fly over it! If you CARED about the environment truly—you wouldn't be packing in everyone from the borders into our tiny state. Are you getting a battery for the helicopters that the team uses? Obviously it's a vote and a dollar sign. In CT the cost of living is 30% higher than the rest of the country and you want us to buy high end cars that no one can afford? Retail and corporations are leaving because the costs are ridiculous and your ideas are too far out there. This one is the craziest. Fix your priorities. CA is a SHITHOLE. Don't make us one. I cannot afford a \$50,000 car. Most of us can't with your taxes. You want the middle class gone. This is part of the plan.

Comment ID: 819

First Name: Phyllis

Last Name: Lobo

Commenter Email: flair5.1@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 06:08:50 PM

Comment:

Name: Lobo, Phyllis Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please reconsider banning gas cars. There is no need to do this. People will choose if an electric car suits them. The government should not be making decisions for people!

Comment ID: 820

First Name: Lori

Last Name: Murphy

Commenter Email: Lorimurphy9@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Citizen

Commenter Title: NA

Posted Date: 08/22/23 06:11:45 PM

Comment:

Name: Murphy, Lori Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 DO NOT BAN GAS CARS! LEAVE US OUR FREEDOM!

Comment ID: 821

First Name: Marty

Last Name: Charette

Commenter Email: marty_charette@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 06:17:21 PM

Comment:

Name: Charette, Marty Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to oppose the proposals. Based upon many leading studies including government agencies which have all said that electric cars will hardly make a dent in reversing climate change. I am sick and tired of our Democratic leaders acting like dictators telling the people who put them in office and gave them a job how we should live our short miserable lives. If the government wants me to drive one of these electric vehicles then I expect you to make the car payment for me and any additional maintenance that comes with said electric vehicle. If you want it so badly you can fork the bill. I think we are putting the cart before the horse we don't have the infrastructure and yes we're in the process of trying to advance it but will it be completed in less than 10 years.. let's be realistic we all know how long it takes just to pave a road. We the people get to decide what is best for ourselves and our families. That doesn't mean that we are not good stewards or that we are evil. The government has no place doing this. The state of Connecticut is very small and we have some of the best environmental laws and regulations in the country we are very proactive and we've done very well. With that said the impact will be so little that you're not even going to notice a difference climate change is not going to stop at the New York Connecticut line and go around us because we're being good little minions. Enough with the politics because that's all it is It is politics and not science I have a degree in environmental science and climate change so I know a thing or two about this topic I have dedicated a lot of my time to it. I implore you to listen to your constituents, and really make sure you can accomplish what you propose because if it fails or it takes longer than expected, we the people won't stand for it. Thank you for your time.

Comment ID: 822

First Name: Ma

Last Name: Fl

Commenter Email: grand5ms@outlook.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: N/A

Commenter Title: Norwalk resident

Posted Date: 08/22/23 06:26:24 PM

Comment:

Name: Fl, Ma Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 As a Norwalk, CT taxpayer and life-long resident, I do not agree with Governor Lamont, State of Connecticut Governor, Mandating the ownership of EVs by 2035 or anytime. Thank you.

Comment ID: 823

First Name: Louis W.

Last Name: Bach

Commenter Email: lwbach@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 06:54:48 PM

Comment:

Name: Bach, Louis W. Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do NOT ban liquid fuel vehicles in Connecticut. Government in CT has no moral mandate to force citizens in a purportedly FREE society in a purportedly FREE market to alter their buying decisions in order to benefit a few investors in "green" technology at the expense of actual environmentally sound actions. Electric vehicles are an environmental nightmare: the cradle to grave carbon footprint far exceeds that of fuel vehicles. Electricity is, itself, largely fossil-fuel derived and inefficiently transmitted in our state. We do not have the infrastructure for this. No one wants this. Stop. Government please STOP. TAKE A BREAK. YOU CAUSE MORE HARM THAN GOOD. JUST STOP.

Comment ID: 824

First Name: Loren

Last Name: Andreo Jr

Commenter Email: andyjr76@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 06:55:56 PM

Comment:

Name: Andreo Jr, Loren Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposal is total INSANITY!!! What are people thinking. Unless the entire Eastern Half of the Country agrees to this it is like fighting a forest fire with a garden hose!! Connecticut is having a hard enough time trying to generate adequate Electricity for its existing uses & because of adjoining states not allowing for additional natural gas pipe to be connected to us we are at near capacity of Electric Generation. This measure would put an undue & death knell strain on the system. How about the affordability for the average working class family to but one of these vehicles (NOT). Ask a fireman how they like working on electric vehicles that are in traffic accidents? Again much of the pollution in the State is being blown in from more highly densely populated areas that will not be under the same regulations YOU are espousing. I am 70 yrs old & have lived most of my life in this state BUT a proposal as Asinine as this is enough to drive me out of here Literally!!!! Thank You.

Comment ID: 825

First Name: john

Last Name: leardi

Commenter Email: mr.shawn.oconnor@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: concerned citizen

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: leardi, john Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To whom it may concern, my name is John Leardi. I am very concerned about Governor Lamonts ban on gas cars by the year 2035. First of all electric cars are very expensive, which in laymans terms would mean us poor folks, and a lower class people would not be able to afford them, and secondly, why can't the citizens of Ct vote on this? Electric cars have lithium batteries which can cause fire too, and its unsafe. I don't think we should have to follow a "Mandate" which is not a law, if we can't afford to. Please reconsider doing this, everything should be a "Choice" in our society. Its getting harder and harder to even make a living in Ct, everything is taxed to death, and too many regulations. We need to go back to a "Constitutional state" not government beurocracy, thank you.

Comment ID: 826**First Name:** Joshlyn**Last Name:** Lucas-Nash**Commenter Email:** lucky05stars@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Lucas-Nash , Joshlyn Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Good Evening, I am writing concerning Proposed Regulation Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023. I am opposed to this proposal. The people of CT are burdened enough with cost of living expenses. In addition to having to purchase a car they may not necessary want or can truly afford. Buying a vechile should be a descion based on need, budget and wants. Consumers should have the option to choose gas or electric. How many current electric car owners are lower to middle class? In additon to the cost of an electric car in the future, there are other cost to be considered and the final amount at this time cannot be known. This includes but is not limited to: Upgrading their house electrical to include a charging station Possibly having to move if their apartment/condo complex is not equipped with charging stations Home owners and renter insurance increases Aditonal cost of electricity Upkeep of vechile There will be an increase of demand on mechanics and trainings that may go with that, and cost passed along to the consumer What about or electric grids, how much more load can they handle? Who will pay for upgrades, if they are needed. There is also concerns for our fire departments, after seeing a few Teslas catching on fire. Will they be equipped to handle more of these fires? How will they afford to do so? This proposal also brings into play, will gas vechiles be totally banned in the future? What about classic cars and race vechiles. Hobbies that many people enjoy and race tracks that have been part of CTs history for decades. There is also situations like in 2011 when a hurrican struck. Some people had no power for three weeks. How will people be able to get anywhere if their vechile can't be charged. Thank you for allowing me to opportunity to share my thoughts. I hope that you will realize we have a long way to go before this proposal should even be considered.

Comment ID: 827**First Name:** Ben**Last Name:** Fitzgerald**Commenter Email:** bfitzgerald3132@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 07:22:32 PM**Attachments:**

Ben Fitzgerald Testimony.pdf

Comment:

Name: Fitzgerald, Ben Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Department of Energy and Environmental Protection: I am writing in support of Connecticut's proposed ban on the sale of new fossil cars. I am a voter and a constituent, and I have lived in Norwalk for nineteen years. Climate change is unquestionably a devastating global catastrophe. If widespread reforms like these are not passed, our state will be crushed by climate change?both by its direct impacts and its indirect economic impacts. By contrast, banning the sale of fossil vehicles will have little to no impact on the average consumer. The 2022 IPCC (International Panel on Climate Change) report warns of a climate emergency if carbon emissions fail to reach net zero by 2050. Reaching this target requires the world to cut emissions in half by 2030 ? only six and a half years away. So far, America has taken little action to reach this goal. If we continue on our current trajectory, experts estimate that average global temperatures will rise by 2°C to 3°C, resulting in catastrophic natural disasters, food and water shortages, mass extinctions, and many other crises (Climate Action Tracker, 2021 IPCC Report). Opponents of this policy are worried about its financial impacts. However, they do not seem to worry about the state of an economy when these widespread disasters halt global production. In 2018, the G3C (Governor's Council on Climate Change) identified the steps Connecticut must take to reach the IPCC's 2030 target. As of the writing of that report, Connecticut is woefully falling short. Rather than beginning to slash emissions to 29% of 2014 levels, transportation emissions have been increasing since 2019,

halted only by the COVID pandemic. Of the 125,000 registered electric vehicles Connecticut promised by 2025, the state only reports 36,271. (DMV news and announcements | CT.gov). If Connecticut wants a prayer of mitigating climate change's worst dangers, it needs to do everything it can to curtail the sale of electric vehicles NOW. What's the harm in missing the IPCC's targets? If warming reaches the projected 2°C cited above, 8% of the world's farmland may become unsuitable for cultivation by the end of the century. As many as three billion people may face chronic water scarcity. If warming reaches 3°C, 29% of land-dwelling plant and animal species may be at risk of extinction, a loss of biodiversity which will trigger other devastating ecological impacts (New York Times). These, in turn, threaten to cripple global industry and supply chains, affecting the average consumer much more than the need to purchase electric vehicles that are already government subsidized. This brings me to my second point: this legislation will not harm the average consumer. In 2021, a team at MIT aggregated data of fossil and electric vehicle prices in the United States and determined that mid-level electric vehicles and fossil vehicles retail at similar prices; however, lower maintenance and fuel costs make electric vehicles more profitable long term. An analysis by the Union of Concerned Scientists concurs, finding that fueling an EV is more profitable than fueling a fossil vehicle in fifty states. Additionally, Connecticut's CHEAPR program is already offering up to \$7,500 in EV subsidies for average consumers (and supplemental subsidies for low-income consumers). Connecticut's nine-year electric vehicle charging program is already on-track to address Connecticut's lack of charging stations. Its proposed 50,000 charging stations by 2030, in partnership with Eversource, will stimulate CT's energy economy, further addressing false concerns about a negative impact on the economy. I urge you to support CT's ban on fossil vehicles. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Ben Fitzgerald

Comment ID: 829

First Name: rita

Last Name: omeara

Commenter Email: flagg.janet7@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: rita omeara

Commenter Title: mrs.

Posted Date: 08/22/23 07:23:55 PM

Comment:

Name: omeara, rita Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hi my name is Rita O'Meara, and I am writing to you in regards to the bill on wanting to ban "Gas cars" I never knew i'd live to see this day that this is going to take place, without any citizen getting involved and voting on this. WE the people should be able to decide to vote on important issues like this. I have children and grandchildren, who are struggling like most middle class and working class Americans, we don't want to buy an expensive car, and the politicians have no business telling us what to drive. I heard many bad things about electric cars, like burning engines, and the lithium batteries are very expensive to fix, If you cared about "Low income people" you wouldn't put such a burden on them. We need to have "freedom of choice " for everyone, I would appreciate it if you would not propose or pass this bill, let we the people decide. Thanks, Sincerely Rita O'meara.

Comment ID: 830

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Croce

Commenter Email: spc2772@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 07:55:59 PM

Comment:

Name: Croce, Susan Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not want CT to ban gas powered cars. I don't want to be forced to purchase and/or drive a certain type of car. I want options.

Comment ID: 831

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Santoro

Commenter Email: Rjs@knottlaw.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 08:30:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Santoro , Robert Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Not only is this an absurd proposal because new gas cars are so much better for the environment on a whole than electric cars and better for our over stretched power grid, this proposal likely violates the dormant commerce clause.

Comment ID: 832

First Name: Debi

Last Name: Ellsworth

Commenter Email: jimdebi99@protonmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Ellsworth , Debi Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Education not Regulation.

Comment ID: 834

First Name: Danielle

Last Name: Bournos

Commenter Email: Daniiiishop@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Na

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Bournos , Danielle Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please stop messing with the people of this state. We want to live our lives and not have unaffordable, untenable, unrealistic regulations that would make it more difficult to remain in this state. We like driving our gas powered cars at affordable rates. Electric cars take much electricity to charge and the batteries take up so much more resources. Please don't do this thing. Thank you!

Comment ID: 835

First Name: David

Last Name: Baccaro

Commenter Email: Dbaccaro@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/22/23 09:09:56 PM

Comment:

Name: Baccaro, David Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I disagree with this proposed regulation. It seems very premature to force Ct Residents to buy only electric cars. CT residents already pay very high electric rates for apparently no good reason. Why would you hurt the residents and businesses of our state even more? People are already struggling in the current economy. Electric cars should be OPTIONAL!!!

Comment ID: 836

First Name: Mark**Last Name:** Piotrowicz**Commenter Email:** marknotime@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Piotrowicz, Mark Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut is an expensive state to live in. We have among the highest electric rates in the country. We are last in the nation, according to the Tax Foundation, to achieve tax freedom day. Grocery prices, rent, and all other essentials of life have exploded thanks to reckless federal spending and money printing. Despite the official government proclamations, everyone knows wages have not kept pace with the increased cost of living. And now a small group of un-elected bureaucrats apparently feel it's a good idea to further increase the cost of living in the state by mandating the sale of only electric cars. Why? To combat global warming? To improve air quality? I could write pages about the naivete of these arguments but here's just a couple important points - our air comes from the west, Pennsylvania and Ohio, who are not participating in CA emissions regulations. America is the only major CO2 producer who has already reduced CO2 production. India and China simply laugh at us and continue pumping out more CO2, making our efforts little more than economic suicide. Perhaps you should review the recent work of Princeton professor William Happer and MIT professor Richard Lindzen which explains the many ways the "consensus" CO2/climate change relationship is questionable at best, if not purely political. Connecticut is a difficult state to live in. Why can't you just leave us alone? Why must you force more command-and-control regulations down our throats?

Comment ID: 837**First Name:** Robert**Last Name:** Flanagan**Commenter Email:** bob@robertdflanagan.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Flanagan, Robert Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing in opposition to the Connecticut Department of Energy and Environmental Protection's proposed regulation, Advanced Clean Cars II, that would ban the sale of new gas-powered passenger cars. Connecticut has a mixed history regarding exploitative labor practices. In the late 1700s, the state passed the Act of Gradual Abolition, which sought to free slaves by age 25. Unlike Massachusetts, which had only two enslaved persons in its 1790 census, Connecticut's slavery did not end until 1848. On the other hand, in 1813, Connecticut became the first state to enact child labor laws that required employers to provide children with basic education. Today, Connecticut faces another exploitative labor crossroad. Regulations that force the conversion to electric vehicles from gas-powered ones will support slave and child labor in countries such as China and the Congo. On August 17, 2023, Reuters News Service reported that China uses forced labor to create electric car batteries. In a Washington Post article dated August 4, 2023, Katherine Houreld and Arlette Bashizi stated that "countless" children have been and will continue to be used in mining essential minerals for electric car batteries in countries such as the Congo. Given the increasing worldwide demand for minerals used in electric car batteries, which is substantially higher than in hybrid cars, the unacceptable risk for abusive labor practices will remain. These articles highlight the exploitive practices within electric car battery manufacturing. With Connecticut's mixed history regarding slavery and child labor, the DEEP has a moral choice that will impact everyone in the state. Will it ignore the plight of exploited people, or will it not tolerate the abusive treatment of people wherever they live in our tightly-connected human community? The DEEP's decision will indicate what kind of world we are saving while combating climate change. Without sound choices, the world may be green but morally bereft of human integrity and values.

Comment ID: 838**First Name:** Jared

Last Name: Trink**Commenter Email:** racingfox016@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Homeowner**Commenter Title:** None**Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Trink, Jared Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I believe that if electric vehicles were good enough to be purchased by everyone that there wouldn't be push back on the implementation of such standards. Forcing people into vehicles that do not fit their needs or lifestyle through the guise of "Environmental Needs" is outrageous and fear mongering. Switching everyone in such a short time frame is simply not feasible without incurring HUGE costs on both the consumer and infrastructure levels. As it stands I would need to spend over 40k to cut down clean air producing trees in order to make solar a viable option at my house. It would save me 30k over the lifetime of its operation so in fact it will cost me money to make a full switch. I think a balanced approach chosen by the people based on their needs is a far fairer option for the consumer. Don't let the one company that stands to make billions of dollars off this switch be the one telling you how much it will cost....when have they ever been truthful in the past 20 years?

Comment ID: 839**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Robinson**Commenter Email:** robinsjm@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** None**Commenter Title:** None**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:33:38 PM**Comment:**

Name: Robinson, John Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I completely support the new regulation to BAN the sale of gas-powered cars by 2035. I am very happy to see that Connecticut is joining California in being a leader in eliminating fossil fueled cars. This summer's weather is proof that something major needs to be now. I completely reject the Republican efforts to support the oil companies' profits, at the expense of all our health and safety.

Comment ID: 840**First Name:** Mark**Last Name:** Maruschak**Commenter Email:** maruschakm@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:36:10 PM**Comment:**

Name: Maruschak, Mark Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I believe the Connecticut Clean Air Act (Public Act 22-25) is wrong for Connecticut. Our state politicians should not be taking away the choice for the residents of CT to choose between purchasing a gas-powered vehicle or an electric vehicle and forcing only one option. It is fine for electric vehicles to be a choice, but it should not be the only option. I hope our state representatives understand that the people of CT want options and not be forced to purchase only electric vehicles in CT. Let the residents have a choice to choose the type of vehicle they want and vote no to the Connecticut Clean Air Act. Thank you, Mark Maruschak

Comment ID: 841**First Name:** Angela

Last Name: Kearns**Commenter Email:** kearnzog@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:47:32 PM**Comment:**

Name: Kearns, Angela Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am absolutely against mandating electric vehicles. If people want them and have the means to purchase them, by all means. They have the FREEDOM to do that. Besides the usual talking points about why so many are against this; the price, lack of infrastructure and the fact that it will have absolutely no effect on the global climate, there are questions such as: -Safety - putting out an electrical fire -what happens when we get a storm that knocks the power out for 10 days? How will anyone get to work? -How are we going to dispose of these vehicles once they no longer run? How is that going to be good for the environment. - Mining the materials for the batteries. Are we going to give China (or any country) more control over us? - How long before these batteries start losing their charge? We all know that the longer we have our cell phones, the shorter the charge on the battery lasts and the more often they need to be charged. Is that the same for cars and trucks? This just goes to show how absolutely out of touch our (rich) Governor is with the average citizen of this state. He may as well mandate that only Mercedes and BMWs will be sold after 2035. Most people can't afford those either. Right now, it takes me about 15 minutes to drive to work. Since I most likely will no longer be able to afford a vehicle, it would take me over an hour and a half to get to work by bus (that includes 25 minutes walking). That will add about 2.5 hours to my work day for commuting time. To visit my family, right now it takes me about 25 minutes. If I need to take the bus, that trip will now take me 2.5 hours and that includes an hour of walking....each way! I don't necessarily need the government to make my life easier, but I sure as hell don't need government to make my life more difficult. This law will have little to no effect on the rich or upper middle class, but it can be devastating to the rest of us.

Comment ID: 842**First Name:** Ann**Last Name:** Destito**Commenter Email:** Annldestito@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 09:55:12 PM**Comment:**

Name: Destito, Ann Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not ban or prohibit the sale of gas powered vehicles in this state! Connecticut is nearly impossible to live in with its high taxes and high cost of living. Many find it difficult to make ends meet. A ban on gas powered vehicles would make everything more difficult for the residents of this state. Let's put the people first!

Comment ID: 843**First Name:** Mark**Last Name:** Odyniec**Commenter Email:** mark.odyniec@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 10:00:40 PM**Comment:**

Name: Odyniec, Mark Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Forcing compliance to electric vehicle ownership is not a path we should follow at this time. There are too many knowns and unknowns regarding electrical vehicles. Areas of concern include: initial cost of the vehicles (i.e. affordability), delivery of convenient and affordable power to the owners of these cars, cost to upgrade our electrical infrastructure, costs to replace and dispose of expended car

batteries, the impact on the environment producing and then disposing of cars just because the cost to replace a battery is too high. There is also the uncertainty of future electrical costs, availability of raw materials and the level of emissions created by creating massive amounts of additional energy. Mandating ownership of electrical vehicles is not an easy fix to our climate issues. I don't have the answer but, demanding compliance to electric vehicles seems to be leading us down the wrong path. It might make some feel better but, ask these same people if they realize that about 60% of the energy created in the U.S. is produced by fossil fuel burning plants. If we need to bump up the supply of energy to power the batteries in these vehicles, how will we generate the power other than burning more fossil fuel? Nuclear power was first thought of as a viable solution. Poor controls, avoidable accidents, public opposition and a lack of additional research and development efforts put this viable alternative on the back burner. Unfortunately, Nuclear power was dropped like a hot potato. Right or wrong, do we really want to go down this path without a 360-degree understanding of the costs and impacts of this legislation? Let us focus on real efforts to save fuel and the environment. Simply propping up electric vehicles, subsidizing massive empty commuter trains, seldom used busways and carpool lanes is simply not the solution. There is no easy solution but, I assure you that mandating electric vehicles will cause more issues than one might initially imagine. Sincerely, Mark Odyniec

Comment ID: 844

First Name: Josh

Last Name: McGee

Commenter Email: Joshuaajmcgee2@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Greater Hartford Association of Realtors

Commenter Title: Realtor

Posted Date: 08/22/23 10:17:46 PM

Comment:

Name: McGee, Josh Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am fully against banning gas powered vehicles.

There is no reason to. For starters people will not be able to fully adapt in 10 years to transfer to fully electric, it will be extremely expensive for every individual because people who can't change over to electric immediately will be paying an absurd amount of money for gas. The electric ports to charge the cars are extremely expensive, and what happens to the people who don't have space to put an electric port in their own house. Not only that the electric bill on those car chargers are insane on their own. Secondly, there is a massive community of car lovers and you will be stripping that hobby away from them after signing this law. The state and especially the world is not ready to rush into all electric vehicles.

Comment ID: 845

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Mailhot

Commenter Email: Rcemplumbing06820@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Owner

Posted Date: 08/22/23 10:31:23 PM

Comment:

Name: Mailhot, Robert Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I against these electric car There not Enough power for all the electric that we need in our homes now for air-conditioning lighting TVs heatersComputers and everything else The charging stations are not sufficient enough to travel distances Not everyone lives in a house that has enough power for chargers Insurance companies will be raising the rates on homeowners insurance anybody owns electric car due to fires that cannot be put out Easily Government should not be mandate that it's all electric cars let the car sell itself and then the consumer will buy them

Comment ID: 846

First Name: Kristin

Last Name: Eaton

Commenter Email: diddins265@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 10:43:08 PM**Comment:**

Name: Eaton , Kristin Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I write in opposition to the proposed ban on the sale of new gas cars and trucks by 2035. From what I've read, it is not a well-thought-out concept and extremely burdensome to Connecticut residents. Here are some examples of why this proposal is not in the interest of the residents of Connecticut: Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. I hope you will reconsider this proposal instead of burdening the residents of Connecticut with unnecessary mandates.

Comment ID: 847**First Name:** Karl**Last Name:** Missal**Commenter Email:** Missal79@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 10:44:41 PM**Comment:**

Name: Missal , Karl Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is another perfect example of why I, and undoubtedly many other tax-paying residents, will leave CT soon.

Comment ID: 848**First Name:** Joanne**Last Name:** Yurso**Commenter Email:** jyurso@live.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/22/23 11:08:06 PM**Comment:**

Name: Yurso, Joanne Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I really think we should wait to see how this goes in California. It is too sudden and too extreme. Think of the economic impact to gas station owners, convenience stores, and car owners who are now forced to buy extremely expensive vehicles! Many of these vehicles can't even take you the number of miles you need to go on a long trip without having to worry about recharging somewhere along the way. Let's slow down and THINK first!

Comment ID: 849**First Name:** Linda**Last Name:** Miner**Commenter Email:** lmscuba@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:**

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/22/23 11:45:33 PM**Comment:**

Name: Miner, Linda Submission Date: 8/22/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am pro environment. I use 100 % renewable energy. However, I can not support everyone going to all electric vehicles. We do not have the utility infrastructure. Even if the government supports this infrastructure (with Eversource in your back pocket,,) the increase cost to everyone's elect bill (families and businesses) will be way too much to bear and will break our budgets. Many, including myself, are in no position to upgrade our electrical system to be able to plug in our vehicles. I would need an entire electrical overhaul, new circuit breaker box to expand, interior redesign as that is where my breaker box is(no basement), no garage for an electric car ... Reducing its longevity. I am not set up for, not can I afford an electric car. This proposal would be a disaster. So much electric energy comes from coal that this will not help the environment. I know you are trying to do your best to reduce global warming and green house gasses, but forcing all electric cars on the general public is Not the way. So, what can be done ... Have the utilities cut trees and limbs back more ... A six year plan, instead of three. Not just come around every six years, but trim back 2 to ,3 times the current be required distance from the wires. Work with towns to completely remove future problem trees. If you keep trimming the same tree, and that tree is not doing well, it may be more prudent to remove the tree. Remember, the trees along the side of the road are actually owned by the town, so the resident does not need to sign. If you must insist with electric vehicles, why not start with all government vehicles? Why not have CT cut back on beef, cattle, cow's milk, and the like,? This will have a greater impact on improving our environment. I am against forcing all electric vehicles. They are also a huge initial investment for the consumer Where should we cut back? Food, heat, medial and medicine. Please do not force me to change my electric system, buy an electric car and figure out how to charge it. Please don't do this. Please! Thank you, Linda

Comment ID: 850**First Name:** Judd**Last Name:** Malin**Commenter Email:** Juddmln@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 12:29:11 AM**Comment:**

Name: Malin, Judd Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Another state going towards communism. CT is just following California in its failed policies. Let the people decide what they drive. The production of batteries is not good for the environment. The disposal of old batteries will not be good for the environment. Not to mention most of the money in manufacturing the batteries goes to China. Just follow the money in every politicians' actions. CT can follow California off the cliff. Can't wait to sell off everything here and move to a free state.

Comment ID: 851**First Name:** Stacie**Last Name:** Van Deusen**Commenter Email:** stacvand@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 12:45:49 AM**Comment:**

Name: Van Deusen, Stacie Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My outdoor parking at my apartment does not support electric car charging nor do I wish to pay for the upgrades and electricity. Sometimes I have to park on the street. How could I charge my car. My campground does not have electric car charging capability. I can just afford my regular electric bill there since they charge me at a demand rate .34 kh. We drive across the US. Other states will not have the same ability to charge my car. Do not make thus mandatory.

Comment ID: 852**First Name:** Joseph**Last Name:** Hukill**Commenter Email:** SSG.ROCK@YAHOO.COM**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** N/A**Commenter Title:** N/A**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 05:08:15 AM**Comment:**

Name: Hukill , Joseph Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 These proposed regulations are absolutely flawed and are prohibited by our Bill of Rights and our Constitution of the United States of America. Please reference these documents Especially Article 14 section 1. Furthermore, the state of California has no jurisdiction over the state of Connecticut whereby California representatives are not elected by Connecticut citizens. Therefore Connecticut elected officials and non-elected officials of the State of Connecticut must comply with the will of Connecticut citizens. As is often the case of a free society the natural course of economics Will dictate the will of the citizens of the state. Scientifically the Electric automobile, Supporting infrastructure, especially electric generation, Plus public safety and environmental quality have not demonstrated to be factual and Superior to that of the American automotive industry. Lastly no state Connecticut agency or Department should have any type of data collection, enforcement actions and or penalty powers Without explicit approval of the citizens of the state of Connecticut.

Comment ID: 853**First Name:** Kathryn**Last Name:** King**Commenter Email:** kathrynsmithking@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 05:43:57 AM**Comment:**

Name: King, Kathryn Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Just want to remind our legislators to be careful not to make changes that seem theoretically good without considering the realities of regular working folks and their families. Not all CT residents have the means to afford electric vehicles or their supporting accessories. The price of combustion cars is nearly out of reach since wages are stagnant and prices have soared. For my husband and I and our children, there is no way we could afford even one electric vehicle or its charger. Second, the supply of electricity in CT cannot possibly be sufficient to support the entire population. Additionally, the cost of electricity in this state is so outrageous: what do you think additional demands will do to our costs? Please, please consider the realities on the ground for your regular working folks! We are already struggling to feed and shelter our families. Speaking of electricity, though: what fuel do you propose to use to make all that additional electricity? Will that fuel be cleaner than combustion engines? Finally, consider the infrastructure costs of electric vehicles before you impose this on us. A multitude of heavier cars will wreak havoc on our roads, and you already cannot keep up with the regular maintenance on our roads. Think of the bridges which are in such disrepair! Please be sensible about making drastic changes in short periods of time. There are dire consequences for those of us without the means to afford this technology, as well as questions about the feasibility of electric supply. Our roads and bridges and parking garages, too, must be considered. Think about all the implications of what you are proposing.

Comment ID: 854**First Name:** Jay**Last Name:** Kamins**Commenter Email:** jaykamins@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:**

Posted Date: 08/23/23 06:22:26 AM

Comment:

Name: Kamins, Jay Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Change is difficult. People are used to what they know and can fear what they don't. Economic interests can have valuable stakes in the past. But that is no reason to be mired in the past. I support this legislation for electric vehicles are proven (I have one) and help us solve critical environmental concerns. While they must develop and improve, the legislation's timeline provides ample room to do so, and their costs will continue to drop. Even at today's prices, you pay more for the vehicle, but save by not paying for gas that damages our climate and complicates our foreign politics. Time to change.

Comment ID: 855

First Name: Dawn

Last Name: Crouch

Commenter Email: crouchfour@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 07:07:46 AM

Comment:

Name: Crouch, Dawn Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear agency members, I am writing with regards to the proposed regulations from DEEP regarding banning gasoline powered vehicles. I am against the proposed regulation. Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. This does not even consider the on-going maintenance and replacement costs for the battery. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 856

First Name: Brian

Last Name: Green

Commenter Email: bgreen2@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 07:17:58 AM

Comment:

Name: Green, Brian Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We are not California! The technology for electric vehicles needs fossil fuel (or nuclear) in order to charge them. It's expensive and car batteries have a high rate of failure and a high burn temperature. We are a State also of much agriculture. We cannot be removing the option of the people to buy what they would like. Let the free market and individuals decide what's right for them; NOT politicians, States, and the Federal Government. The rights of the people need to stay with the people. Thank you!

Comment ID: 857

First Name: Michelle

Last Name: Daniels

Commenter Email: daniels.michelle@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 07:44:32 AM**Comment:**

Name: Daniels, Michelle Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric cars are not a solution to an energy crisis or fuel crisis. This really affects the lower income. Please do not allow this to pass.

Comment ID: 858**First Name:** Richard**Last Name:** Rogozinski**Commenter Email:** rich.rogo.rr@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Project Manager**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 07:47:52 AM**Comment:**

Name: Rogozinski, Richard Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Here are my comments to my state rep
 Good morning Christie, This issue is one that deeply troubles me as well. So thank you for reaching out and giving your constituents an opportunity to comment. I will try to respond to the links that you provided, but I wanted to provide you with some helpful facts that will hopefully aid you in your own thoughts. As you know, I worked in the electric power industry for nearly 40 years. I completely understand what it takes to create electricity and deliver it to the homes and businesses in this state. I am troubled to think what burden the electric vehicles will place on an already threatened electric grid. A few facts: - The average electricity requirement for an EV is 35 kilowatt-hours (kw-hr) for 100 miles of operation. - 1000 miles of operation would then require 350 kw-hr (perhaps a months use). As a matter of comparison, my all electric house in Cromwell generally uses about 700 kw-hr in a month. - From a national source, the number of registered vehicles in CT is roughly 1.1 million. - Assuming all 1.1M were EV's, and each one drove 1000 miles each month, the electric grid in CT would need an additional 500+ Megawatts of generation to charge those vehicles. - Putting that into real terms. A new power plant of that size, or greater, would be required to charge those vehicles. It's my belief that CT will not be ready for that challenge in just 12 years. I have many other thoughts, but that's enough for now. Thank you for listening and God bless you in your efforts. Warmest regards, Richard Rogozinski 5 Rivercove Dr, Cromwell, CT 06416

Comment ID: 859**First Name:** Cliff**Last Name:** Klein**Commenter Email:** cl109508@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 07:52:40 AM**Comment:**

Name: Klein, Cliff Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose this regulation as well as the regulation on trucks.

Comment ID: 860**First Name:** Eric**Last Name:** Eckman**Commenter Email:** e_eckman@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 07:54:07 AM

Comment:

Name: Eckman, Eric Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against the future banning of gas powered vehicles in 2035. Besides the lack of infrastructure to support them, I don't see any private efforts that show any confidence in the technology. In fact I still see gas stations being built-new ones not renovations. Add a lack of raw materials in this country, or lack of will to allow us to get them and this ban looks like a plan to put the Connecticut citizen into poverty. The fact that government struggles to maintain current infrastructure at great cost to us is another reason to doubt that this plans to succeed. California's nonsensical policies should have no place in Connecticut. Thank You.

Comment ID: 861

First Name: Adam

Last Name: Fine

Commenter Email: adamcfine894@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 08:07:45 AM

Comment:

Name: Fine, Adam Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposal to only ban the sale of new internal combustion engines after 2035 is unironically the same move that boneheaded government "officials" made with the Covid 19 scare tactics that were used to harm small business and prop up large corporations. Not only does making such an asinine law like this harm the poor and middle class, but it also completely ignores the fact that the majority of the cobalt which is used to power all of our battery powered rechargeable devices, from cell phones to teslas, comes from slave labor mines in Africa where even children are forced to dig these resources up either by hand or with hand tools. These minerals are an even more finite resource than petroleum, this whole idea does not make sense at all. What is pushing this nonsense agenda? Are batteries somehow going to be more efficient now than less efficient in colder weather, as they currently are? Our state does not even have the robust infrastructure or power generation to prop up an all-electric transportation system and I do not see that changing anytime soon. Sure, billionaires like the governor and all of their ultra wealthy friends can afford new EV's at the drop of a dime like its nothing but for the rest of us this idea is not currently viable. Sincerely, the working class.

Comment ID: 862

First Name: Stephen

Last Name: Quinlan

Commenter Email: stephen.quinlan@frontier.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: resident and taxpayer

Posted Date: 08/23/23 08:21:27 AM

Comment:

Name: Quinlan, Stephen Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I Am Against The Banning of Gasoline Powered Vehicles. Everyone is in favor of clean air but the proposed ban is short on details and annual milestones needed to meet the proposed goal of 2035. I wish to submit the research of Mark P Mills, Physicist And Senior Fellow with the Manhattan Institute who has done extensive research on electric vehicles. One sample report is attached below. Also, living in a region where extended power outages from ice and snow are common putting all your eggs in one basket is foolish. Thank you.

Comment ID: 863

First Name: Diane

Last Name: Malozzi

Commenter Email: shopfile66@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 08:33:27 AM**Comment:**

Name: Malozzi, Diane Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not support a mandate for electric vehicles, nor will support any politician who does.

Comment ID: 864**First Name:** Christina**Last Name:** Davies**Commenter Email:** tinadavies@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 08:41:50 AM**Comment:**

Name: Davies, Christina Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I comment here as an individual, concerned with the future health of our state and our world, in support of proposed Advanced Clean Cars II regulations and Medium and Heavy Duty Emission Standards and Heavy Duty Omnibus Regulations. These standards have essentially been adopted by numerous other states; yet, Connecticut is burdened by a laxity toward vehicular emissions which adds to its citizens' health problems, including respiratory and cardiac issues. Our current standards may have been appropriate for the 20th Century but, now, we face an ever-more-evident climate crisis, accelerated by reluctance to act quickly to remedy our practices. We need to take action to reduce carbon emissions, and the proposed regulations, if adopted in their whole and as written, will contribute positively toward this effort. This is important, and it cannot wait. I wholeheartedly support the regulations and urge the Regulatory Review Board accept them as written. Connecticut needs to be at the forefront of clean vehicle initiatives, and the Board's acceptance will be a healthy and positive step toward that objective. Thank you. Christina Davies Avon, CT

Comment ID: 865**First Name:** Scott**Last Name:** McCall**Commenter Email:** mccallhill@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 08:52:13 AM**Comment:**

Name: McCall, Scott Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 If folks in Hartford had half the sympathy for the people of Connecticut that they pretend to, the discussion of banning gas cars would not be an issue. Should technological gains and market forces ever so dictate, we would have a gradual and reasonable transition away from combustion engines. As is, the cost involved and the disruption to the lives of each and everyone of us will continue to drive residents out of state to places where every aspect of their life is not controlled by the State Capitol with no regard to the difficulty created for them. You will have any number of letters detailing the specifics of how costly such a mandate would be and for how little gain we would generate.....rich people don't care because the cost of their virtue signaling does not impact their every day life. Everybody else from middle class down suffers not just from either the cost of the cars you wish to force us to buy (or are unable to purchase), but from the sky high prices that would accompany our "noble" pursuit. Please consider the logistical issues this would create; please consider the staggering cost to everyday people; please scrap the idea of using California for a model of anything as that state should only be used for a model of how not to do things.

Comment ID: 866**First Name:** Fred

Last Name: Behringer**Commenter Email:** fbhringer@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 09:03:08 AM**Attachments:**

230822_Comment on electric car and truck exec order_Behringer.pdf

Comment:

Name: Behringer, Fred Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Commissioner Katie Dykes Department of Energy and Environmental Protection 79 Elm Street Hartford, CT 06106 Re: Proposed Regulation Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II. Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While well intentioned, CT should refrain from implementing Gov. Lamont's executive order banning the sale of gas-powered vehicles beginning 2035. A less rigid approach is warranted given many uncertainties, the potential for harmful consequences. Circumstances do not rise to the level where the State must restrict the freedom of CT residents regarding the vehicles they choose to own. I appreciate the need to transition from fossil fuels to cleaner forms of energy and CT doing its part in that effort. Transportation, as the largest contributor to CT CO2 emissions, is an important sector for reductions. However, the mandate for all light vehicles sales from 2035 on to be fully electric or hydrogen powered presents a number of issues and is not needed for meaningful reductions. EVs certainly provide benefits, but the costs and challenges cannot be overlooked. These include: 1) EVs require significant amounts of raw materials ? including rare earth minerals. Will the supply keep up with demand as the countries around the globe seek more EV's? How will that affect the final cost of EVs? What will be the impact of the mining needed to produce these materials? Will the US become dependent on countries (think China - already highly dependent) and face reliability/security issues as a result? There is significant opposition to mining in the US ? will those in favor of more EVs agree to more mining? If the US does not take on its share of mining, are we going to continue to look the other way while the dirty work of mining is done in other countries where both people and the environment are exploited (think the Congo and China)? 2) There are already many ways that EVs and other forms of clean energy are being promoted. These include subsidies, loans, PTC's, RECs, substantial rebates for purchasing EVs and others. These large, costly investments are helping to increase the percentage of EVs. Let these incentives play out. 3) Currently higher to moderate income people are the ones benefiting from EVs as taxpayers and ratepayers subsidize their EVs. Will EVs become more affordable so access is more equitable and there is no longer a need for subsidies? Given the immense global demand, that remains a question. 4) Providing the infrastructure for powering an expanding fleet of EVs will require large investments. How much will this cost? Will functional, reliable charging be available for all who need it? Will reliable, affordable, low carbon electricity be available to meet the demand? 5) A big driver in this decision is the statute that allows CT to adopt decisions made in CA ? a statute that was enacted almost 20 years ago. While adopting CA regulations is not required, the statute allows for a path that makes that all too easy. There needs to be a stronger safeguard to prevent poor decisions from CA influencing decisions in CT. With rolling blackouts CA is no model to emulate. No doubt advances will be made to remedy issues raised above to some extent. I sincerely hope so. Keep in mind other technologies may advance as well. Admittedly it takes judgement to figure a path with so many variables and things we can't fully know. There are others benefits and costs that are not discussed here to keep this short. As you consider all the factors ? the impact not only in CT but globally, I hope the State adopts a more flexible approach ? one that can adapt as we learn more. As CT does its part, bear in mind that reductions here are trivial compared to future GHG emissions increasing in other countries ? primarily China, India and other nations as they emerge from poverty and manufacture things for the US. The US (including CT) has made good progress in reducing per capita GHG emissions. More needs to be done for sure and EVs are an important part of that. Please give market forces time to adjust to demand, have some faith that people are interested in transitioning to clean energy and will move this along ? particularly in CT. Please reconsider this Executive Order. We need a more nuanced discussion of what actions are most meaningful. I believe the mandates are divisive and it is better to work collaboratively. We can get where we need to be without forcing this on CT citizens. Thank you for considering my views. Fred Behringer Old Lyme, CT

Comment ID: 867**First Name:** george**Last Name:** SEGANOS**Commenter Email:** gsegan48@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** none**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 09:08:48 AM**Comment:**

Name: SEGANOS, george Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This new mandate for EV'S is a burden to seniors, middle and low income families. The federal tax credit will not help low income families afford these cars or convert their homes to charge the EV'S The best way to find out what people really think is put it on the ballot for the state. Make it a yes/no question and make it easy to understand and don't hide it on the back of the ballot.

Comment ID: 868**First Name:** Kerry**Last Name:** Guilfoyle**Commenter Email:** kerryguilfoyle@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 09:19:24 AM**Comment:**

Name: Guilfoyle, Kerry Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am all for cleaner air and advance technology in order to assist in both lower emissions and energy efficiency. Battery only cars are not this!!!! We live in a state with power outages and high electric. In addition, the mineral sourcing for these batteries have a far worse environmental and human toll than oil. In addition, it forces energy reliance vs. independence. I was recently in an electric Uber situation where they couldn't make it from New London to New Hartford without stopping to charge. This is neither safe or reliant. No mandatory electric vehicles in the state of CT.

Comment ID: 869**First Name:** Justin**Last Name:** Baltrucki**Commenter Email:** baltruckij@netscape.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Automotive Engineer**Commenter Title:** Mr**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 09:36:40 AM**Comment:**

Name: Baltrucki, Justin Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Here in connecticut we have the second highest electricity rates in the nation. Second only to Hawaii. This fact alone proves that Connecticut is not a leader in creating a clean and affordable electric grid for its residents. On the coldest days of the year the power grid is heavily taxed to produce electricity from gas generation plants and continue to supply heat to the homes in new England. Our grid is over priced, and undersized to meet todays needs for electricity. Connecticut's weather conditions are not ideal for solar power. I have a 3.2KW solar system on my home in Connecticut with ideal southern exposure. I generated less than 2500 kwh last year. The average per hour generation is less than 10% of its power rating. To replace a 1 gw fossil fuel plant you would need to replace it with over 10 gw of solar. CT is not equipped to produce affordable green energy that makes electric vehicles actually beneficial for the environment. EV?s are not zero emissions ? They require very large resources and emissions to produce them. Emissions that are not offset till far into the future ? and they are not offset at all unless the grid is very clean and affordable. EV?s in cold climates like CT are not efficient ? they require energy to warm the batteries just sitting in our driveways. EV?s in Connecticut are not clean, they are not affordable, they are not good for our economy, and will cause grid disruptions that require rolling blackouts on the coldest days of the year. You may be able to convince people who do not do the math on the subject that EV?s are wonderful. You will not convince people who are in a power outage in the coldest days of winter that our power grid is working. CT should not adopt passenger car or diesel truck standards that require EV?s which will not benefit the state, and significantly disadvantage its residents. There are

better solutions for our environment - Hybrid vehicles reduce emissions and provide benefits to consumers while providing a means of transport when the power is not available.

Comment ID: 870

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: Maloney

Commenter Email: kmaloney@nexttrans.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 09:45:13 AM

Comment:

Name: Maloney, Kevin Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing to oppose Bill PR2023-023 which proposes to ban the sale of gasoline powered vehicles in 2035 for the following reasons: 1. There is no guarantee that an already taxed electric grid will be capable of handling what will significantly increased demand, and there is also no guarantee that there will be enough charging stations constructed in the state by that date. 2. There is now increasing dialogue about whether hybrid vehicles are a more realistic solution to the problem as opposed to totally electric vehicles. It would seem prudent to put off banning any gas-powered vehicles until that argument is settled. 3. There is also much discussion as to whether the aggregate pollution caused by the mining and production of the minerals utilized in EVs result in an actual overall reduction of same. 4. The cost of EVs will clearly be beyond of purchasing power of many of our fellow citizens. Our lower and even middle-class buyers will struggle to afford these cars without a substantial financial sacrifice in other areas of their lives. 5. Lastly and most importantly, with all due respect, a decision like this one with such far reaching consequences for our population should NOT be made by unelected bureaucrats, but rather it should be put in the hands of our elected officials who are responsible to their constituents for their actions.

Comment ID: 871

First Name: Paul

Last Name: Dowgewicz

Commenter Email: paul@dowgewicz.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None

Commenter Title: N/A

Posted Date: 08/23/23 09:50:00 AM

Comment:

Name: Dowgewicz, Paul Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Even with the July electric rate reduction, Connecticut still has the highest electric rates in the continental United States. During cold weather last winter, ISO-New England showed that 31% of our electricity was generated from oil. The limited supply of natural gas had to be used for heating since New York won't let any more gas pipelines be built. Electric cars have greatly reduced range when cabin heaters are used and batteries are subjected to the cold temperatures. The point of this comment process may be moot since there is already Connecticut Public Act 04-84 that states Connecticut must adopt California light duty motor vehicle emission regulations. That quietly slipped past when the result was just some minor adjustments to cars and pickup trucks. This process is the most outrageous point for me. This remote-emission vehicle regulation wasn't even created through the California legislative process. Their governor, Gavin Newsom, wrote a letter. Now that becomes the law in Connecticut without any input from the citizens, our elected representatives, or even our unelected bureaucrats. We have no representation for our laws being created. How is that constitutional?

Comment ID: 872

First Name: John

Last Name: Mrozowski

Commenter Email: jam0000@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 09:50:55 AM**Comment:**

Name: Mrozowski, John Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 John Mrozowski 08/23/23 22a-174-36d
 Comments As I am not opposed to electric motor vehicles. I do have concerns with the Proposal that will no longer allow for the sale of petroleum powered vehicles by 2035. My concerns range from economic, environmental, public convenience, and personal freedom to choose products and services but I will keep my comments to the most important. We all know that the electric vehicles do not emit emissions like an ICE vehicle, but it is also common knowledge that pollution takes place at the points of electric generation, battery manufacturing and disposal, the difficulty in extinguishing battery fires and the ground water pollution that occurs in the process etc. What happens during a mass evacuation emergency? How will the grid survive everyone simultaneously charging their vehicle in order to evacuate and how far will they be able to travel in an electric vehicle that is loaded down with the entire family, pets, and important life sustaining supplies like food medicine/medical equipment clean water, clothing etc? After the battery dies at an accelerated rate due to the heavy weight load and use of the environmental controls (A/C or heat) needed for the potentially overcrowded vehicle, then what? The experts think lives will be extended by the possibility of reducing pollution, but at what cost of lives in emergencies? I ordered a Ford Maverick hybrid in September 22 and still have not received it (11 months wait so far). If component shortages occur now with a diverse choice in vehicle power, what will happen to supplies when they all need the same chips? This forced EV mandate is ill-conceived. Like most plans that are rushed, the likelihood of failure is probable. If this plan fails, the cost will be not only monetarily high, but, also, place additional burdens on Connecticut Citizens. Connecticut should work on a sustainable, reasonable and commonsense environmental long-term plan that considers all the factors involved, not just emphasizing on electric vehicles because it is a popular opinion. Some politicians are marketing the EV as a major advancement to stopping climate change. I don't believe this is a working solution and disparity needs to be reengineered.

Comment ID: 873**First Name:** george**Last Name:** SEGANOS**Commenter Email:** gseگان48@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** none**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 09:59:57 AM**Comment:**

Name: SEGANOS, george Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My concern is that why do you have to make it where we in America do not have a choice to buy what we want. Whats next no meat. The production of batteries for EV'S causes more pollution than oil and gas production.

Comment ID: 874**First Name:** Suzanne**Last Name:** Marinaran**Commenter Email:** smarinan@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 10:01:11 AM**Comment:**

Name: Marinaran, Suzanne Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 How this helps low income folks is beyond me. The average cost of an electric vehicle today is out of reach for the majority of the population. The public transportation in cities works well, but in suburbia there is little and very limited public transportation. This is an absurd proposal. We are already stretching our electric supply as we have not built an electric power plant in decades and our grid is already stretched to the limit, getting most of our electric power from Canada. This is why Connecticut has some of the highest electric rates in the country! Why push a bad situation to worse? If you want to

help the people, build another electric power plant! Instead you want to constantly take away the people's rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Comment ID: 875

First Name: Carmine

Last Name: Trotta

Commenter Email: cptrotta@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Self

Commenter Title: Concerned Citizen

Posted Date: 08/23/23 10:20:27 AM

Comment:

Name: Trotta, Carmine Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I fully support the intent to reduce emissions and improve air quality. However, making a mandatory requirement to sell ONLY electric vehicles seems a bit short sighted. The anticipated infrastructure to accommodate electric only vehicles currently is not and will likely not be in place by the 2035 target year. If technology would be developed to "fast recharge" electric vehicles (say as quickly as one can currently refuel a gas-powered vehicle), electric vehicles would likely become more widely accepted. I find it disheartening that proponents of electric vehicles only publicize the benefits of and not the disadvantages of all-electric personal transportation and heavy duty vehicles (such as the need for secure home recharge stations, sufficient power grid support, possible power outages, recharge time, and infrastructure support). In any assessment of options, a COMPLETE alternatives assessment should be conducted and must be publicized, considering all benefits and disadvantages (considering alternatives such as no action, combination gas/ev options, and full ev implementation, as well as ALL near-term and long-term capital and operating expenses).

Comment ID: 876

First Name: Mary ann

Last Name: Pelletier

Commenter Email: mpelletier1120@icloud.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 10:21:30 AM

Comment:

Name: Pelletier , Mary ann Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am very concerned with the proposed legislation as the state of Californian does not have the season called WINTER. They do not have blizzards that last for 12 hours or the bitter cold with wind chills 20 below! Many citizens that are poor to middle income do not have the luxury of a garage.which would enable the battery to remain charged. It is proven w EV the cold reduces the battery capacity.The salt that is put on the roads is very corrosive; what will that do to an electric vehicle? Electric vehicles have many unanswered questions when it comes to the New England weather. A comprehensive independent study must be done. Another concern is that the infrastructure is not there to support such drastic measures mandating selling electric cars only. Lastly, the power grid is old; this must be fixed before going EV only. CT has one of the highest electric rates in the U.S.; low to middle income people will simply struggle every day with living day to day in CT. In summary, I am against this legislation.

Comment ID: 877

First Name: Doug

Last Name: Dalena

Commenter Email: dougdalena@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 10:25:06 AM

Comment:

Name: Dalena, Doug Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 1. I strongly support this proposed regulation. It is critical to the state's economic future as well as the health and safety of our residents and our moral obligation to cooperate with other states and governments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Improvements to the CHEAPR incentive program are excellent, but Connecticut should also waive the sales tax on EVs for a limited number of years to make EV adoption easier. This is more straightforward and easier to administer than purchase incentives or rebates. 2. Objections to the regulations based on cost of vehicles, timeline of adoption, and concerns about sparse charging infrastructure are exaggerated and fail to take into account advances in technology, increasing variety of EV models, the massive ongoing expansion of infrastructure, and the cost benefits of EV ownership over time. 3. Manufacturing EVs has a significant emissions impact, but that is only a small fraction of the emissions impact of a motor vehicle - most of which comes from operation. Not long into ownership, EV emissions fall below those of combustion vehicles, and over the life of ownership it's not even close. Further, the electric power grid is becoming cleaner rapidly (as are manufacturing processes), so the emissions benefits of EVs will only improve over time. EVs also use much less in other petroleum products (no engine oil, for example). 4. In every state in the country, even in Northeastern states with a high cost of electricity, EVs are less expensive to charge than fueling a combustion vehicle. As fossil fuel prices continue to increase and wind and solar continue to add generation to the grid, this divergence is likely to increase. 5. Multiple large legacy automobile manufacturers are adding EV models rapidly, increasing choice and competition, and providing many more options. Over the 10-year time scale to shift to all-EV new car sales, concerns over initial cost will evaporate because many new models affordable to working people will be available - further decreasing the overall cost of ownership. 6. The federal government, large auto manufacturers, and EV charging companies are all expanding charging infrastructure rapidly, so that on highways and major roads there will be multiple options to charge while on longer trips without "range anxiety." Battery technology will also improve greatly over the next 10 years, based on the rapid pace of improvement already seen. All of these improvements will make charging outside the home more affordable, faster, and more convenient. 7. The Inflation Reduction Act and state programs include not just EV purchase incentives, but also significant incentives to install home EV charging infrastructure - covering the vast majority of both purchase and installation costs for certain chargers. Home charging will meet the needs of most drivers, most of the time. 8. Connecticut must continue to lead in this area, and should make policy more friendly to EVs to make this regulation even more successful. Potential policies could include: - mandate that utilities offer reduced rates for EV charging at low demand times (Time of Use Rates). - offer incentives to combine solar with EV-as-backup-battery, providing incentives to install interconnection technology to use EVs as home backup generators - Waive the sales tax on EVs during the ramp-up period contemplated by the regulations - Eliminate the restriction on direct sales of EVs by manufacturers - or narrow it to apply only when a manufacturer has required that dealers make certain investments in order to sell its EVs. The requirement to sell through dealerships was only implemented to protect dealers who had been required by manufacturers to invest in sales, marketing, and repair facilities to meet manufacturers' franchise requirements. That is not applicable to EV-only manufacturers who have never required dealerships to do anything.

Comment ID: 878

First Name: Maria

Last Name: Roj

Commenter Email: mrlu795pc@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: n/a

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 10:33:06 AM

Comment:

Name: Roj, Maria Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Re: PR2023-023 Proposed Regulation Concerning Advanced Clean Cars II. I am writing to express my objection to the implementation of this proposed regulation for the following reasons: CT already has an Emissions program for these vehicles and these emissions account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions so Ct is already doing a very, very good job in regard to minimize global emissions. Further, the cost of electric vehicles is prohibitive for many CT residents and imposing this costly burden upon our citizens will, in turn, hurt the economy for them individually and for the state as a whole. Also, our electrical grid here and across the country is in no way ready to handle electric charging stations (or in home electrical charging) and realistically won't be ready in the not-so-distant future of 2035. Additionally, the disposal of batteries for electric cars will have a major long term demanding effect on the environment which is

a is a problem no one seems to be considering. Ct is doing its part when it comes to minimizing the impact on global emissions, and before we jump into electric vehicles, we must consider all the unforeseen long term consequences they will present. In my view, electric vehicles of any kind are not the solution. If passed, this proposal, it will create significant hardship upon the people of this State, which in turn, will damage potential opportunities and ultimately the quality of life in our state. Therefore, for the reasons and more, I ask that you do not move forward in implementing this proposal. It does not make for good public policy. Thank you.

Comment ID: 879

First Name: Ryan

Last Name: Fazio

Commenter Email: ryan.fazio@cga.ct.gov

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Connecticut General Assembly

Commenter Title: State Senator

Posted Date: 08/23/23 10:37:28 AM

Attachments:

Fazio EV Mandate Testimony.pdf

Comment:

Name: Fazio, Ryan Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Attached is my testimony. Sincerely, Senator Ryan Fazio

Comment ID: 880

First Name: Glenn

Last Name: Doiron

Commenter Email: gwdoiron@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 10:38:33 AM

Comment:

Name: Doiron, Glenn Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am very concerned about the fact that there is no plan for (1) expanding electricity generation, (2) expanding electricity distribution, and (3) REAL budgeting for any of the previous two items (Earmarking some money and hoping that its enough is NOT going to cut it - this needs an actual case study and engineering estimates so that we actually have a reasonable idea of what its going to cost us each year (both directly AND indirectly) before we can even decide to commit to, what seems like an exceedingly expensive proposition).

Comment ID: 881

First Name: Shelley

Last Name: Michelson

Commenter Email: shelly.michelson@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 10:50:41 AM

Comment:

Name: Michelson, Shelley Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a very poorly thought out idea and is profoundly anti-democratic. The State should look at all sources of pollution and climate changing emissions. Start with selling off the large buses that transport a tiny fraction of their capacity, then look for other low-hanging fruit. This idea follows a plethora of other State-mandated clamp-downs on individual freedoms. Following the lead of California will result in loss of population and loss of revenues. An electric car fire in Stamford resulted in

the use of 11,000 gallons of water. If I see an electric car in a parking lot, I park way away. The materials used in these cars helps our political enemies. Please reconsider this terrible idea.

Comment ID: 882

First Name: Matthieu

Last Name: Hargrove

Commenter Email: Matthargrove1@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Concerned Citizen

Posted Date: 08/23/23 11:12:23 AM

Comment:

Name: Hargrove, Matthieu Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This will dramatically effect poor and middle class people in our state. Please stop this right now.

Comment ID: 883

First Name: Anne

Last Name: Greene

Commenter Email: aniact@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 11:25:01 AM

Comment:

Name: Greene, Anne Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not ban gas vehicles! Banning gas vehicle sales by 2035 will hurt CT residents and businesses. We have emissions tests for our vehicles already! Look at the cost to change to only EV's and talk to union electricians like my husband. EV vehicles require charging stations and many people do not have the infrastructure at home to supply this electrical demand. Gas vehicles need to be available until our infrastructure and these EV's are affordable for all CT drivers. The cheapest EV I found is a Chevy Bolt around \$27,000, and it is not big enough for my family! We need diversity and choices in the market to keep the costs lower for CT residents. More competition will help create better and more efficient vehicles. Banning gas vehicles for CT People is taking away our rights to a free market. Some questions for you are: How and where do we charge our new EV's? Will our infrastructure be able to support the electricity needed? Are the materials and resources even available to upgrade our infrastructure? Can most CT residents afford an expensive new EV car plus the electrical service upgrades needed to their homes to support charging stations? Please do not create more financial burden for CT residents! Thank you for your time ~ Anne Greene ? Lebanon, CT (860) 468-0013

Comment ID: 884

First Name: Anne

Last Name: Greene

Commenter Email: aniact@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 11:27:45 AM

Comment:

Name: Greene, Anne Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not ban gas vehicles! Banning gas vehicle sales by 2035 will hurt CT residents and businesses. We have emissions tests for our vehicles already! Look at the cost to change to only EV's and talk to union electricians like my husband. EV vehicles require charging stations and many people do not have the infrastructure at home to supply this electrical demand. Gas vehicles need to be available until our infrastructure and these EV's are affordable for all CT drivers. The cheapest

EV I found is a Chevy Bolt around \$27,000, and it is not big enough for my family! We need diversity and choices in the market to keep the costs lower for CT residents. More competition will help create better and more efficient vehicles. Banning gas vehicles for CT People is taking away our rights to a free market. Some questions for you are: How and where do we charge our new EV's? Will our infrastructure be able to support the electricity needed? Are the materials and resources even available to upgrade our infrastructure? Can most CT residents afford an expensive new EV car plus the electrical service upgrades needed to their homes to support charging stations? Please do not create more financial burden for CT residents! Thank you for your time ~ Anne Greene ? Lebanon, CT (860) 468-0013

Comment ID: 885

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Pratt

Commenter Email: eapratt51@hotmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 11:51:33 AM

Comment:

Name: Pratt, Elizabeth Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The state does not have enough electric grid to support this. Will they be able to with the fact that New England has a problem with getting enough natural gas to power generators now. Also it takes more un-environmentally products to produce the batteries for electric cars. Is the state going to make those who produce those batteries to make them more environmentally friendly? Along with the possibility to these batteries self igniting.

Comment ID: 886

First Name:

Last Name:

Commenter Email:

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 11:52:31 AM

Attachments:

Advanced Clean Cars II public comment. David Flemming 8.23.23.pdf

Comment:

Name: , Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Public Comment in Opposition to Proposed Regulation PR2023-023: California Light Duty Vehicle Emission Standards for 2027-2035 Submitted by David Flemming, Director of Policy and Research August 23, 2023 I am writing to express Yankee Institute's opposition for Advanced Clean Cars II proposed by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP). Electric vehicles (EVs) are not a practical choice for Connecticut workers who are not able to make large salaries from the comfort of home, and will limit employment opportunities for many deserving Connecticut residents. California regulators adopted these regulations specifically for California, over 2000 miles away, and they did not have Connecticut residents in mind. There are many reasons to not simply adopt the same regulations here in Connecticut. One glaring concern is the cost of electricity. According to the most recent data available from the Energy Information Administration the average Connecticut resident spent 31.32 cents/kilowatt hour of electricity. The 14 other states that that have adopted California's standards all have a consistently lower price of residential electricity than Connecticut, led by Washington state which pays less than half of Connecticut's rate. Residents of those states can count on the cost of charging an electric vehicle to be less than the cost of filling up at the gas pump. In Connecticut, residents have every reason to suspect that charging will be just as expensive, if not more so, for the foreseeable future. Even if Connecticut residents are not able to purchase new combustion vehicles in 2035, gasoline vehicles will still dominate the road for many years to come. According to automotive journalist David Booth, combustion cars now last about 12 years, with drivers replacing only 17 million of 275 million vehicles in the US each year. In the unlikely event that battery power accounts for half the cars sold in the U.S. by 2030, EVs will still only represent between 50 and 60 per cent of all the cars on North American roads by 2050. Connecticut

currently offers some of the most generous incentives to purchase EVs in the United States. And yet, only 0.73% of cars on Connecticut's roads are electric, and most people who own an EV also own a gas-powered vehicle. To all appearances, demand for electric vehicles, is quite unresponsive to even large subsidies. Many residents see little point in the doubtful proposition of "saving money" by buying an EV, if one is forced to plan their day around charging their means of transportation. It also remains an open question if Connecticut will be able to maintain this level of financial support for EVs, as the federal money which buoyed state budgets in recent years dries up. Connecticut's long term fiscal outlook remains precarious, ranking 49th of 50 states in Truth in Accounting's 2022 Fiscal Health rankings, largely due to enormous unfunded retirement obligations. Additionally, legislators and residents will likely prioritize making Connecticut's infrastructure more climate resilient leading up to 2035. The cost/benefit of such action far exceeds whatever minuscule benefit can be attained from reducing Connecticut's 0.11% share of global emissions, especially in terms of avoided disaster relief expenses. For these reasons, Connecticut may soon be tempted to remit such generous subsidies, forcing legislators, and by extension taxpayers, to make the tough decisions about which parts of public spending will need to be pared back to pay for obligations that Connecticut is legally on the hook for. As such, Connecticut residents, especially those with limited and/or fixed incomes, could be left with the difficult choice of purchasing a new, pricey electric vehicle at the unsubsidized full price, a used combustion vehicle (of which there will be a dwindling supply and higher price with each passing year) or a used electric vehicle. Even with the continued massive state and federal production subsidies of EVs, Oliver Wyman's analysis for the Financial Times predicts that EVs will be 9% more expensive than combustion vehicles by 2030. Connecticut cannot count on used EVs to keep the price of new EVs in check. All signs point to used EVs losing value at a faster clip than combustion vehicles. Used EVs driven in cold climates like Connecticut retain less value than used EVs in warm climates like California. According to Michigan Technological University's Advanced Power Systems Research Center, the life expectancy of an EV battery decreases by 20% when driven at 32 degrees and deteriorates even faster the colder it gets. Used electric vehicles are also less likely to hold value due to the uncertainty surrounding accident history. According to Carfax Vehicle History reports, 40% of vehicles on the road today have sustained damage of some sort, though this total is certainly higher because many fender benders go unreported. Whereas minor damage is rarely enough to make a combustion vehicle undriveable, EVs are more vulnerable to fender benders that can cost as much to repair as the vehicle is worth, a cost that car insurance companies will often not fully cover. It is the duty of Connecticut's government to inform the public of the very real risks of electric vehicles. Forcing car owners to choose between more expensive options will only push the cost of car ownership for lower-income Connecticut residents skyward, which is already the highest in the US, according to Automoblog. The ramifications of Advanced Clean Cars II extend beyond the Connecticut consumer. While particulate matter emissions from exhaust will decrease if EVs replace combustion vehicles, non-exhaust particulate matter emissions will increase due to the heavier nature of EVs. There is no scientific consensus on which of these factors will alter health outcomes to a greater extent. If vehicle prices increase due to the passage of this rule, a large swath of Connecticut could become more vulnerable to mental health crises. Access to automobiles has a strong positive relationship to employment outcomes. If fewer Connecticut residents have access to vehicles due to increased prices of vehicles overall, unemployment (and underemployment) will follow. According to the National Library of Medicine, we can expect a 1% increase in unemployment to cause a 2-3% increase in the rate of suicides. I urge DEEP to reconsider passing such onerous clean vehicle standards. Until electric vehicles are shown to be a viable alternative to combustion vehicles, consumers should have the option to choose what makes the most sense for them. Please do not adopt the Advanced Clean Cars II. (See comments with hyperlinked sources in attached PDF) David Flemming Director of Policy and Research David@YankeeInstitute.org

Comment ID: 887

First Name: John

Last Name: Neff

Commenter Email: neffjohns@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 12:02:41 PM

Comment:

Name: Neff, John Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I and my wife have owned and occupied CT real estate since 1980. Once a lovely low tax escape from NYC environs, CT has been progressively mismanaged into the same morass of failure. Rather than get snarky, allow me to ask two critical questions ... -- How do you plan to

maintain our deteriorating roads and highways? Gas taxes? Already not sufficient. Mileage monitoring/tolling? Impossible to implement and Big Brother-ish. -- Where will the power come from to support this mass electrification? No new pipelines entering New England via NY State. No high capacity power lines from Canada. New nuclear plant(s) will ever be built in New England. Indian Point has been shut down, eliminating ~25% of NYC electricity. Who will be prioritized in a shortage, CT or NYC? I'm worried enough about extended brown-outs in our near future that, just this Spring, I spent a five figure \$\$\$ number to install a high capacity propane generator. Please back off these pie-in-sky electrification initiatives. There is no pathway to success in the time discussed. Don't be like California but without the natural endowment. Sincerely John S. Neff Darien

Comment ID: 888

First Name: Isla

Last Name: Kennedy

Commenter Email: isla.kennedy@chargepoint.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 12:12:25 PM

Attachments:

ChargePoint Comments ACC II 8.23.23.pdf

Comment:

Name: Kennedy, Isla Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Comments of ChargePoint, Inc. in support of Advanced Clean Cars II adoption.

Comment ID: 889

First Name: Tim

Last Name: Rogers

Commenter Email: rogerst529@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 12:24:07 PM

Comment:

Name: Rogers, Tim Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Stop this top-down control over our daily lives. The use of electric powered cars should be a free-will decision. Furthermore, the mining of cobalt for electric car batteries endangers the lives of poor adults and children in the Democratic Republic of Congo, a leading source of this toxic metal. Back in America, emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have a negligible effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Residents of CA are fleeing the state whose government is also mandating electric car purchases. We have a steady stream of evacuees as well because of high taxes and over regulation. Let's not increase the outflow with additional heavy handed regulation.

Comment ID: 890

First Name: Bob

Last Name: Eddy

Commenter Email: b56eddy@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 12:25:15 PM

Comment:

Name: Eddy, Bob Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 While I understand the need for a clean environment following California down the rabbit hole is not the way to go. No one is highlighting any of the downsides associate with EV's. The technology is not at the point where you can dictate that it is our only option. CA has shown that their infrastructure cannot support the current number of EV's let alone 100% EV mandates. Following their path will only make CT more expensive to live in. You will continue to drive people out of state. Any new mandates on EV's should be put to a public vote. Thank you for listening.

Comment ID: 891

First Name: Maria

Last Name: Weingarten

Commenter Email: maria.d.weingarten@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Realtor

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 12:33:44 PM

Comment:

Name: Weingarten, Maria Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Do not support a ban on new gas powered vehicles. CT lacks the necessary infrastructure to support such a drastic move. Why are we following CA, which has an entirely different economy than CT. We lack the businesses to be able to overcome such a burden on our residents. Our economic future is bleak, there is not reason to make it even worse. Further, such greater demand on energy will make CT, which has the 3rd highest energy costs, #1 in the US. This does not help improve affordability in CT and will only hurt our state economy and real estate market.

Comment ID: 892

First Name: Mary

Last Name: Stevens

Commenter Email: mk-stevens@live.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 12:58:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Stevens, Mary Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I live in a residence that is plagued by heavy duty and medium sized trucks due to ongoing development. Often the trucks sit for long periods of time with their engines running even though there are laws against it. They are loud and carbon producing. This has been the hottest year on record and it's only going to get worse if we don't rein in harmful emissions. We are no longer facing a ecological collapse, we are seeing it transpire before our eyes all over the world. We must take steps NOW to avert national and global catastrophe. And Connecticut is NOT on track to meet the overall climate goals set forth in the Global Warming Solutions Act. MHD trucks make up only 6% of vehicles but are responsible for 24% of greenhouse gas emissions. The Advanced Clean Cars II will incentivize switch to electric trucks which will mean less pollution and cleaner air. And in the long run save billions of dollars in disaster and health related costs. Please approve this sensible and crucial regulation.

Comment ID: 893

First Name: Lina

Last Name: Michell

Commenter Email: lmichell2010@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 12:59:00 PM

Comment:

Name: Michell, Lina Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 No to banning Gas cars in CT! We the people have the right to choose which vehicle we want to buy wether gas car or EV.

Comment ID: 894

First Name: Derek

Last Name: Pisani

Commenter Email: dpisani@juno.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 01:08:14 PM

Comment:

Name: Pisani, Derek Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Vehemently opposed to the proposal because; Connecticut will not have the infrastructure in place to support the regulation from a grid and charge point standpoint. The cars themselves are not affordable to the average income family. Charge times are too long and in the event fast charging is used, it adds to the degradation of the (expensive) battery. There is no an unlimited amount of natural resources. And most importantly, fossil fuel is still used for the supply of electricity and in the construction of the vehicles. Duh! I just hope people come to their senses and take into consideration all the factors before thinking this agenda is valid.

Comment ID: 895

First Name: Ellen

Last Name: Schwartz

Commenter Email: ebsphd@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 01:18:16 PM

Comment:

Name: Schwartz, Ellen Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello, I feel strongly that the schedule of transitioning to electrical vehicles is WAY too accelerated. People will find benefits of electrical vehicles and switch to them over time for certain driving needs. But for other driving needs (eg distance driving) they will want gasoline or hybrid vehicles for a long time - until battery life is much longer and there are plentiful charging stations across the country. Politicians who force us to abandon gasoline cars will very likely get a huge backlash from angry citizens and be voted out of office. Respectfully submitted, Ellen Schwartz

Comment ID: 896

First Name: Max

Last Name: Teirstein

Commenter Email: mteirstein@newhavenct.gov

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Sustainability Policy Analyst and Engagement Coordinator

Posted Date: 08/23/23 01:21:32 PM

Attachments:

ACT_ACCII_Comment_08232023.pdf

Comment:

Name: Teirstein, Max Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The City of New Haven strongly supports Connecticut's adoption of the Advanced Clean Cars II (ACC II) and Advanced Clean Trucks (ACT) regulations as

soon as possible. For New Haven, much like for the state, transportation and mobile sources are the largest sources of greenhouse gas emissions. In 2021, the City passed the Climate Emergency Resolution, calling for an end to greenhouse gas emissions in the city by 2030, and the Community Electrification Resolution, committing the City to electrifying its buildings and vehicles in the same time frame. To achieve these emissions reductions, New Haven will have to reduce its transportation emissions by about 28,000 MT CO₂e every year from 2021 onward?an annual 11% reduction in transportation emissions that dwarfs current reductions of 2-5% annually. However, by 2030 ACCII is projected to reduce light duty vehicle emissions by 30%, and ACT will reduce bus and truck emissions by 18%. These steps bring the City much closer to its goal and surpassing the state?s objective of a 29% decline in transportation emissions relative to 2014 levels. The City of New Haven is segmented by highways, and air pollution across New Haven is among the worst in the nation. The air pollutants from vehicles along these highways?specifically, nitrogen oxide (NO_x), carbon dioxide (CO₂), and particulate matter (PM_{2.5})?harm the city?s communities, particularly low-income communities and communities of color. New Haven has long suffered from poor air quality and exceedingly high asthma rates, and its historically underserved communities suffer the worst of these public health impacts. By adopting ACC II, Connecticut can reduce total NO_x and PM_{2.5} emissions by 580 and 39 tons/year, respectively, and ACT can reduce NO_x and PM_{2.5} by 86% and 27%, respectively. These bills are lifesaving for New Haven?s underserved communities. The sooner they are implemented, the better. Lastly, ACC II and ACT will allow owners of both internal combustion engine vehicles (ICVs) and electric vehicles (EVs) to save on car ownership. 29% of New Haveners do not own a car, and this share increases among Black and brown communities. Electric vehicle sales in New Haven also lag behind national averages. These bills would lower the costs of vehicle ownership significantly and saturate the market with EVs, allowing many low-income New Haveners to afford an EV or a cleaner ICV. For all these reasons, we strongly support the adoption of the ACT and HDO regulations. Please adopt the ACT and HDO rules as soon as possible to clean up our local air, improve public health, bolster our economy, and reduce climate-harming greenhouse gas emissions. With each year that Connecticut delays adopting ACT and HDO, the state misses another model year of the program and the subsequent public health, environmental, and economic benefits.

Comment ID: 897

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Sanford

Commenter Email: rsanford@sanfordandhawley.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: President

Posted Date: 08/23/23 01:23:28 PM

Attachments:

Robert P. Sanford Comments 8.23.23 RCSA 22a-174-36d.pdf

Comment:

Name: Sanford, Robert Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I oppose adoption of RCSA Sec #22a-174-36d for the reasons stated in my written commentary dated August 23, 2023.

Comment ID: 898

First Name: Rita

Last Name: Gertsch

Commenter Email: blain1974@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 01:32:06 PM

Comment:

Name: Gertsch, Rita Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Unless you plan on purchasing me an electric car, install the outlet at my home and pay for the already high cost of electricity (for the upgrade in the electrical grid which will be handed down to me) don?t even think about this. We are not California! How do you expect we elders to pay for all that? Get your heads out of the clouds and think before you completely send CT and it?s people to the poor house.

Comment ID: 899**First Name:** Robert**Last Name:** Sanford**Commenter Email:** rsanford@sanfordandhawley.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** President**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 01:33:27 PM**Attachments:**

Robert P. Sanford Comments 8.23.23 RCSA 22a-174-36d.pdf

Comment:

Name: Sanford, Robert Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Attached is my written comment in opposition to the adoption of RCSA Sec 22a-174-36d.

Comment ID: 900**First Name:** Mark**Last Name:** Salinas**Commenter Email:** mjsalinas88@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 01:37:57 PM**Comment:**

Name: Salinas, Mark Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This regulation is a bad idea for several reasons.

First, it outlaws a reliable form of transportation that is a known quantity. Most people comfortable with internal combustion vehicles and like them. Internal combustion vehicles also have known costs, allowing businesses to plan their expenses more accurately. Companies that do logistics also lose money when their fleets are down and mandating charging will increase those hours that vehicles are not in use supporting small businesses and consumers. Second, there are several negatives associated with electric vehicles. They cannot recharge nearly as quickly and gas or diesel vehicles can be refueled. Additionally, their range can be limited in very hot and very cold weather, of which there is plenty of both in this state. Consumers have a right to decide if the trade-offs involved are worth it. Further, all of us will pay more for electricity with this mandate. Unless supply is dramatically increased, rates will have to spike as demand increases to power these cars, effectively forcing non-drivers or drivers of older cars to subsidize those who drive the new electric vehicles. Third, electric vehicles do not solve the problems they purport to. The electricity involved has to come from somewhere, and our grid relies on fossil fuels, and the costs associated with ramping up for the increased demand through renewables are prohibitive. So CO2 might not be reduced, even with the costly switch. Compounding the issue is the need to mine rare-earth minerals to make these cards. These are often strip-mined in countries without the strong standards we have in the United States, resulting in us effectively outsourcing the pollution from American oil wells and refineries to Chinese strip mines, which can come back to us anyway through air and ocean currently. Electric vehicles may be part of the climate solution in the future, but it is not at all settled that they are right now. Lastly, although this regulation may be constitutional and legal in this state, it potentially mandates a massive change in our lifestyles by outlawing a common commodity. If the people of this state want this change, it should be mandated through our representatives with a vote in the General Assembly, not through a bureaucratic function. The spectre of similar actions from the capitol happening without the input of Constitution State legislators is scary indeed.

Comment ID: 901**First Name:** Allen**Last Name:** Hill**Commenter Email:** a.jon@att.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:**

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 01:42:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Hill, Allen Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 August 23, 2023 I write in opposition to the Deep's proposed 2035 ban on the sale of gas powered cars and trucks in Connecticut. It makes no economic sense as the range of EVs is severely limited for long trips, curtailing peoples' freedom of movement due to the lack of infrastructure, and EVs have the potential of being more highly toxic and polluting to our environment in the long run at time of disposal. In short, these EVs would NOT be clean. I am not a scientist, but do follow many who write on this topic and I can only cite what they have to say. As example, the information provided in this editorial by Thomas Stevenson about Ford CEO, Jim Farley's practical experience with the technology. Please see link...
<https://thepostmillennial.com/ford-ceo-hit-with-reality-check-when-trying-to-charge-ev-truck-on-us-road-trip> Mr. Farley expressed, 'Recharging his car took too long and was a "really good reality check." This would be an economic hardship to all citizens imposed by EV mandates on any level. I ask that these type of arbitrary deadline dates, which are premature at best, be tabled until a lot more study may be completed regarding the overall EV technology and infrastructures needed that will work and can be applied. Thank you, Allen Hill South Glastonbury, CT 860-490-3963

Comment ID: 902**First Name:****Last Name:** Quimby**Commenter Email:** johnboat1@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** None**Commenter Title:** None**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 01:48:39 PM**Comment:**

Name: Quimby, Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To Whom It May Concern, While I know that the Governor and many of his allies want to go full blown green like the President everyone needs to STOP and actually think about what he and the DEEP wants to do in the time frame listed. Some FACTS and questions everyone needs to think about before forcing a draconian policy on the people of CT. 1)The price of electric in this state keeps going up and we are near the top, if not at the top, for electric rates. 2) Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. 3)There needs to be an infrastructure to handle the extra Megawatts needed for these electric vehicles. 4)There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? 5) On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses. You do know the President recently made it harder to mine the metals needed for the batteries, right? China owns or controls a great majority of the metals needed for these batteries. Want to bet they increase those prices to the US, making them even more unaffordable? 6) Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. In summary, it's time to use some common sense before Forcing this foolish regulation on the people of CT. John Quimby

Comment ID: 903**First Name:** Christopher**Last Name:** Paulin**Commenter Email:** christopherspaulin@paulinpermaculture.org**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 01:56:42 PM**Comment:**

Name: Paulin, Christopher Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Connecticut DEEP (Department of

Energy and Environmental Protection), comment on Proposed Regulation Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II, Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I learned critical thinking skills in South Windsor, Connecticut public schools, but the Connecticut public legislators do not think critically, as I do. Here is why. * No man or woman shall ever force me to buy a new non-gasoline-engine or electric car from 2027 or from any other date. That is unacceptable behavior to force me to purchase a certain type of car with my own money. That is removing my rights and is communism, where I do not have free will in America, which is un-American. * Dr. John Christy of the University of Alabama-Huntsville testified before the Natural Resources Committee on May 13, 2015 that carbon dioxide emissions have no significant impact on climate change. There is no link. This is a scam. There is no emergency. The predictions (models, hypotheses) do not match the observations (real data). This is how the scientific method is done. Watch on YouTube: John Christy on The Economics and Politics of Climate Change. Climate change is exaggerated and simplified political science (an agenda), not observations. For example, trees pacify the climate, which are not in the equation. * Electric cars burn from fire because of the lithium and can not be put out by firefighters. That is unacceptable behavior to force me to be burned by battery fires. * The lithium has to be mined in large quantities for all of the batteries that you are requiring. Watch on YouTube: Are Lithium Batteries For Electric Vehicles Costing The Earth? | True Cost | Insider News. The water dried up because of lithium mining in salt brines because mining companies use millions of gallons of fresh water. That is unacceptable behavior. * Electric cars need to be using power all of the time, when driving and when plugged in for charging the batteries. A gasoline car that is parked does not use power. That is unacceptable behavior. * Not everyone has an electrical outlet where one parks one's car. That is unacceptable behavior to force people to have electrical outlets near where one parks one's car. * Electric cars need an electric plug if the battery dies. That is unacceptable because then one will be stranded. * The government is criminally involved in geoengineering the sky, as seen almost every day by its chemtrails and with invisible HAARP (High-frequency Active Auroral Research Program). Weather manipulation to create the weather problems is unacceptable behavior. This is called create the problem, create the reaction, and create the solution to your own caused problem, or shorted to: problem, reaction, solution. That is a scam to push the Laudato si' agenda on everyone. * The 2015 Catholic Jesuit Laudato si' climate-change encyclical exaggerates climate change and the so-called greenhouse gases. This is unacceptable behavior because it is centralized power, a Roman Empire dictatorship that all nations are following, just like during the unproven pandemic of no purified virus. Without a purified virus, there is nothing to study or to test because you need an independent variable with everything else constant. Local power is the only way to avoid a world-wide dictatorship. Think back to Nazi Germany. Is that what we want? No. * This crime of forcing people to buy a product was also acted by taking away the right of students to not poison themselves with vaccines, which is unacceptable behavior and impenitent (no regret for one's sins). It is commonly known that a living body, which is a man, woman, or animal, is self-healing when provided the conditions of health, which is diet and lifestyle, not foreign chemicals. * Henry Ford created the Ford Model T car, and it is not outdated because of the gasoline engine. Outdating a historical car like the Ford Model T is unacceptable. It is a beautiful car with a manual design without needing a computer, which is good design, and it requires the driver to use one's brain more than a computer car does. A simple manual catalytic converter can be added to the tail pipe and checked by sensing the exhaust. * Gasoline cars have catalytic converters that remove toxic materials. Carbon dioxide is not toxic and is a nutrient to plants. That is unacceptable behavior to consider gasoline cars as toxic, especially with trees that are planted to consume the exhaust. Cities are a poor design because they remove trees. * Trees moderate the climate, so the answer is to get rid of cities, according to permaculture, which stands for permanent agriculture. From <https://www.permaculturenews.org/2017/05/12/mere-20-roles-trees-can-play-permaculture-design/>, "This steady supply of wind-breaking, shading, and transpiration equate to moderate temperatures around trees. The heat of the sun is blocked out, the cold of the wind is pacified, and the moisture in the air is kept regular. Areas around trees are generally cooler in the heat and warmer in the cold." Trees are the answer to pacify the climate. * Electricity has to be made from burning carbon or nuclear power, for the majority of it. That is unacceptable behavior to transfer the environmental damage to nuclear waste, which is radioactive. Who wants nuclear waste in one's backyard and in one's water to get cancer? More electricity needs to be generated, and thus more nuclear waste needs to be generated. * This legislation is worship of technology, which is your god. That is blasphemy to your Creator, the godhead. Your technology has not created a single life from scratch. * Once the batteries die, one has to replace the batteries, which is expensive. That is unacceptable behavior. Christopher Paulin 19 Miller Road, Apt. A Colchester, Connecticut 06415-2707

Comment ID: 904

First Name: STEVE

Last Name: KRASINSKI

Commenter Email: spkjr@cox.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 02:17:47 PM**Comment:**

Name: KRASINSKI, STEVE Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not want elimination of gas vehicles and do not want imposition, in Ct., of the California motor vehicle emission standards. Vehicle emissions, in Ct., are not the pollution problems in the world. The problem is China, India etc.

Comment ID: 905**First Name:** Margaret**Last Name:** Saunders**Commenter Email:** margarethamil@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 02:50:10 PM**Comment:**

Name: Saunders, Margaret Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not pass the regulation banning gas powered cars. Here are various reasons why. Forgive me for not re-phrasing these arguments but they are better written than anything I would put together and I believe whole heartedly what they convey. -- Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate --On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses --Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. --There are not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 906**First Name:** Scott**Last Name:** Reiss**Commenter Email:** scott_reiss@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Reiss, Scott Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 1) What is the limiting principle of which legal products can be banned by government? In a free society, free people delegate limited power to government in order to secure their rights and liberty. Banning products is authoritarian and not consistent with the American form of government. 2) Regulatory changes of such significant impact should not be undertaken solely by agencies, but at minimum should be subject to state-wide referendum. 3) Mandating massive, disruptive technical changes never works well. The market is better suited to effectively realize an optimal solution given current limitations. That's what a market does.

Comment ID: 907**First Name:** Juliet**Last Name:** Howe

Commenter Email: juliet@eehowe.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Resident of the state of Connecticut**Commenter Title:** Tax payer and voter**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 02:56:22 PM**Comment:**

Name: Howe, Juliet Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate[1]. On average, electric powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline powered cars. Banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs to residents and businesses[2]. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy.[3] There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle.

Comment ID: 908**First Name:** Jill**Last Name:** Guzzetti**Commenter Email:** jgpmail2@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Guzzetti, Jill Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric cars coast exponentially more on average than gas's powered cars, placing the burden of the transition squarely on the backs of states workers and causing economic catastrophe for the states most vulnerable populations. Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. The cost of such a de minimus improvement is way out of line. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of available energy in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure?

Comment ID: 909**First Name:** Ileagh**Last Name:** MacIvers**Commenter Email:** ileagh@interfaithpowerandlight.org**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Interfaith Power & Light**Commenter Title:** Clean Cars Organizer**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 03:01:43 PM**Attachments:**

Connecticut ACCII Comment.pdf

Comment:

Name: MacIvers, Ileagh Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please see attached.

Comment ID: 910**First Name:** Carl**Last Name:** Hull

Commenter Email: bhull@consumerenergyalliance.org
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association: Consumer Energy Alliance
Commenter Title: Vice President of Strategic Communications
Posted Date:

Attachments:

08232023 PR2023-23 ACCII Connecticut.pdf

Comment:

Name: Hull, Carl Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Attached please find Consumer Energy Alliance's comments on the above-mentioned docket.

Comment ID: 911

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Belodeau

Commenter Email: belodeau@optonline.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 03:10:18 PM

Comment:

Name: Belodeau, Jennifer Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I strongly disagree with the proposed regulation to eliminate the sale of gas powered vehicles in Connecticut beginning in 2035. While I'm not opposed to the transition to EVs, I am opposed to the state of Connecticut setting an arbitrary deadline for a forced transition. My first concern is that EVs are substantially more expensive than ICE cars, and until the pricing comes more in line with ICE cars, the state will be placing an undue economic burden on those who have to purchase a car beginning in 2035. Secondly, the current public EV charging infrastructure in Connecticut is sparse and unreliable (while there may be charging stations in the ground, many are not operational) and it will take a great deal of time and financial investment to get a reliable public EV charging infrastructure into place. The state is unlikely to have that publicly available infrastructure in place and operational by 2035. Finally, while much has been made of the installation of DC Fast Chargers, the most economical charger to put in the ground is the L2, which takes much longer to charge a car and typically allows at most, 2 cars to charge at one time. Forcing adaptation of EVs before the infrastructure is ready will certainly negatively impact EV drivers in terms of fueling time (both in terms of waiting to get access to. public charger and the time it takes to charge) and will also impact driving range expectations - today, traveling from New Canaan to Vermont for example, is a non-starter in an EV. Thank you for your consideration, Jennifer Belodeau

Comment ID: 912

First Name: Leslie

Last Name: Lebl

Commenter Email: leslie.lebl@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 03:15:53 PM

Comment:

Name: Lebl, Leslie Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Mandating a switch to electric vehicles in Connecticut is a terrible idea, for several reasons. First, where will the additional electric energy come from to power these vehicles? Presumably it will be generated by plants using fossil fuels. Surely those emissions should be factored into any calculation of the benefits of switching to electric vehicles. Second, how will Connecticut handle the increased demand for electricity? We finally purchased a generator after years of being left up to a week without power after a storm. Let the power companies first demonstrate their competence to supply the existing market. Third, what about the increased costs of maintaining the roads and the possibility of more fatal accidents, due to the

weight of electric vehicles? All this to impose a requirement that will have absolutely no positive impact on CO2 emissions? Very bad policy indeed.

Comment ID: 913

First Name: Dan

Last Name: Thurston

Commenter Email: dant222@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 03:24:09 PM

Attachments:

CT Banning Gas-Powered Vehicles.pdf

Comment:

Name: Thurston, Dan Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am opposed to the regulation.

Comment ID: 914

First Name: Thomas

Last Name: Boylan

Commenter Email: thomas.boylan@zeta2030.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Zero Emission Transportation Association (ZETA)

Commenter Title: Regulatory Director

Posted Date: 08/23/23 03:31:33 PM

Attachments:

ZETA Comment_ACC II Adoption in Connecticut.pdf

Comment:

Name: Boylan, Thomas Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please find ZETA's comments attached.

Comment ID: 915

First Name: Paul

Last Name: McKenna

Commenter Email: p.mckennan@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 03:40:01 PM

Comment:

Name: McKenna, Paul Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I speak in opposition to this legislation. This is another burden that the citizens of this state should not have to bear. The only reason there is any competition for the electric car market is because of government subsidies. Even China is starting to show the strain of government support for these companies and is now seeing them fail. We should let the market define and develop sustainable business models for the green initiatives, not taxing us into support for companies that could not survive with out our tax dollars.

Comment ID: 916

First Name: Esther

Last Name: Vasarhelyi

Commenter Email: eszterct@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 03:52:34 PM

Comment:

Name: Vasarhelyi, Esther Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am strongly against a ban on gas-powered vehicles!!! The timeline is unrealistic. This should evolve naturally as improvements are made and technology advances. 1. Electric cars are too expensive. Rebates are not enough. There will be additional fees to cover gas tax revenue losses. 2. Driving range per charge is too small and charging takes too much time when driving on a long trip. 3. The cost to add chargers to homes is too expensive. How would condos/apartments be handled? 4. Infrastructure is inadequate for the increased electric usage. Rates are already too high before adding car charging to limited grid capacity. Also, there are too few charging stations - especially in rural areas. BTW, much of electricity generation is made by burning fossil fuels! 5. The cars use up valuable resources and are not eco-friendly/ green to manufacture. 6. New England winters are not suitable for battery power. 7. Batteries will not last the current lifetime of a car and will be too expensive to replace. 8. Battery disposal will be a problem. 9. Citizens should have choices, not a mandate for their car purchases. 10. The USA has been doing well with cutting pollution over the past decades. Go after China and India to reduce emissions! They're the real pollution culprits. Any US emissions reduction will be completely nullified by the coal plants being added in China.

Comment ID: 917

First Name: JOHN

Last Name: JUHASZ

Commenter Email: juhaszjw@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: mr

Posted Date: 08/23/23 03:54:47 PM

Comment:

Name: JUHASZ, JOHN Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Commissioner, I am writing to oppose the proposed regulations (PR 2023-023) aimed at banning the use of gas powered vehicles in CT by 2035. Firstly, I object to regulations for CT that are in blind lockstep with California. CT deserves to develop its own regulations based on its constituents needs and preferences. California governance is not a model that I would follow since it is too heavy handed and has not proven its effectiveness in terms of meeting goals. Secondly, a mandate such as this imposes an unfair burden on the people since gas powered vehicles are more affordable. Finally, it is deplorable that CT is ceding its leadership in zero emissions vehicles to the false promise of plug-in power. CT once led the way in fuel cell technology with companies like Ballard. Fuel cells are truly zero carbon emissions and renewable. That is not the case for plug-in power which merely transfers the emissions from one site of production to another. Where is a true energy policy for CT? We have the most expensive rates in the lower 48 with an outdated infrastructure. Where is the proposal to fix this? The people of CT will not be fooled by the facile virtue signaling tactics of this proposal. We want real solutions, not mandates. Respectfully, John Juhasz Wilton, CT

Comment ID: 918

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Giaimo

Commenter Email: giamom@api.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: American Petroleum Institute (API)

Commenter Title: Northeast Region Director

Posted Date: 08/23/23 04:01:58 PM

Attachments:

ct_act_api_comments_FINAL_aug23_2023.pdf

Comment:

Name: Giaimo, Michael Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Attached please find comments from the American Petroleum Institute relative to the "Proposed Adoption of the Low Emission Vehicle IV and Zero Emission Vehicle Regulations for 2025-2035 (PR 2023-023)." These comments will be submitted through the "eRegulations System" and emailed to "deep.mobilesources@ct.gov." Respectfully submitted, Michael S. Giaimo

Northeast Region Director American Petroleum Institute 11 Beacon Street Suite 1230 Boston, Massachusetts 02108
email: giaimom@api.org cell: 603.777.0467

Comment ID: 919

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Giaimo

Commenter Email: giaimom@api.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: American Petroleum Institute (API)

Commenter Title: Northeast Region Director

Posted Date: 08/23/23 04:05:40 PM

Attachments:

ct_acc2_api_comments_FINAL_aug23_2023.pdf

Comment:

Name: Giaimo, Michael Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Attached please find comments from the American Petroleum Institute relative to the "Proposed Adoption of the Low Emission Vehicle IV and Zero Emission Vehicle Regulations for 2025-2035 (PR 2023-023)." These comments will be submitted through the "eRegulations System" and emailed to "deep.mobilesources@ct.gov." Respectfully submitted, Michael S. Giaimo
Northeast Region Director American Petroleum Institute 11 Beacon Street Suite 1230 Boston, Massachusetts 02108
email: giaimom@api.org cell: 603.777.0467

Comment ID: 920

First Name: Dave

Last Name: Robba

Commenter Email: drobba@ceres.org

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Ceres

Commenter Title: Manager, State Policy, Transportation

Posted Date: 08/23/23 04:15:12 PM

Attachments:

Ceres_CT_ACT_ACCII.pdf

Comment:

Name: Robba, Dave Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please see the attached comments on behalf of Ceres

Comment ID: 921

First Name: Juliana

Last Name: Simone

Commenter Email: julianahsimone@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 04:23:34 PM

Comment:

Name: Simone, Juliana Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 California is not the model state to follow in looking to increase vehicle efficiency and reduce vehicle emissions.? California has been experiencing rolling brownouts and blackouts which highlight a regression in its economy and are one reason for the mass out-migration of productive citizens.? Due to the lack of sufficient electric power generation and overall storage capacity, California has implemented new rules to prevent people from charging electric vehicles at home overnight, which is counter-intuitive to the state's electric vehicle mandates.? People need to be able to charge their vehicles cheaply at home, without profiting third parties and wasting valuable time during their workdays.? Lost work time would not be compensated by any government under the proposed regulation.??The proposed regulations do not address this

important issue. Many people in Connecticut rent their dwellings or park their vehicles on public streets.? These people would not be able to charge an electric vehicle, so this "vehicle efficiency" mandate would prevent them from purchasing a new vehicle that he or she could actually use.??The proposed regulations do not address this important issue. Many people in Connecticut cannot afford the upfront cost of an electric vehicle, as the initial cost is substantially higher than a combustion-powered vehicle.? The proposed regulation places new vehicle out of reach of lower-income earners, unfairly limiting their ability to work and be productive.??The proposed regulations do not address this important issue. Medium-duty vehicles used for towing have drivetrains optimized for this type of work, including diesel engines and low gear ratios.? Current electric vehicles in this class do not have the driving range an utility of existing combustion vehicles in this regard, thereby reducing the efficiency of Connecticut's workforce while increasing un-reimbursable costs.? In addition, alternative fuels such as biodiesel blends, new?combustion engine design innovations including use of?"pre-chambers" and rotary systems, and new pollution capture methods make combustion vehicles, including diesel combustion vehicles, cleaner than ever before.??Current alternatives are not suitable for replacing common medium-duty combustion vehicle uses.? By pushing EV's, all investment in alternative combustion engines, such as those powered by hydrogen, will come to a halt. The proposed regulations do not address this important issue. Much of Connecticut's air pollution comes from states located west of here, and these states also generate a great amount of electricity into the national grid via coal and natural gas.? With mandated EV use here and zero planned new nuclear plants, Connecticut will need much more electricity, thereby requiring more coal and gas pollutant by-products from western states reaching Connecticut.? This is a never ending cycle hurting Connecticut's productivity and environment.??The proposed regulations do not address this important issue. Electric vehicles create an over-reliance upon electricity which is dangerous when the electric grid is disrupted for any length of time.? A storm taking out local power lines could leave many more people stranded at home, work, or wherever their EV happens to be.? Gas stations can easily employ a back-up generator to supply many vehicles with fuel, whereas that same electric power could effectively charge just one electric vehicle at a time.? This situation is dangerous during an emergency.? Protection of lives is the main function of government.??The proposed regulations do not address this important issue. Battery storage for off-peak and back-up power is expensive to install, the charging capacity of current electric batteries diminishes over time, and the batteries themselves contain toxic materials.? In addition, electric vehicle batteries have a high recycling cost, if they are capable of being recycled.? Replacing worn-out batteries in an electric vehicle is currently cost prohibitive, with the cost of the batteries and labor making this effort not practical given the total value of an older electric vehicle.? End-of-life and scrapping of electric vehicles may therefore come faster then for combustion vehicles.??The proposed regulations do not address this important issue. There are not enough trained automotive technicians in Connecticut, America, or world-wide who are capable of maintaining and fixing electric vehicles.? Manufacturers have also been reluctant to share technology, diagnostic tools, and parts with third-party mechanics, thereby forcing all consumers to use manufacturer-authorized dealerships or manufacturer-owned repair facilities.? These practices are anti-competitive and greatly increase the costs of electric vehicles to consumers.? The proposed regulations do not address this important issue. For the foreseeable future, electric vehicle batteries benefit Communist China, and each electric vehicle sold in America enriches this military adversary.? Communist China uses slave labor in Africa to obtain the materials needed for EV batteries, while also running slave labor and "re-education" camps for dis-favored minorities and engaging in totalitarian surveillance and control of its population.? Connecticut, being America's "Arsenal of Democracy" for centuries, should stand 100% against slavery and totalitarian governments who are planning America's demise.??The proposed regulations do not address this issue of utmost importance. Juliana Simone Barkhamsted, CT 06063

Comment ID: 922

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Drake

Commenter Email: chris.drake@ct.gov

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Connecticut Secretary of State

Commenter Title: Business Services Divison Director

Posted Date: 08/23/23 04:35:04 PM

Comment:

Name: Drake, Christopher Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is a test comment posted on the portal due to customer complaints of error messages received. Please keep this comment unpublished.

Comment ID: 923**First Name:****Last Name:****Commenter Email:****Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 04:39:55 PM**Comment:**

Name: , Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 To: DEEP August 23, 2023 Re: Proposed Ban on the sale of new gas powered cars and trucks My name is Leigh Ann Hutchinson. I reside in Andover, CT. I am writing in opposition to the proposal named above. I feel that, for several reasons, the proposal is ill-advised. It removes all personal choice from the consumer for the type of vehicle that they feel safe and comfortable driving. Safety and vehicle size and type are critical issues for anyone operating a motor vehicle. Also in the interest of safety, lithium battery fires in electric vehicles are known to burn for a much longer time than gas-powered vehicle batteries, because they have a chemical reaction wherein they make their own oxygen. This takes additional time for first responders to extinguish as opposed to those in gas-powered vehicles. I also feel that many people will voluntarily opt for EVs anyway. This will help to alleviate concerns about environmental emissions and gas consumption. Thank you. Sincerely, Leigh Ann Hutchinson

Comment ID: 924**First Name:** Michael**Last Name:** Lennon**Commenter Email:** corsair16msl@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Mister**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 04:46:13 PM**Comment:**

Name: Lennon, Michael Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This comment is in opposition to the purposed electric vehicle mandate of 2035 in the State of Connecticut. Two main concerns regarding Electric Vehicles and their purposed mandate will be addressed herein : 1) Fire safety with regards to salt water and Flooding; 2) Lack of infrastructure supporting purposed mandate and economic impact this will have. In October of 2022, the United States Fire Administration, a division of FEMA, posted an article on their website entitled "Responding to Electric Vehicle Fires Caused by Salt Water Flooding" In this article, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and International Association of Fire Chiefs list concerns and share guidance on the safety issues that plague electric vehicles and their exposure to salt water. Local Connecticut cities and towns regularly are exposed to flooding during inclement weather and would further compound this issue. Given that this article is less than one year old and the fact that the state of Connecticut's southern border is completely flanked by the Long Island Sound and the Atlantic Ocean, I believe these facts highlight the complete lack of foresight by the purposed mandate. These vehicles are a danger to any owner exposed to salt water and also lack efficiency in the cold winters the Northeast can experience. Battery capabilities degrade in the winter months' low temperatures. The current implementation of charging stations will also not support the demand which would increase given a mandate on EV's, and would widely impact both taxpayers and business owners being forced to comply with a poorly thought out mandate.

Comment ID: 925**First Name:** Jeff**Last Name:** Westcott**Commenter Email:** westcott1535@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** none**Commenter Title:** none**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 04:51:26 PM**Comment:**

Name: Westcott, Jeff Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This proposed legislation will create havoc in the transportation system and with the utility power grid. 40% of total power consumed is consumed by cars and trucks, so the current utility electricity grid would need to be increased by 40% in the next 12 years to support EV's, something that is not feasible, but hideously expensive to even try. The Connecticut legislature needs to do some homework on the engineering and cost implications of such a fantasy. This is not even a close decision to make!

Comment ID: 926

First Name: Dennis

Last Name: Crowe

Commenter Email: dennis_crowe@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: retired

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 04:51:40 PM

Comment:

Name: Crowe, Dennis Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I ask that DEEP not generate any regulation restricting vehicle sales to EVs. While I would like some day to buy such a car, I am retired and the current costs of these vehicles is prohibitive for me. It would be nice if we could be assured that the cars would be cheaper (and the grid be sufficient and vehicle range be extended and sourcing issues be resolved), but putting all our eggs in one basket is a great risk for those of us who cannot afford for your faith in technological advances to be misplaced. Please don't leave us with no Plan B.

Comment ID: 927

First Name: Michael

Last Name: McMahon

Commenter Email: Mmcmahon.hoosier@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 05:07:28 PM

Comment:

Name: McMahon, Michael Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 OPPOSE - PR2023-023 CT GAS CAR BAN On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. In addition, shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. Finally, there is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure?

Comment ID: 928

First Name: Daniel

Last Name: Colcord

Commenter Email: dancolcord@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 05:15:01 PM

Comment:

Name: Colcord, Daniel Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 THE BAN PROPOSAL IS A VERY BAD IDEA THAT WILL HURT CONNECTICUT FAMILIES FINANCIALLY. IT IS WELL DOCUMENTED THAT CONNECTICUT IS UNFRIENDLY TO RETIREES. THE STATE INCOME TAX, PROPERTY TAX, CAR TAX,

AND THE TAXING OF SOCIAL SECURITY / PENSIONS IS SO OUT OF LINE. NOW YOU WANT TO FORCE PEOPLE TO PURCHASE A \$65,000 BASE LEVEL EV CAR IS RIDICLOUS. MEDIAN INCOMES ARE AROUND \$43,000 I BELIEVE. THE MATH DOESN'T WORK. NO ONE CAN AFFORD TO LIVE HERE. USING CLIMATE CHANGE AS A SCAPEGOAT IS SAD. PEOPLE NEED TO BE ABLE TO EAT, PAY YOUR TAXES, DEAL WITH INFLATION ..ETC...THIS IS OUT OF CONTROL. IT'S NOT RIGHT TO FORCE PEOPLE TO DO ANYTHING. EVER HEARD OF HYBRID CARS IF YOU HAVE A MISSION AGAINST CO2? THIS COUNTRY HAS BEEN BASED ON CHOICE VS AUTHORITARIAN GOVT!!!

Comment ID: 929

First Name: Brenda

Last Name: Steen

Commenter Email: Steen_email@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Resident

Posted Date: 08/23/23 05:20:45 PM

Comment:

Name: Steen, Brenda Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My electric bill is astronomical. How can I pay to plug in my car? I live in a condo and pay disproportionately high condo fees because we have too many work force units. Unless you lower electric rates, this proposal is unaffordable. I cannot install solar panels on my roof because I don't own it.

Comment ID: 930

First Name: Inge

Last Name: Meyer

Commenter Email: TaffTaffs@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 05:44:37 PM

Comment:

Name: Meyer, Inge Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Mining the materials for the batteries are very bad for the environment. Not to mention the child labor that's happening with the mining of the materials. The batteries cost more to the environment and are not renewable. When a vehicle gets stuck they have to charge it with a gas powered engine, where's the sense in that? When the batteries blow up, and they do blow up, they have killed more people and the gas vehicles. It happens so fast the driver and passengers just burn up. To put the fire out it takes a tremendous amount of resources and that doesn't always put it out; they just have to monitor it until it burns itself out. Charging gives off huge amounts of cancer causing electromagnetic radiation. Electric vehicles are environmentally harmful and dangerous.

Comment ID: 931

First Name: Glenn

Last Name: Siglinger

Commenter Email: Glennsiglinger@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 05:44:52 PM

Comment:

Name: Siglinger, Glenn Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Banning gas powered vehicles in Connecticut will only lead to significant costs to residents. Electric vehicles cost exponentially more to purchase and maintain. What about the disposal costs of the batteries, not just financially but on the environment?! Do Ct residents really want to

model itself after California's bad environmental policies? And how much taxpayer dollars will it cost to pay for charging stations? This is not the will of the citizens of this State. This is government overreach and not in the best interests of the constituents of Connecticut. This is not a solution to improve climate change. It's a violation of our freedoms. If people can afford and want to buy EV'S, it should be their choice, Not a Government Mandatory Requirement! Vote NO to the ban on gasoline vehicles and trucks.

Comment ID: 932

First Name: Jason

Last Name: Knox

Commenter Email: Jason.knox@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/23/23 06:34:55 PM

Comment:

Name: Knox, Jason Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It's a nice thought to believe costs will be down for electric vehicles in the future when everything has continued to appreciate. Most people don't have \$500 put away for an emergency yet now we're gonna force people to purchase vehicles that are still not convenient for anyone who travels. CT may have this regulation. Will all other states follow suit? Will EV drivers be stuck in CT because there is no other infrastructure in surrounding states? Twelve years is a short time in the grand scheme of things and I'm willing to bet most people will remain in similar situations, if not worse situations financially. I also wonder how our electrical grid will handle everyone charging their vehicles. I'm not an expert to say that it will cause brown outs, however I'm pretty sure adding extra stress on an aging power grid isn't the best idea. Also let's not ignore the impact of mining these elements. That process is FAR from carbon neutral and it would take a lot more than electric vehicles to square that ledger. Are these batteries recycled? I'm pretty sure battery disposal is an environmental issue. What happens when we have tons upon tons of dead car batteries to deal with? These are just some of the issues that the average Joe like myself would be concerned about. I do believe lower CO2 emissions is a good thing; however I have my doubts about this being the ultimate solution.

Comment ID: 933

First Name: Bonnie

Last Name: Olivieri

Commenter Email: olivieribonnie@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None

Commenter Title: None

Posted Date: 08/23/23 08:04:51 PM

Comment:

Name: Olivieri, Bonnie Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate. On average, electric-powered cars cost nearly twice as much to purchase as gasoline-powered cars. Banning gasoline-powered vehicles in Connecticut will lead to significant costs for residents and businesses. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure? Electric-powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which result in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. One of the biggest benefits of a hybrid car over a liquid fuel car is that it is greener to handle and has better gas mileage, making it much more environmentally friendly. A hybrid vehicle features two motors: an electric motor and a gasoline engine, resulting in lower fuel consumption and energy savings. A hybrid vehicle produces fewer emissions and uses less energy, resulting in lower pollution and less dependency on fossil fuels. As a result, the domestic economy benefits from lower gasoline prices. Over a ten-year period, a hybrid vehicle (gas and battery (not a plug-in) are proven to be the most effective and efficient vehicle. Cons of an electric vehicle: limited driving range; limited charging infrastructure; affordability; long charging time; and battery degradation and disposal of.

Comment ID: 934**First Name:** Kenneth**Last Name:** Knapp**Commenter Email:** mr70n@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Knapp, Kenneth Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I 100% oppose the proposed Ban on the sale of Gas powered vehicles in Connecticut for a multitude of reasons. Vote NO to the bans

Comment ID: 935**First Name:** Terry**Last Name:** Monahan**Commenter Email:** terencemonahan@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Owner**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 09:32:20 PM**Comment:**

Name: Monahan, Terry Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 With over 40 years in the auto and truck industry the dream of electric cars and trucks is far fetched. The batteries and disposal as well as the creation on them is an environmental horror. In order to create the torque and horsepower to move man 80,000 gvw truck is possible but the consumption of battery voltage and amperage makes the range ridiculously short. According to statistics air and water quality is continuously improving using plentiful low cost fuel. The expense and inconvenience of a mandate like this is just another example of legislation without realistic expectations and input from the industry. DONT DO IT!

Comment ID: 936**First Name:** Christopher**Last Name:** Guzzi**Commenter Email:** caguzzi@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 09:41:52 PM**Comment:**

Name: Guzzi, Christopher Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposal to ban gasoline powered passenger cars is a bad idea. First, we have not given DEEP the authority to dictate what kind of passenger vehicles can be manufactured, bought or sold. Second, electric vehicles cannot replace gasoline powered vehicles due to the following: The purchase price is too high for electric vehicles; The maximum distance of travel on a charge is much less than a gasoline powered vehicle; It takes way too long to charge electric vehicles, if a charging station can be found in Connecticut. Most importantly, our State's electric utility power supply infrastructure cannot supply the power needed to 'fuel' electric cars and trucks. Several nuclear power plants must be built in Connecticut dedicated to power generation just to handle the massive transportation electrical load. This will cost hundreds of billions (maybe trillions) of dollars to the State of Connecticut. The proposal to ban gasoline powered passenger cars is a bad idea for Connecticut - Please do not do such a thing. Thank you.

Comment ID: 937**First Name:** Kathy

Last Name: Cheslok**Commenter Email:** kcheslok@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/23/23 09:58:56 PM**Comment:**

Name: Cheslok, Kathy Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Forcing every CT resident to purchase VERY expensive electric vehicles is not practical. Most of us can barely afford the vehicles we have. I keep my cars for 10-15 years, I will not be able to save enough money to purchase another vehicle in the near future. I live in a condo with NO means to install a charging station. Our association runs on a very limited budget with no extra funds to pay for the numerous charging stations we will need to install to ensure all of our cars are charged. What is the plan to provide the hundreds of charging stations we will need? How does the electricity get produced? Wind? Solar? Coal? Electricity is dirty and expensive to produce. What is the plan to manage the extra waste that will be the by-product of producing so much extra electricity? Do we have the infrastructure in CT to produce the very high demand that will be created from this legislation? Cordially Yours Kathy Cheslok

Comment ID: 938**First Name:** Kenyon**Last Name:** Murphy**Commenter Email:** kenyonmurphy@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** kenyonmurphy@yahoo.com**Posted Date:** 08/23/23 11:35:01 PM**Comment:**

Name: Murphy, Kenyon Submission Date: 8/23/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would like to speak out on opposition of the Proposed Regulation Concerning: Advanced Clean Cars II. Connecticut is becoming increasingly unaffordable for the underserved and working poor that Democrats pretend to champion. Expensive EVs are out of the price range for our underserved. Connecticut will see further economic loss as customers do business out of state as Connecticut shuts down car dealerships. Employment will suffer as well. And if the intent of this regulation is to help the environment, I assure you that it will have a negative effect. Lithium ion and nickel cadmium and the means employed to mine and dispose are damaging to the environment, and the labor that countries use to mine thus material is often slave labor or indentured servitude.

Comment ID: 939**First Name:** Arielle**Last Name:** Annecharico**Commenter Email:** Aannecharico@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/24/23 07:27:28 AM**Comment:**

Name: Annecharico, Arielle Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I believe Americans everywhere should have a choice in the best vehicle for them and their families. If electric vehicles are so amazing than over time people will naturally buy them more than gas powered vehicles. This should be a process where the best vehicles win because they are better not because of some climate initiative or rich elites telling the rest of us that we have to use them. I do not think electric vehicles work very well in extreme cold or heat. Electric vehicles would decrease the ability of CT residents to move from place to place. The price for them far exceeds what most people can afford. If you think this is a good idea I urge you to take a cross country trip in one and see how that works out. If California jumped off a bridge apparently so would CT. Nonsense. Lithium and cobalt are not mined sustainably nor treat the miners with dignity and respect.

Comment ID: 940**First Name:** Vincent**Last Name:** Cercone**Commenter Email:** vincercone@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/24/23 10:39:08 AM**Comment:**

Name: Cercone, Vincent Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I want to let you know that I am against forcing CT citizens to buy EV cars at any time. No one has taken into account the additional cost of the EV and the demand it will place on the power grid. The CT government is forcing their ill conceived policies on all of us; it is a violation of our rights. Similar policies like defunding the police have created a mess in our streets and courts. The criminals have all the rights and law abiding citizens have to run away in fear. NO to the ban on gas-powered CT cars! Vincent Cercone Milford , CT 06460

Comment ID: 941**First Name:** joy**Last Name:** saunders**Commenter Email:** diamondjoynp@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** none**Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/24/23 11:55:14 AM**Comment:**

Name: saunders, joy Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO NO NO TO MANDATE AGAINST GAS CARS! A THOUGHTLESS AND POORLY THOUGHT OUT MANDATE!

Comment ID: 942**First Name:** Vincent**Last Name:** Dussich**Commenter Email:** vince@dussick.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/24/23 11:57:50 AM**Comment:**

Name: Dussich, Vincent Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 ask that DEEP not generate any regulation restricting vehicle sales to EVs. While I would like some day to buy such a car, I am retired and the current costs of these vehicles is prohibitive for me. It would be nice if we could be assured that the cars would be cheaper (and the grid be sufficient and vehicle range be extended and sourcing issues be resolved), but putting all our eggs in one basket is a great risk for those of us who cannot afford for your faith in technological advances to be misplaced. Please don't leave us with no Plan B.

Comment ID: 943**First Name:** Paul**Last Name:** Harris**Commenter Email:** Paul.harris@nmvfc.org**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** President

Posted Date: 08/24/23 12:25:07 PM

Comment:

Name: Harris, Paul Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do not believe the state has the right to dictate to me whether I can drive an electric or gas powered vehicle. Also the demand for electricity is already challenged. Lastly as a first responder, the thought of having 2 to 3 electric vehicles in every home scares me! If you like Calif, go move there and leave CT alone to chose.

Comment ID: 944

First Name: Nick

Last Name: Postovoit

Commenter Email: Npostusa@snet.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: Mr.

Posted Date: 08/24/23 12:26:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Postovoit, Nick Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Last winter our power grid could not keep up with demand and Eversource had to charge more to get power from other providers. Unfortunately many of our electric bills doubled, and there were Eversource statements eluding that we may possibly have power outages. That said, I am not against EV's, but I do not believe that the power grid will be able to support it. In addition, more importantly, I am against a forcing this mandate on the good citizens of Connecticut. Other things to consider is the cost of an EV, and the average worker in CT is making only about \$66,000 a year where as the lowest average is bordering \$34,000, and the higher average is \$109,000 according to <http://Ziprecruiter.com>.

Comment ID: 945

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: Rose

Commenter Email: rosekevin@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Kent Road Homeowners Association

Commenter Title: Chairperson

Posted Date: 08/24/23 12:38:20 PM

Comment:

Name: Rose, Kevin Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The ban on the sale of combustible engine cars in CT should be delayed by 10 years (i.e. 2045). The battery powered car technology is in it's infancy and nowhere near scalable to a country of 330 million where combustible engines have been perfected over 100 years with a full infrastructure. Battery powered cars take over an hour to charge vs. 4 mins in refueling and batteries have a 10 year life span. After 10 years, the batteries need replacement so where are we going to dispose of all of these batteries? Where is the battery refurbish centers? Additionally, combustible engines can be extinguished in the case of fire while battery powered cars CANNOT be extinguished leaving toxins entering the environment. Please remember that mining of valuable minerals to manufacture batteries has a similar environment impact as fossil fuel mining/consumption. Lastly, the cost of electric cars are average of 30-40% more that combustible engines creating a hardship for those that cannot afford. Therefore, please delay the ban by another 10 years (2045) until infrastructure and technology has developed to a stable level for an average CT resident.

Comment ID: 946

First Name: John

Last Name: Massari

Commenter Email: john@accent-signs.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Accent Signs LLC

Commenter Title: Owner

Posted Date:**Comment:**

Name: Massari, John Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The CT and US infrastructure cannot handle a large number of electric cars being charged. The energy grid needs to be upgraded to handle the higher demand. This will not reduce greenhouse gas emissions, because most electricity is being produced by oil, coal and natural gas. This will impact middle and lower income households greatly, because of the cost of electricity and these vehicles. In addition, many people cannot afford new vehicles, and with a 8 year battery life used cars will not be an option. Deposing these batteries will significantly impact our environment.

Comment ID: 947**First Name:** Mark**Last Name:** Sieczkowski**Commenter Email:** ctdeepcomment@sieczkowski.org**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/24/23 03:22:14 PM**Comment:**

Name: Sieczkowski, Mark Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support PR2023-023. Connecticut should take a leading role in the electrification of our automobile fleet. There are numerous challenges that await us on the road to this conversion but ten years is an appropriate time frame to tackle those challenges.

Comment ID: 948**First Name:** Steven**Last Name:** Vyce**Commenter Email:** Rallysox@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/24/23 03:57:23 PM**Comment:**

Name: Vyce, Steven Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hi. I do not think purchase of gas powered should be banned. Battery power still has many issues including economic (high cost per vehicle, high battery replacement, high charger cost) environmental (limited lithium supply, no safe recycling method, AS toxic to the environment as gas production and use) safety (fire risk while charging, and higher risk of explosion or fire in an accident!) and infrastructure (where will electricity come from to charge all of the cars in CT?) Also, what happens with the significant number of electrical outages we have in CT? How will cars charge? Who will get charging priority? Too many unanswered questions and issues compared to status quo. Let the market decide if people want to make the switch. Do not make society go backwards, thinking it will go forward.

Comment ID: 949**First Name:** Anthony**Last Name:** Amplo**Commenter Email:** anthony.amplo6@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/24/23 04:08:33 PM**Comment:**

Name: Amplo, Anthony Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I ask that DEEP not generate any regulation restricting vehicle sales to EVs. While I would like some day to buy such a car, I am still working, and the current

costs of these vehicles is prohibitive for me. It would be nice if we could be assured that the cars would be cheaper (and the grid be sufficient and vehicle range be extended and sourcing issues be resolved) but putting all our eggs in one basket is a great risk for those of us who cannot afford for your faith in technological advances to be misplaced. Please don't leave us with no Plan B.

Comment ID: 950

First Name: Kathryn

Last Name: Dennen

Commenter Email: kathryndennen@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/24/23 04:22:20 PM

Comment:

Name: Dennen, Kathryn Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I would ask the DEEP not generate regulations restricting the free market (and my ability to purchase a gas-powered affordable vehicle). Electric vehicles use alot of electricity to re-charge. Beyond the inital cost of the vehicle, there is no way that I could maintain the cost of chargin the vehicle every ight. (I have seen the electric bills of homeowner's who do so). The time is not now to enact such regulations. Thank you. Please act as AMERICANS, not lobbyist-funded cronies.

Comment ID: 951

First Name: Judy

Last Name: Brown

Commenter Email: Sunnyslane@charter.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/24/23 05:20:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Brown, Judy Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am so glad to live in an area where the existential threat of climate change is being addressed in a pragmatic and positive way. We desperately need to reduce our carbon emissions in a significant way sooner rather than later and electric vehicles are one of the ways we can achieve that goal. We do need to develop better infrastructure with our electric grid, number of charging stations, etc. Any state incentives for buying electric vehicles would be helpful as well.

Comment ID: 952

First Name: len

Last Name: kriegsman

Commenter Email: lenkriegsman57@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title: citizen

Posted Date: 08/24/23 05:28:08 PM

Comment:

Name: kriegsman, len Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm presently 66 so in 2035 I'll be 78 and How much I'll be driving I can't say. However right now I sell cars. some of them are electric. I want my grandchildren to have clean air and blue skies and green trees. I also believe there needs to be a balance. you can't expect people to give up their occupations completely. Auto parts stores, repair facilities and so forth. It's also a bit optimistic to think everyone will be willing to give up their gas cars for just electric cars. I doubt you will get 100% compliance willingly.

Comment ID: 953

First Name: Kenneth
Last Name: Keeler
Commenter Email: kenkee2012@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/24/23 05:40:57 PM

Comment:

Name: Keeler, Kenneth Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I do NOT support the proposed ban on the sale of gasoline powered cars.

Comment ID: 954
First Name: Brian
Last Name: Koerber
Commenter Email: briandkoerber@gmail.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/24/23 05:42:29 PM

Comment:

Name: Koerber, Brian Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We need to move toward the future, not live in the past. Some of the talking points submitted by Republicans in this congress go directly against the findings of the EPA. The effects of climate change are unfolding in front of our eyes, and a ban on gas-powered vehicles is a step in the right direction. This will create jobs and allow future innovation for decades to come. The future of our world is at stake, and we should be doing whatever we can to create renewable energy and a cleaner state for the future of us all.

Comment ID: 955
First Name: Tom
Last Name: Perkins
Commenter Email: tperkinsct@mac.com
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date: 08/24/23 06:32:37 PM

Comment:

Name: Perkins, Tom Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Our electrical infrastructure is in no way ready now or ten years from now for an increase in purely electric vehicles. For the next 25 years or so hybrids would be a far better alternative as they would reduce emissions likely by half while still retaining emergency range for longer trips. I am against this requirement for a ban on the sale of gasoline, diesel, or other fossil fueled vehicles by 2035.

Comment ID: 956
First Name: Jacquelyn
Last Name: Mitchell
Commenter Email: quin1963@snet.net
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title:
Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Mitchell, Jacquelyn Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Keep gas going !

Comment ID: 957

First Name: Nicholas

Last Name: Scaturchio

Commenter Email: Nickscaturchio4@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Scaturchio, Nicholas Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 We need gas powered cars for multiple purposes

Comment ID: 958

First Name: Maureen

Last Name: Montalvo

Commenter Email: Mcc03006@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/24/23 09:27:58 PM

Comment:

Name: Montalvo, Maureen Submission Date: 8/24/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please provide information on how the state proposes to support the infrastructure and projected future usage requirements for the regulatory requirements.

Comment ID: 959

First Name: Jason

Last Name: Ginnetti

Commenter Email: jasonginnetti@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Taxpayer

Commenter Title: None

Posted Date: 08/25/23 07:15:13 AM

Comment:

Name: Ginnetti, Jason Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I vehemently oppose this legislation and will oppose any persons that support it. Electric vehicles are not affordable, and will prove to be the largest economical failure in the history of this country.

Comment ID: 960

First Name: Chris

Last Name: Pasquale

Commenter Email: christopher8088@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Individual

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/25/23 09:11:36 AM

Comment:

Name: Pasquale, Chris Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Our 2nd highest in the nation electrical rates will go even higher if these standards are adopted. The free market should decide this. The government should not be in the business of picking winners and losers. Remember when the Malloy administration picked natural gas to

supplant home heating oil? Natural gas is in short supply and homeowners who converted are now praying the price.

Comment ID: 961

First Name: Rich

Last Name: Moutinho

Commenter Email: rich.moutinho@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/25/23 10:03:53 AM

Comment:

Name: Moutinho, Rich Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 This is the most idiotic thing I heard in a long time. EV's only benefit China. Let's be smart and think about the lifecycle of the EV's, what will we do with millions of old batteries? Can I drive from CT to CA in an EV? What will happen in a snow storm when sitting in traffic on I-95 traveling home from Stamford? Is a tow truck giving me a battery to get home? Let's give people the option to choose and stop trying to shove your agenda down peoples throats.

Comment ID: 962

First Name: Anthony

Last Name: Provenzano

Commenter Email: tonypro123@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/25/23 10:43:49 AM

Comment:

Name: Provenzano, Anthony Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 NO to the ban on gas-powered cars in CT!

Comment ID: 963

First Name: Anthony

Last Name: Provenzano

Commenter Email: tonypro123@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/25/23 10:47:48 AM

Comment:

Name: Provenzano, Anthony Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric powered vehicle batteries make them heavier than comparable gas-powered vehicles which results in greater emissions from tire, road, and brake wear over the life of the vehicle. Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. Also emissions from vehicles in Connecticut account for an estimated 0.04% of global emissions, banning gasoline powered vehicles in Connecticut will have no effect on the global climate whatsoever.

Comment ID: 964

First Name: MICHAEL

Last Name: DEROBERTIS

Commenter Email: mderobertis@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/25/23 10:53:51 AM**Comment:**

Name: DEROBERTIS, MICHAEL Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I think banning gas powered cars and trucks is absolutely the dumbest idea I have ever heard for so many reasons. The primary reason is the CT. and America's electric power grid and electric power generation transfer systems will not have the ability to handle such an increase in electric power. If the ban is approved it will lead blackouts during peak charging times such as summer heat waves. California uses rolling blacks, along with asking EV owners not to charge their EV's during peak summer hot days during evening hours. This is exactly what will happen in CT. if our elected officials continue along the California road to going all electric!!! On another topic, I recently received the property tax bill for my 2006 Subaru Legacy. The tax on the 2006 Subaru's is based on its assessed value of - \$3,350!!!! It's an 18 year old car - 18 years old. The assessed value is ridiculous. This is highway robbery. As a 78 year old male and a Connecticut resident for 35 years. The cost of living in Connecticut has gotten way out of hand. I'm totally disgusted with elected officials that believe rising taxes is the solution to all problems. Also, retired people in Connecticut should have their real estate taxes frozen at the at the dollar level when they retire and should not have to pay a property on their cars!!!! Enough is Enough!!!!

Comment ID: 965**First Name:** John**Last Name:** Ricciardi**Commenter Email:** johnricciardi@outlook.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/25/23 11:09:50 AM**Comment:**

Name: Ricciardi, John Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Shifting to all electric vehicles in Connecticut will demand a drastic increase in the amount of energy created in the state and the region and there is no reasonable plan to create this energy. There is not nearly enough electric car charging infrastructure available to require all vehicles to be electric-powered. How many taxpayer dollars will be spent to build this infrastructure?

Comment ID: 966**First Name:** Donald A**Last Name:** Dube PhD**Commenter Email:** drdondube@comcast.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** self**Commenter Title:** retired**Posted Date:** 08/25/23 11:23:09 AM**Comment:**

Name: Dube PhD, Donald A Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 ADDENDUM TO PREVIOUS COMMENTS - During the Public Hearing of August 22, 2023, mention was made by another commentator that the Rule would allow Hybrid-Electric vehicles. This is not completely correct. A thorough review of the California law upon which the Connecticut regulation would be based indicates that only PLUG-IN hybrids would be allowed, but not conventional Hybrid-electric vehicles. This is technically unreasonable based on the following analysis. The following data are used: Mileage of conventional hybrid-electric: minimum of 50 miles per gallon combined city and highway. CO2 emissions = 9 kg per gallon of gasoline Emissions = 9 kg/ gal x gal / 50 miles = 0.18 kg CO2 per mile, or less Average electric vehicle obtains 3 miles per kilowatt-hour from the battery On the margin in New England, an electric vehicle charger draws power typically powered by a natural gas plant. That plant emits approximately 1 pound (0.45 kg) of CO2 per kwh generated. Furthermore, one must account for approximately 2% loss in transmission, 4% loss in the distribution system, and 13 to 14% losses in the battery charger according to Tesla test data submitted to the US EPA. Thus, emissions from a typical EV are: Kwh/3 miles x 0.45 kg / kwh x 1/(1 -0.02 -0.04 -0.13) = 0.185 kg CO2 per mile In other words, a typical EV drawing from the grid would have a

global emissions of approximately the same as a conventional hybrid-electric vehicle. Based on this analysis, a conventional hybrid-electric vehicle obtaining better than 50 MPG should be allowed by the regulation to be sold after 2035.

Comment ID: 967

First Name: Laurin

Last Name: Smith

Commenter Email: laurin784@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Smith, Laurin Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please DO NOT pass legislation banning gas powered vehicles. Considering the high costs and limited power available from "clean" energy sources, and that reliable sources of electricity are powered by dirtier fossil fuels (e.g. coal) than gasoline, such a ban makes no sense. It will only create financial hardship for CT voters, and will impact those with lowest incomes the hardest. Your voters are NOT in favor of any legislation limiting gas powered vehicles. Please listen to your voters and abandon this costly and useless proposal.

Comment ID: 968

First Name: Karen

Last Name: Mehra

Commenter Email: kpm5454@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: TNC

Commenter Title: Board member

Posted Date: 08/25/23 12:15:43 PM

Comment:

Name: Mehra, Karen Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The proposed regulations for light medium and heavy vehicles in Connecticut is a necessary part of moving forward toward our goals to combat climate change. We must protect our environment for future generations.

Comment ID: 969

First Name: Maryann

Last Name: Francischelli

Commenter Email: fourfirstnames@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/25/23 03:17:35 PM

Comment:

Name: Francischelli, Maryann Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 My car goes 50 miles on an electric charge. It cost me .24 per kWh to charge my 15 kWh battery at home so \$3.60 (.24x15). When gas is below that amount I no longer charge but buy gas as it's cheaper. CT has the 2nd highest price of electricity after Hawaii and we have a ridiculous price of gas now at close to \$4.00 It also takes my car 12 hours to charge at home on a 120 watt line and 6 hours on a 220. So it's not practical to keep thinking electricity is the way to go.

Comment ID: 970

First Name: John

Last Name: Salerni

Commenter Email: jsalerni@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/25/23 04:19:59 PM**Comment:**

Name: Salerno, John Submission Date: 8/25/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do NOT create any regulation discouraging gas-powered cars. Replacing traditional cars with electric cars does NOT make a significant impact on worldwide emissions and it creates a hardship for many citizens. Electric cars are much more expensive and cumbersome to own/drive because of charging and range issues. The mining to create the batteries and the lack of reuse/disposal issues, combined with the emissions to generate the electricity needed result in a net NEGATIVE impact by electric cars on the environment compared to gas-powered cars. Let the market control the evolution of cars...if they become cheaper and more effective, they will naturally replace traditional cars over time.

Comment ID: 971**First Name:** suzanne**Last Name:** spinelli**Commenter Email:** willowreed@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/26/23 12:32:24 AM**Comment:**

Name: spinelli, suzanne Submission Date: 8/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm not in favor of banning normal vehicles. I think that Connecticut's air is clean. We have to get our emissions tested all the time, so I think that should suffice. Electric cars are expensive, but even worse, the electric rates are expensive. How are normal working people supposed to afford charging electric cars when the rates are so high. Eversource is getting rich, but yet we just get pushed around. Another reason is that we would be beholden ever more to China, due to their capacity to produce the necessary batteries for the cars, and if not that, they have the sourcing of the materials at their fingertips. They pollute while we get to reap the benefits of their 'generous' battery production? No. Let's not do this electric car thing. Let the people paying all the bills decide, and what vehicle they want, and, that is us, the tax payers.

Comment ID: 972**First Name:** Brooke**Last Name:** Monsky**Commenter Email:** Bamster00@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/26/23 08:12:35 AM**Comment:**

Name: Monsky, Brooke Submission Date: 8/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hi, I oppose this tentative regulation for because of following: 1. The EV industry has not stabilized and does not seem to be well vetted for its own issues such as high emissions for battery production which when compared to Gas vehicles (GV) takes years of use to realize environmental benefits. 2. The production of EV batteries has serious questions - is it ok for CT to go green, if other countries bear the burden such as child labor, environmental contamination and other ethical issues? 3. Over-burdening your residents: CT is already an exceedingly expensive place to live, this initiative will likely cost millions if not billions to the state for a questionable return, all falling on a shrinking population who is becoming less willing to pay for experimental government initiatives. 4. What happens when lots of accidents happen and these EVs catch fire and extinguishing is difficult, that will be a cost and industry into itself 5. This will kill certain incomes and businesses including family-owned businesses like gas stations, it may increase some new ones, but will we actually stay to find this out. 6. The relationship between the State of CT gov and Eversource seems untrustworthy and could be restrictive and perilous for residents. We just went through a huge price hike. I believe forcing people to use a government-adjacent resource is government overreach and we have seen these effects in

your darling California. If our technology was more evolved so that we could fully produce our own electricity for our cars and become self-reliant, it might be different, but that likely wouldn't ever be allowed by the utilities companies, would it? 7. What happens when Eversource gets overburdened with everyone plugged in, brown outs, hurricanes, etc. Much of life would come to a standstill; people may die or otherwise not get the care they need because of limited transportation. It is a small but real possibility. Please consider not forcing all of this on your people. Thank you.

Comment ID: 973

First Name: Craig

Last Name: Tini

Commenter Email: cmtdds@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Tini, Craig Submission Date: 8/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 In response to the government forcing the sale of electric cars, I believe that the free market should be able to dictate the best product. Our electric grid is taxed as it is without adding the undue stress of everyone charging their cars. I would be in favor of incentives direct to the consumer. As has been noted in the press, most recently by the CEO of Ford trying to drive his electric F-150 and finding it difficult to charge during a road trip, electric cars are not efficient modes of transportation on long trips. They make much more sense for commuting or short daily trips around town. The mindset of travel needs to change before shoving a mandate down the public's throat. Charging stations are not like gas stations. Charging stations need to be installed at the destination so hte car can charge while the people are at the grocery store, movies, mall, etc. Charging stations should not be on the highways. If people want to take long trips, they need to incorporate charging into their trip. This could revitalize the small towns that were killed when the interstate system bypassed them. By having people come into these towns to charge their vehicles the local economies will get a boost.

Comment ID: 974

First Name: Jeffrey

Last Name: Samoska

Commenter Email: jeffsam0071@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Home

Commenter Title: Owner

Posted Date: 08/26/23 09:10:10 AM

Comment:

Name: Samoska, Jeffrey Submission Date: 8/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric vehicles cost too much. Prices are excessive. After the 5-year loan is paid off, the battery wears out and must be replaced for around \$20,000. The max range now for a charge is maybe 450 miles, and charging is slow. Also, there are not enough stations around the U.S. for millions of cars to charge. Putting in a system for the home is not feasible for everyone. Quip: 95% of electric cars are still on the road; the other 5% actually made it home. The U.S. electric grid system will be over-loaded with vehicles trying to charge up. Will there be brown-outs or power outages? Everyone can't afford an electric any time soon. What will they do for transportation? For the foreseeable future, hybrids seem to be a good option. We're just not ready for electric.

Comment ID: 975

First Name: Marcia

Last Name: Santos

Commenter Email: marcia.santos@sbcglobal.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:**Comment:**

Name: Santos , Marcia Submission Date: 8/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am totally opposed to this proposed bill. I nor anyone in my family will ever purchase an electric vehicle. What right do you or any agency have to try and shove this down our throats! Last time I checked, this was the United States of America and a free country!!

Comment ID: 976**First Name:** ANDREW**Last Name:** MILLAR**Commenter Email:** andrew_millar@sbcglobal.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: MILLAR, ANDREW Submission Date: 8/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Oppose Ban on Sale of Gasoline Vehicles This is to oppose the proposed ban on gasoline powered vehicles. As an elected member of my town's RTM, I meet frequently with voters. While a few of my constituents support the proposal, and one even now owns an electric vehicle, the majority vehemently oppose the proposal. The reasons are the following: - High cost of electric vehicles despite government incentives - Lack of charging stations - Takes too long to charge - High cost of charging - Lack of range for long distance travel - Severe battery drain when utilizing heater in cold weather - Battery drain when utilizing air conditioning in hot weather - Philosophical objection to government overreach and limiting freedom of choice My recommendation is to urge a solution that allows residents who want electric vehicles to purchase them as they wish, yet allow those who need gasoline vehicles to continue to purchase them in our state. Alternatively, if the state insists on mandates, may I suggest a compromise in which all legislators of both parties, all W-2 and 1099 state employees, including university and unionized employees, be required to purchase electric vehicles and be denied access to gasoline pumps within state borders. And of course, the final solution is simply to move out of state, as some of my voters have done already. Sincerely, Andrew Millar Registered voter Member Darien RTM

Comment ID: 977**First Name:** Justin**Last Name:** Murphy**Commenter Email:** jmmurphy@outlook.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/26/23 10:59:49 PM**Comment:**

Name: Murphy, Justin Submission Date: 8/26/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I applaud you for thinking big, but in the end, we need to be practical. A mandate for EVs only is not practical. The mandate would increase the demand for electricity, especially during peak hours when EVs are likely to be charged. This may require costly upgrades to the state's electric grid, transmission lines, and generation capacity. It may also increase the risk of blackouts or brownouts if the grid cannot meet the demand or if there are disruptions in supply. Further, the mandate may not achieve the desired environmental benefits. The mandate aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality by replacing gas-powered vehicles with EVs. However, the environmental impact of EVs depends on how the electricity they use is generated. If the electricity comes from fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, or natural gas, then EVs may not reduce emissions significantly or at all. Moreover, EVs may have other environmental costs, such as the extraction (mining) of rare earth metals and disposal of batteries. At this point, it raises as many questions as it answers. Where do all the batteries go? Where are the exceptions for public safety and commercial vehicles that can't function on charging alone? An unintended consequence may be overuse of EVs. Since people will believe they are carbon neutral, they will drive more often, resulting in greater stress on the power grid. If I own an EV, then I'm going to drive it the half mile to get my morning coffee. If I own a Ford F-250 Super Duty, I'm going to walk or

ride my bike to get the coffee. Again, unintended consequences. Let's incentivize people to walk, ride their bike, or take public transportation, not to drive our cars more often.

Comment ID: 978

First Name: William

Last Name: Licht

Commenter Email: bill.licht@alpa.prg

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: none

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/27/23 04:16:11 PM

Comment:

Name: Licht, William Submission Date: 8/27/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am firmly opposed to the proposed ban on the sale of gasoline powered cars in Connecticut. Electric cars are cost prohibitive for most residents, in that they cost more to purchase, upkeep, power, and do not last as long as gas powered cars. Our state is also not set up for all residents to be driving electric cars. The grids can barely handle the current demand, and my home has been without electricity on many occasions, some lasting more than a week. In those times my family and I would be stranded at home and unable to attend work and school if we had only electric vehicles. Additionally, electric vehicles are not better for the environment. The materials used to make the batteries are terribly toxic and are mined by slave labor in other countries. In short, I see NO way our state would benefit from banning the sale of gasoline powered cars and forcing residents to buy electric cars. This is not something that should be legislated, let the consumer make the choice. Thank you.

Comment ID: 979

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Perkowski

Commenter Email: petitioncongress2@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: none

Commenter Title: none

Posted Date: 08/27/23 04:17:36 PM

Comment:

Name: Perkowski, Elizabeth Submission Date: 8/27/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Like a never-ending game of ping-pong, the California Waiver of emission standards and mandatory ?ZEV? production continues to go back and forth between Republican and Democrat administrations. Republicans want people to be free to choose to purchase products they want, and manufacturers should be free to make those products. Democrats will mandate what we must purchase. Biden?s EPA?s decision to reinstate the California Waiver is what allows Connecticut's unelected bureaucrats to adopt California's unelected bureaucrats' regulations. There is no such thing as a Zero Emissions Vehicle. It?s the ultimate NIMBY mode of transportation. Drivers of electric cars get to put their noses in the air, certain that they are superior to their internal combustion neighbors -forgetting completely that their EV does have a tailpipe, but it is hundreds of miles away where coal, oil or gas is burned to put the electricity into the grid for their vehicles to use. And let?s not forget - or maybe learn for the first time ? the vast amounts of Cobalt and Lithium necessary for the electric car batteries, is harmful to those in the Congo (children and adults) and China who mine these metals. (Congo produces 70% of the world?s supply. Some mining is/will be done in Idaho and Nevada but it?s a fraction of the global output. Getting permits to mine on U.S. federal lands, for some reason, takes a long time.) So we will be dependent on our foe, China, to get move around. Mandating electric vehicles leads to more mandates. For instance; California Building Codes now require landlords to install charging stations to accommodate electric vehicle owners. How does that help the housing industry? Is Connecticut ready to force that cost increase onto property owners and renters? Additionally, CA senate Bill SB233 would require all electric vehicles to be ?Bi-Directional?, meaning power can flow from the car?s charging battery into the Electric Grid when brownouts or blackouts occur. Won?t that be fun when those in power decide you have to send your car battery?s energy into the grid? Just when you thought you were all charged-up for that long car trip or commute! It?s for the common good, you see. So far, I haven?t seen government siphoning gas out of my car?s tank. When the market is truly ready for electric cars to become dominant, we will know. It will not have to be forced onto the people of

Connecticut. It will be their decision. Mandating people to buy a product is not the same as consumer demand. There are plenty of petroleum products to power the flourishing of society worldwide for centuries to come. Scare tactics about the end of the world are getting tiresome. There is no reason why we can't build more nuclear power plants. We use them safely on submarines and surface ships. We have the technology. People will decide with their purchases and not some arbitrary bureaucrats following other arbitrary bureaucrats 3000 miles away, denying citizens their right to buy what they want. Connecticut DEEP can crunch their numbers all they want but China and India and other Third World countries will more than make up for any tiny fraction of reduced pollution these regulations might accomplish.

Comment ID: 980

First Name: Daniel

Last Name: Hunt

Commenter Email: dhunt4@protonmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/27/23 04:56:27 PM

Comment:

Name: Hunt, Daniel Submission Date: 8/27/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The U.S. Constitution is the supreme law of the land per Article VI Clause 2. Nothing supersedes the U.S. Constitution. Any power not delegated to the Federal Government, and not prohibited by it to the States or to the People respectively per Amendment Ten in the Bill of Rights. The same concept applies to all state constitutions since the U.S. Constitution is part of every state constitution. Regulating transportation is not an enumerated power delegated either to the Federal Government either in the U.S. Constitution or to the State of Connecticut in the Connecticut Constitution. It is therefore a power/unalienable right reserved by the People, for the People. Consequently, the proposed bill is unconstitutional and must be removed from further consideration.

Comment ID: 981

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Miller

Commenter Email: jennm0720@comcast.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/28/23 10:08:44 AM

Comment:

Name: Miller, Jennifer Submission Date: 8/28/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please do not further burden the working middle and poor in this State. What a great vision it is but another government mandate plus the added gas taxes we will already have to pay from the transportation bill makes this state unlivable for workers. The state is just about to get an influx of young folks in to work at GD and they have no place to live and now will be additionally burdened with a non sensical mandate to search for an EV with no guarantee that the grid can even support the demand required. The car dealers that may be able to remain in business will jack the prices up and gouge everyone. Why make it a mandate? Build the infrastructure and people can make their own choices with their brains and wallets to move to EV when it is affordable and meaningful.

Comment ID: 982

First Name: Joan

Last Name: Shobrinsky

Commenter Email: loonview7979@att.net

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/28/23 12:53:35 PM

Comment:

Name: Shobrinsky, Joan Submission Date: 8/28/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Electric cars should be the choice of the resident not a mandate by government. Price of installing charger in home-price of car-battery-what return if car is traded in-life of battery and most of all car price-Ct is expensive now without your ideas. Politicians never think any through. Advice go to China-India-Africa and mandate your rules for clean air i.e. coal furnaces etc. You never think of cutting costs just spend-spend spend. Do the batteries perform well in the cold-less mileage-heat interferes and charging stations fail. Fires in the cars are a concern which has not been properly addressed. DROP YOUR MANDATE and find something of value to do.

Comment ID: 983**First Name:** Jeanne**Last Name:** Kent**Commenter Email:** woodah@att.net**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** N/A**Posted Date:** 08/28/23 03:33:10 PM**Comment:**

Name: Kent, Jeanne Submission Date: 8/28/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Too much ? too soon. CT is not ready for all electric vehicles. Lack of power grid to support all EVs. Lack of charging stations. Cost. Combustability of the EVs. We are not California? thank God!

Comment ID: 984**First Name:** JACK**Last Name:** PROVENZANO**Commenter Email:** jprove02@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/28/23 04:08:12 PM**Comment:**

Name: PROVENZANO, JACK Submission Date: 8/28/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 It is disturbing that these days when California emissions laws are literally driving people from their state, Connecticut is allowing these measures to push forward in this state. People are leaving Connecticut state in droves along with businesses. It is truly upsetting that our regulators are allowed to propose such a stupid option without legislative approval. It would be even worse if our legislature entertained this matter. It should just be thrown out. Concentrate on reducing taxes, improving schools, filling jobs and bringing more into the state, and improving the quality life in CT

Comment ID: 985**First Name:** Angela**Last Name:** Liptack**Commenter Email:** asliptack@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:****Comment:**

Name: Liptack, Angela Submission Date: 8/28/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I fully support implementation of CT DEEP's proposed regulation focused on improving our state's air quality and reducing Connecticut's contribution to the global warming caused by burning fossil fuels ("Advanced Clean Cars II"). The benefit of reduced health care costs for individuals with asthma and other respiratory illnesses would be sufficient in itself; equally important, though, is

that by implementing this regulation, Connecticut will join other states in the effort to de-escalate the global warming that threatens the ecosystems on which humans depend for survival. Our children and grandchildren deserve nothing less.

Comment ID: 986

First Name: Kairo

Last Name: Kitchens

Commenter Email: kairokitchens100@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Kitchens, Kairo Submission Date: 8/28/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support banning gas vehicles by 2035. Were in 2023 it's only 11 years and 4 months until then, that's enough time for more charging stations to be planted in the state. Plus Connecticut is the top 5 most dense states and 3rd smallest state so it's gonna take less time to fill it up with charging stations than larger less densely populated states. Noise pollution doesn't get enough attention as it should but since electric cars are quieter people's hearing will be better in their later years and delayed hearing aids purchases. Even though we're up here in the north we don't get as many climate disasters as the southern states do, climate change will intensify in the coming decades and when that storm hits gas pipes in our state or Texas or something the cost of gas will elevate for a period of time affecting people's wallets where more will have to take on debt. More politicians are talking about energy security nowadays and electric cars will help us achieve that quicker. Using electricity will make us more independent and we won't be affected as much by fuel costs from outside countries who want to increase oil prices for profits at the cost of consumers' wallets. The cost of electricity is cheaper, more stable and every year that goes by the range on electric cars gets longer which means people can drive more and take less trips to the station. We're always gonna be affected by OPEC controlling gas supply which affects gas prices in our country. Electric vehicles have less moving parts so people don't have to keep running the car repair shops so much saving them money. As humans were always gonna be traveling and moving from place to place for future centuries so it's important to have cleaner air so people can breathe easier. Kids, seniors and people with respiratory illnesses are the most at risk for toxic air quality. More electric vehicles on the road means less respiratory problems for those groups. The less respiratory citizens clogging up doctor's offices, hospitals means medical workers have less exhaustion/burnout and they can prioritize their attention on other patients instead. Look at electric vehicles as a large but necessary investment in the short term that can save people hundreds of dollars in medical bills, less trips to the doctor, fewer people being buried in the graveyard, less hearing aids, more animals alive, and more people enjoying their life more. It's better to invest now and accumulate long term savings in the future cause with money you either have to pay more to mitigate/reduce the problem or pay more to fix it or do damage control. Lastly electric cars are safer than gasoline ones. Here's a bonus it's more convenient to charge at home or overnight cause once you're done your car is stationary for the next day. Versus after the work day is over you have to go to a gas station, fill up then waste a few miles of gas going home. That's less efficient time and money wise.

Comment ID: 987

First Name: John

Last Name: Kissane

Commenter Email: kissanejohn8@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None

Commenter Title: None

Posted Date:

Attachments:

Psychology of Climate Change Catastrophism.pdf

Comment:

Name: Kissane, John Submission Date: 8/28/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am hopeful that there are still enough rational people in the DEEP and the State of CT to stop and give this some serious thought. If you do you will see that

banning gas cars will do unfathomable damage to the people of CT. And for what? It's time for CT government officials to take a step back and take a balance, rational assessment of their conclusions about the future. Perhaps reading some recent works by serious experts would help you make up your own mind about what makes sense. I recommend the following: "Unsettled" by Steven Koonin, "False Alarm" by Bjorn Lomborg, "Fossil Future" by Alex Epstein, "Apocalypse Never" by Michael Shellenberger and "Climate Uncertainty and Risk" by Judith Curry. The attached also lends some perspective on why some people are SO convinced they are right about climate change.

Comment ID: 988

First Name: william

Last Name: michael

Commenter Email: jandbband@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Bethel Action Committee

Commenter Title: chairman

Posted Date: 08/28/23 10:56:37 PM

Comment:

Name: michael, william Submission Date: 8/28/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I want to voice opposition to the proposed ban on gas powered automobiles. The ban will result in more economic pain on those least able to afford the exorbitant cost of living in the state. it will raise electric demand and it's associated costs . It is the another 'Cash for Clunkers' boondoggle that will benefit special interests to the detriment of the citizen at large

Comment ID: 989

First Name: Holly

Last Name: Keeler

Commenter Email: Pearsall0401@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/29/23 08:00:39 AM

Comment:

Name: Keeler, Holly Submission Date: 8/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear sirs, The electric grid in Connecticut can not support EV at this time. The revenue required to make EV sustainable will be a burden many Connecticut residents can not bear. EV require batteries that use rare earth minerals which will quickly become unavailable. There is no plan that I am aware of for the recycling of EV batteries. These batteries will release radio active waste that will need to be contained, thereby creating another expensive burden. The EV are practically useless after the battery is run down. I can not afford to replace a car because it needs a battery. The danger of uncontrollable fire is also concerning. How many homes will burn because the EV? How many cargo ships will burn while transporting EV and sink contaminating the ocean? The EV are heavier than a regular combustion vehicle. Is there a plan to repair our road ways? This is another burden Connecticut tax payers are ill equipped to bear. The expense of installing a charging station at home is also worrisome. Most home owners will need to upgrade their electrical panels as well as install the charging station. The power generated to charge EV is coming mostly from natural gas and coal. EV does next to nothing to reduce the overall carbon footprint. Nuclear power stations may alleviate our overall carbon footprint, however these plants require time and money to build. The rush to require EV is ill advised for the environment and for Connecticut residents due to the excessive expense. I am vehemently opposed to the plan of action.

Comment ID: 990

First Name: Chas

Last Name: Catania

Commenter Email: ChasHCC@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/29/23 09:19:17 AM

Comment:

Name: Catania, Chas Submission Date: 8/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 When a new technology is ready, both technically ready and financially worthwhile, the market shifts towards it ON ITS OWN. Good ideas do not need to be jammed down the throats of the public! When politicians try to force the issue, they create problems that didn't need to happen. They'll pretend that these problems were unforeseen, but in reality they were obvious to anyone who was paying attention. The motives of these politicians vary, but are rarely anything but greed and desire to remain in power. As the owner of an EV (Tesla) I can tell you that CT's Electric grid is NOWHERE near ready for the added load of mostly and then totally EVs on the road by the proposed deadlines. Do not pretend later that you were not made aware of the problems that you are creating now! Thank you, Chas

Comment ID: 991

First Name: Carol

Last Name: Phelps

Commenter Email: szizlin3@aol.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Concerned Citizen

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/29/23 09:28:21 AM

Comment:

Name: Phelps, Carol Submission Date: 8/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Testimony in strong OPPOSITION to both DEEP Proposed Regulations: ? Low Emission Vehicle IV Program and Advanced Clean Cars II? and ?Advanced Clean Trucks, and Medium and Heavy-Duty Vehicle and Engine Emissions and Warranty Standards.? There may come a day where we are able to replace gas powered vehicles with cars and trucks run by an alternative energy source, but we are not there and there seems little to zero chance we will be there by 2035. The idea of banning the sale of gas powered vehicles and forcing already overtaxed CT residents to purchase electric cars is offensive. Electric cars are too expensive, they have limited travel range without continual stops for charging and any reasonable person would have concerns over their safety (explosions and fires). Our electric grid simply can not sustain the additional burden. We are making our country more beholden to China because we lack the components to make electric cars, and China has control over these minerals, often exploiting children to mine them. Would CT residents be able to go to other states to purchase gas vehicles? Probably, so you are then hurting the economy of our state. It is sad where a lovely state like CT proposes regulations like this and lifelong residents like me have to contemplate moving out of state. For the life of me, WHY would we EVER try to pattern our rules after California? California is another gorgeous state which is being ruined by very bad leadership. Tragic. I urge you to hold off on any kind of limits on gas powered cars until we have reasonable, affordable and safe alternatives. Carol and Bruce Phelps Marlborough, CT

Comment ID: 992

First Name: Marlene

Last Name: Drygas

Commenter Email: marlenedrygas@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Drygas, Marlene Submission Date: 8/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 The idea to lower emissions is good but Ct. doesn't have the infrastructure to support it and there's nothing to suggest that it will have the infrastructure in place by the deadline given.

Comment ID: 993

First Name: Marc

Last Name: Favreau**Commenter Email:** mfavreau721@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/29/23 05:01:36 PM**Comment:**

Name: Favreau, Marc Submission Date: 8/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please, please, please do adopt California's s
 move to have all new cars, pickup trucks and SUVs be electric or hydrogen by 2035. Our air will be cleaner and
 everyone will be healthier for it. Everyone from every town and city in Connecticut.

Comment ID: 994**First Name:** Jennifer**Last Name:** Kleindienst**Commenter Email:** jennifer.kleindienst@gmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/29/23 07:52:01 PM**Comment:**

Name: Kleindienst, Jennifer Submission Date: 8/29/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental
 Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am in full support of the State of
 Connecticut passing clean car regulations in accordance with California Code of Regulations, Title 13, Section 1961
 (subsections noted within proposed regulation). We need to be taking bold steps to curb climate change, and as
 transportation is the largest contributor to greenhouse gas emissions in our state, this is the right path to be on.

Comment ID: 995**First Name:** Patrick**Last Name:** Kelly**Commenter Email:** pkelly@afpm.org**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers**Commenter Title:** Senior Director, Fuel & Vehicle Policy**Posted Date:****Attachments:**

AFPM Comment Connecticut ACC II Adoption.pdf

Attachment B AFPM Comment Connecticut ACC II Proposal EPA LDV Comment.pdf

Attachment C AFPM Comment Connecticut ACC II Proposal NYSDEC ACC II.pdf

Attachment D AFPM Comment Connecticut ACC II DELAWARE Comments.pdf

Attachment E AFPM Comment Connecticut ACC II Proposal RBN Blog.pdf

Comment:

Name: Kelly, Patrick Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Attachment A exceeds file size limits. The file
 "Attachment A AFPM Comment Connecticut ACC II California AFPM-WSPA-CIPA Comment.pdf" can be
 accessed at: <https://acrobat.adobe.com/link/review?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:6dfa9aa5-c6ad-4d02-a947-52b6013456c4>

Comment ID: 996**First Name:** Peter**Last Name:** Auster**Commenter Email:** pjauster@aol.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/30/23 07:39:50 AM

Comment:

Name: Auster, Peter Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am writing in support of the proposed regulation: Sec. 22a-174-36d. Low Emission Vehicle IV Program and Advanced Clean Cars II. Existing law, passed by the legislature and signed by our governor, made a commitment to the citizens of Connecticut to advance a clean energy future. These regulations are the path to take us there.

Comment ID: 997

First Name: Jackie

Last Name: Yeager

Commenter Email: jackie.m.yeager@cummins.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Attachments:

Cummins Inc. Comments to CT DEEP ACC II Aug 2023.pdf

Comment:

Name: Yeager, Jackie Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Comments from Cummins Inc. are attached.

Comment ID: 998

First Name: Sandy

Last Name: Posca

Commenter Email: Slp716@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date:

Comment:

Name: Posca , Sandy Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Thank you for soliciting feedback on the Lamont administration's plan to enact new emissions mandates that would require all new passenger vehicle sales to be electric vehicles by 2035. One of the major concerns I have is infrastructure required to support such a mandate for electric autos. Currently there are 1.4 million registered Commercial and privately owned vehicles in Connecticut. That equates to \$44.8 million amps at 220 volts of electricity. Major upgrades and step-up transformers would be needed to upgrade the current Power Grid system and new sub-stations would need to be added. As it is now, we are being told to limit our home air conditioner unit use in the summer in order to not overload the power Grids. I would ask, how would this concept of electric cars even be possible to handle the load on the Power Grids? With an assumption that each household has an average of 2 automobiles, each home MUST have a 200 amp service minimum and at least 2 charging systems which can run up to \$2k per charger and \$4k for the electric service upgrade. The majority of Connecticut residents would have a difficult time affording such a cost. Additionally, Copper is in short supply due to the fact that the current Administration has limited or closed mines due to Climate change concerns. Even in a condition where mines were reopened, excessive copper mining would expose radioactive material into the atmosphere at a harmful level. Sulfuric Acid from mining would cause a concern for contamination in ground water systems. These issues indicate that more harm than good is being accomplished by converting to electric vehicles. Furthermore, Lithium is also needed to produce electric cars. Currently we do not have nearly enough lithium mining going on to support an all-electric car demand. Also, excessive lithium mining poses health risks, degradation and erosion of soil, forests and have a major impact on ecosystems. So what are we gaining here? What is the benefit? I have to ask what the motivation for creating such an expensive, planet polluting illogical idea is going to achieve. It certainly doesn't seem to be an idea with a well thought out risk-benefit analysis. When additional charging stations are installed, theft of charging cables will most likely occur for the value of the copper, not to mention the traffic and congestion these charging stations will create. The inconvenience alone of having to recharge a car several times a week is not possible for the working class who are already slaves to Federal taxes, Connecticut tax, state tax, auto taxes, gas taxes, taxes on purchases, etc. This is a poor choice for the people of Connecticut. We deserve better living conditions and less taxes. We cannot afford to

fund this endeavor by raising already stretched citizens living paycheck to paycheck. I don't believe electric vehicle mandates is a viable option for Connecticut. It certainly is taking away freedoms and increasing cost and risks of harmful contamination. For these reasons I ask this be immediately stopped. Electrical professionals understand what this decision means to Connecticut. I ask you seek professional advice from licensed electricians who understand the impact of this decision. Sincerely, Stephen LoCascio Sandy Posca

Comment ID: 999

First Name: Monica

Last Name: Sutcliffe

Commenter Email: monicalsutcliffe47@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/30/23 09:49:48 AM

Comment:

Name: Sutcliffe, Monica Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I'm writing in favor of the amendment to adopt more stringent regulations and requirements to emission requirements for light duty vehicles as well as requiring vehicle manufacturers to increase the sale of electric vehicles to work on meeting greenhouse gas reduction goals for the state of Connecticut. We must act now, and swiftly, to slow emissions, and I believe these standards are a positive step towards that end.

Comment ID: 1000

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Chapin

Commenter Email: carpettea@yahoo.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/30/23 09:55:44 AM

Comment:

Name: Chapin, Susan Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I support the Advanced Clean Cars II regulation. Despite many efforts, CT has insufficient measures in place to meet the carbon emissions goals and to reduce pollution, which disproportionately affects the health and general welfare of low-income communities and communities of color. Children in these communities experience higher rates of health impacts and miss more schooldays. Parents are then forced to take days off to care for their children, and - having lower income and fewer workplace protections - cannot afford the days off needed for childcare. These regulations are absolutely vital for future generations, who will be more affected by climate change than are we. We must take responsibility for ensuring their future. I am also advocating that monies be invested in managing people and businesses through this transition through a proper Change Management plan, which will speed adoption. People are legitimately afraid of change, concerned about jobs and infrastructure. Let's address these needs by raising awareness and demonstrating how businesses can benefit from such change. Small businesses are certainly the backbone of CT and provide many jobs. Let's help them help themselves, rewarding innovation and incentivizing transition. We must also counter disinformation. We should measure and monitor the outcomes during the transition, celebrate wins and directly address issues and how we can learn from them.

Comment ID: 1001

First Name: Melissa

Last Name: Everett

Commenter Email: melissa.a.everett@icloud.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/30/23 10:22:31 AM

Comment:

Name: Everett, Melissa Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I write to encourage adoption of the Advanced Clean Cars, Advanced Clean Trucks, and Heavy Duty Omnibus Regulations. Connecticut statewide is out of compliance with Clean Air Act standards, impacting our communities and especially children and elders. By requiring more availability of electric vehicles, these rules strengthen the marketplace and provide more choices -- not fewer, as uninformed critics have claimed. Please don't delay!

Comment ID: 1002**First Name:** Justin**Last Name:** Paglino**Commenter Email:** justin@justin4all.org**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Green Party of Connecticut**Commenter Title:** Co-chair**Posted Date:** 08/30/23 10:52:05 AM**Attachments:**

CO2.pdf

Comment:

Name: Paglino, Justin Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I write to try and imbue you with a sense of urgency in adopting the proposed clean transportation regulations. The planet we live on is now the hottest it has ever been in human history. <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/news-wrap-earth-sees-hottest-july-ever-recorded-in-human-history> Wildfires are killing our citizens and those in other nations. Ecological disasters are piling up and extremely expensive both in money and in human lives. The world's oceans are heating at the same rate they would if Five Hiroshima bombs were dropped into them every second. <https://shorturl.at/djoV5> Food will become more scarce, and prices inflated, as droughts and storms and wildfires increase. <https://shorturl.at/ijlU1> We are doing NOWHERE NEAR ENOUGH to be accused of taking this seriously. This proposal is a BARE MINIMUM. Thank you, -Justin

Comment ID: 1003**First Name:** Mike**Last Name:** Trammel**Commenter Email:** tramct@yahoo.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:****Posted Date:** 08/30/23 11:28:56 AM**Comment:**

Name: Trammel, Mike Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 EV's are NOT environmentally friendly! EV's require 6 times the emergency personnel time and resources to respond to a fire of the vehicle vs gas cars! Understand 'Life Cycle' of EV's from 'cradle to grave' and EV's performance is VERY bad. Highway tax on is not capturing usage of EV vehicles and this is unfair to low income residents. This is a crazy idea and will push more people to move from this high cost state. The list goes on & on saying this is a VERY bad decision for CT and the US.

Comment ID: 1004**First Name:** Francis**Last Name:** Pickering**Commenter Email:** fpickering@westcog.org**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:****Commenter Title:** Executive Director**Posted Date:** 08/30/23 12:18:16 PM

Attachments:

WestCOG Comments on PR2023-23.pdf

Comment:

Name: Pickering, Francis Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 See attached PDF for comments.

Comment ID: 1005

First Name: Ann

Last Name: Biebel

Commenter Email: Annbiebel@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/30/23 12:34:19 PM

Comment:

Name: Biebel, Ann Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please don't pass this. You will pollute the earth with used batteries and trade one problem for another. Big mistake! You will be hurting the residents of Connecticut and helping China. What happens when the power goes out or flooding. Think about before make things worse.

Comment ID: 1006

First Name: william

Last Name: walsh

Commenter Email: walsh1955@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/30/23 12:57:14 PM

Comment:

Name: walsh, william Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 WE need to limit CO2 emissions. Any laws that would reduce CO2 emissions should be priority #1. We can't leave it up to society's good will. It won't happen soon enough.

Comment ID: 1007

First Name: Alan

Last Name: Zelanski

Commenter Email: alan.zelanski@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/30/23 02:21:59 PM

Comment:

Name: Zelanski, Alan Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I feel Ct is going about it wrong. Before pushing for electric cars railroads should be electric powered like Europe. Also CT should have it's own supply of clean electricity not purchased at high cost from out of state. Many people live in places where they can not charge cars at home so that is going to cause them issues. Price of cars and batteries is beyond many people's ability to afford. Also what is the state going to do to replace all the gas taxes it will no longer get? Also in my opinion in a free country the goverment should not be able to tell people what they need to buy. Plus there should be liability coverage for damages caused by these cars if the battery should explode which does happen. People should not have to foot the bill to be safe from damage from this still imperfect technology.

Comment ID: 1008

First Name: Jayson
Last Name: Velazquez
Commenter Email: jvelazquez@acadiacenter.org
Comment Input Method: Portal
Commenter Association:
Commenter Title: Climate and Energy Justice Policy Associate
Posted Date: 08/30/23 02:30:27 PM

Attachments:

Acadia Center's Comments on Connecticut ACC II Adoption August 30, 2023.pdf

Comment:

Name: Velazquez, Jayson Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please accept the attached PDF as submission of Acadia Center's comments in support of adopting ACC II.

Comment ID: 1009

First Name: Lois

Last Name: Fusco

Commenter Email: loisafusco@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: None

Commenter Title: Ms

Posted Date: 08/30/23 02:45:22 PM

Comment:

Name: Fusco, Lois Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I am against all electric vehicles b/c our country is not ready to make a complete changeover. Like with so many things our government decides, it gets an idea, then pushes it through lacking sufficient research and planning. Hybrid vehicles are one thing. I'm not against those. But take into account several factors w/all-electric: *the horrific vehicle crash that recently killed people and was in the news nationwide - why did it happen? what still needs to be done to prevent these types of scenarios?; *the astronomical cost of an electric battery replacement that would place all electric vehicles out of reach for many citizens; *the independence this would take away from several categories of residents, not the least of which are Seniors in my own age group who still want to be active and productive, as well as lower income families who need transportation for their children's after-school activities. Do you really think we can afford to replace a \$15,000 battery? And what is all-electric going to do to the purchase price of these vehicles? Place them out of reach for too many people. This scenario already is driving up the value of our fuel-powered vehicles. When this happens, our vehicle taxes escalate, and eventually, we can no longer afford to retain our vehicle, thus losing our independence. Have you given any thought whatsoever to that scenario? I doubt it! States need to take a more balanced approach. Start with trucks and SUVs -- the worst polluters. People who can afford to buy those vehicles have more means than those of us who own your basic mode of transportation. There remains room for gas-powered vehicles, even if only economy vehicles like your basic Honda Civics and Chevy Sparks. And also for hybrid vehicles until all the benefits AND disadvantages of all-electric are known and factored. Stop running. Walking fast is okay, but please give consideration to the issues presented herein. Thank you.

Comment ID: 1010

First Name: Christian

Last Name: Herb

Commenter Email: chris@ctema.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association: Connecticut Energy Marketers Association

Commenter Title: President

Posted Date: 08/30/23 03:07:20 PM

Attachments:

CARB Regs CEMA Written Comments.docx.pdf

Comment:

Name: Herb, Christian Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Attached are CEMA's comments on the Medium

and Heavy-Duty Vehicle Regulation and Low Emission Vehicle IV and Advanced Clean Cars II Regulations for Vehicle Model Years 2027 through 2035

Comment ID: 1011

First Name: Diane

Last Name: Infantine-Vyce

Commenter Email: di.vyce@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/30/23 03:09:09 PM

Comment:

Name: Infantine-Vyce, Diane Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Hello. I am not in support of banning gas powered vehicles at any time. Our electric grid cannot support the demand this will create. Electric vehicles cannot be used for long distances especially in cold weather. CT frequently loses power, how will everyone charge their vehicles and get around? What will apartment dwellers do to charge their vehicles? There aren't enough charging stations around and it takes too long to charge a vehicle. The demand for the raw materials to make these expensive vehicles and their batteries supports human and child labor practices that are despicable. What will we do with all the batteries from these vehicles? They are toxic to the environment. There are so many issues with using electric vehicles alone that it is unbelievable to even be considering banning gas powered vehicles.

Comment ID: 1012

First Name: Lisa

Last Name: Wahle

Commenter Email: lcwahle@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/30/23 03:20:17 PM

Comment:

Name: Wahle, Lisa Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 I live in Chester CT and fully support the proposed DEEP regulations to bring CT's vehicle emission standards into line with those of California. We do not have time to waste in moving away from fossil fuels in order to mitigate effects of climate change and meet federal clean air standards. The proposed light-duty vehicle (passenger car) standards would implement legislation adopted in 2003; the medium and heavy-duty (MHD) vehicle standards would implement legislation signed into law in 2022. The laws have been passed; the regulations allow them to be realized. According to the DEEP analysis, CT has failed to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone for >40 years and is not on track to meet 2030 or 2050 greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction targets. Compliance will require significant reductions from the transportation sector, which is responsible for 67% of ozone-forming chemicals and 37.4% of greenhouse gas emissions. MHD vehicles (trucks, buses, and smaller delivery vehicles) account for ~53% of ozone-forming NOx. Car and truck emissions together account for nearly 40% of the region's GHG emissions. These emissions put public health at risk and exacerbate environmental disparities. Low and moderate-income areas close to busy roads bear the brunt of the air pollution caused by transportation. Further GHG from the transportation sector significantly contributes to climate instability. Strong standards need to be implemented promptly! Despite scare tactics being used by fossil fuel interests, there is time to implement a methodical transition to electric vehicles... but no time to waste. Thank you for your consideration.

Comment ID: 1013

First Name: Mark

Last Name: Iwanicki

Commenter Email: Mark.iwanicki@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:**Posted Date:** 08/30/23 03:30:00 PM**Comment:**

Name: Iwanicki , Mark Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 If the plan is to ban fossil fuel powered vehicles, then I disagree and subsequently disavow the current administration of CT and only contribute my taxes under extreme duress.

Comment ID: 1014**First Name:** Mark**Last Name:** Mitchell**Commenter Email:** mmitch3@gmu.edu**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** Connecticut Coalition for Economic and Environmental Justice**Commenter Title:** Senior Policy Advisor**Posted Date:** 08/30/23 04:27:18 PM**Comment:**

Name: Mitchell, Mark Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Comments in Support of the proposed DEEP Advanced Clean Cars II and the Advanced Clean Trucks Regulations and Why They are Needed by Environmental Justice Communities By Mark A. Mitchell MD, MPH August 30, 2023 Dear Commissioner Dykes, As you know, I am Associate Professor of Climate Change, Energy & Environmental Health Equity at George Mason University. I am also Co-chair of the Connecticut Equity and Environmental Justice Advisory Council with you. Additionally, I founded Connecticut Coalition for Economic and Environmental Justice and am Senior Policy Advisor to this group. I founded the group in 1998 and led our establishment of chapters in Hartford, Bridgeport and New Haven, have been working with environmental justice communities across Connecticut since then. I am writing to let you know why these proposed regulations are critical for environmental justice communities in Connecticut. From an environmental justice point of view, adopting strong clean cars and clean truck rules are critically important. My neighborhood, for example, is one of the lowest wealth neighborhoods in the State of Connecticut and is 94% people of color. Almost half of the households here do not have automobiles, yet we are in the highest 5% of exposure to traffic in the nation due to the proximity to highways and the heavy traffic from suburbanites and others who work in nearby businesses, according to EPA's Environmental Justice screening tool. We need these drivers to switch to electric vehicles in order to reduce the high traffic-related pollution and asthma rates in our neighborhood. In addition, to assist environmental justice communities, we need more clean trucks, buses, and fleets, as well as additional state incentives to enable lower-income residents to purchase new and used EVs. As more cars, trucks and buses convert to electric, we can expect the prices to drop and the availability of used EVs to increase. In summary, adoption of the ACCII/ACT coupled with increased incentives, such as through the CHEAPR program, for low-wealth individuals will improve health and increase access to healthy transportation for all Connecticut residents, especially those who need it most. Best, -Mark Mitchell MD, MPH

Comment ID: 1015**First Name:** Jerry**Last Name:** Cunningham**Commenter Email:** J.Cunningham2008@hotmail.com**Comment Input Method:** Portal**Commenter Association:** N/a**Commenter Title:** Director of Energy Analysis**Posted Date:** 08/30/23 04:35:56 PM**Attachments:**

Electric Vehicles for Everyone_ The Impossible Dream _ Manhattan Institute.pdf

Comment:

Name: Cunningham, Jerry Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection
 Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Dear Gov Lamont and Commissioner Dykes: I am writing to express my opposition to the de facto ban on internal combustion engines, and thus a defacto mandate to purchase electric vehicles, in spite of all of their flaws, extreme costs, time wasted charging, and environmental damage their manufacture causes. This proposal is the purest form of 'all cost-no benefit' policy I

have ever seen. There are five main categories of my opposition to this hasty and ill-conceived policy: Accountability, environmental & safety, cost, civics, and national security. Accountability: As I write this, I note that Hurricane Idalia is churning up the west coast of Florida. There will doubtlessly be claims that hydrocarbon consumption-caused climate change contributed to the severity of the storm. Governor Lamont, and Commissioner Dykes, you have an absolute obligation to tell each and every citizen of this state, how much their sacrifice will benefit the climate. If I am forced to purchase an EV, I will be the only one paying for my EV, not some NGO, not some lobbying group, so I absolutely have a right to know how much my sacrifice is reducing climate change. To be clear, I am not talking about how many less grams of CO2 per mile driven; I am talking how much cooler the earth will be, how much less flooding rain will fall, how much slower hurricane winds will blow, due to my sacrifice of money and time, for this EV proposal. Coercive public policy requires accountability, and that accountability in this case is telling us the benefit coming from the cost in money and time, you are forcing upon us. We are citizens, not subjects, not serfs. Environmental & Safety: Indelibly Scaring The Earth For Slightly Less CO2 An Electric Vehicle (EV) is NOT emissions free. The emissions occur where the power is generated, and due to generation and transmission loss, the amount of energy to the EV is just a fraction of the energy input to generate power. So the net advantage is less than the gross, especially for those parts of the country that burn coal to replace gasoline. But the biggest environmental issue is the MASSIVE amount of energy used for mining and processing the minerals and metals for the EVs. Energy-intensive mining and refining of EV minerals and metals will occur in places where a great deal of CO2 and other green house gases will be released. Several things to consider: 500 pounds of overburden, of earth to be removed, for every one pound of EV material, will massively, indelibly scar the Earth, and you, Governor Lamont and you, Commissioner Dykes, will share in the blame. And yes, this mining is energy intensive. Transporting and refining the minerals and metals is also energy intensive, releasing much CO2. And the lower the grade of ore, the more CO2 per EV manufactured. Shame on those who export pollution to poor countries, so they can delude themselves into thinking they are doing the right thing. But beyond all of that: With the global hysteria about energy transition to EVs, are there enough minerals to go around? There are about 275 million gasoline & diesel consuming motor vehicles in the US, and probably a billion world-wide. Will we strip the earth bare of all mineral and metal resources, in the name of EV energy transition? Or have Connecticut policy makers blindly assumed a global change they embrace has no negative consequences? Since all the CO2 from the energy intensive manufacturer of EVs is front-loaded, the EV must be driven 60,000 to 70,000 miles, before it shows any net CO2 reduction from a standard car. Did you know that when crafting this ?all cost, no benefit? policy? Finally, there is the issue of safety ? and not just the fire safety, as bad as that is. People who charge an EV become STATIONARY TARGETS. Imagine a waitress getting off at midnight, needing to charge her EV for an hour, or a single mom fleeing an abusive boyfriend, only to find out her car needs to be charged, as she sits helpless with her children for an hour. Proposal: I propose Governor Lamont, Commissioner Dykes, each and every staff member of DEEP, and every elected official in Hartford, go to Bridgeport or Hartford or New Haven, 1 o'clock in the morning, to an intercity charging station. Stand there, by yourselves, not with a TV crew or security, and experience firsthand what you are forcing on the rest of the people of Connecticut. Cost: Others have spoken of the high price of an EV, which can only go up, given the stress on mineral and metal natural resources. I want to speak to the price of electricity. According to the Energy Information Administration, the price of electricity in Connecticut is twice the national average. Twice!. Only a sadist would force people to consume MORE of what is already over-priced. Yet that is exactly what you are doing with this proposal. Civics: Make no mistake ? this ?all cost, no benefit? policy is as un-democratic as they come. By way of analogy, if the Governor of the State of Connecticut, or the DEEP Commissioner, banned the sale of bread, or banned the sale of shoes, such a move should be challenged, and resisted. And if it turns out they had the legal authority to do so, that authority should be stripped ? immediately. I think this should be put before the Connecticut General Assembly for a vote. Democrats clearly don't want that, because they don't want to have to tell their constituents ??hey, man ? get used to walking! I just took tens of thousands of dollars out of your bank account, and hundreds of hours a year out of your schedule, for a policy that has ZERO NET ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFIT?? I urge sane people everywhere to resist this policy. Those who feel strongly that energy consumption is evil, should be like the observant vegetarian: stop consuming energy, but leave the rest of us alone. National Security: China is the OPEC of EV battery mineral and metals processing. They may not have the majority of raw materials, but they have a strangle-hold on processing. To me, this policy weakens the United States, strengthens Communist China, and punishes the people of Connecticut. It is a fair question to ask: why would any elected or appointed official harm their citizens while helping our nation?s enemies? Perhaps the answer to that question is uglier than most can bear. And speaking of Communist China, who keeps adding coal-fired power generation, how could anybody think the Connecticut proposal will offset their massive new CO2 emission? Finally, I will acknowledge that there are many voices in favor of this policy. But those voices are saying, loud and clear: use your authority to crush people. Use your authority to force a policy that

will do nothing to help the climate, but will do a great deal to harm the planet, and harm the citizens of Connecticut. Those voices who want you to punish others, so they can delude themselves that they are doing the right thing ? those voices should be ignored.

Comment ID: 1016

First Name: Balal

Last Name: Khan

Commenter Email: bkhan1997@gmail.com

Comment Input Method: Portal

Commenter Association:

Commenter Title:

Posted Date: 08/30/23 04:53:21 PM

Attachments:

Balal Khan Comment on CT EV Regulation.pdf

Comment:

Name: Khan, Balal Submission Date: 8/30/2023 Agency: Department of Energy and Environmental Protection

Subject: Advanced Clean Cars II Tracking Number: PR2023-023 Please see the attached PDF for my full comments on this regulation
