

Mike Halaiko's Testimony in Opposition to HB 201
October 3, 2023; 1:30PM

Chair McClain, Vice Chair Dobos, Ranking Member Grim, and Members of The Ohio House of Representatives Transportation Committee

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in opposition to HB 201. My name is Mike Halaiko, and I am a retired Ohio Public School Administrator and teacher with over 40 years of experience in Ohio Public Schools and an owner of an electric hybrid vehicle.

I have read all the proponent testimony for HB 201, and I am opposed to this bill for the following reasons:

The proponents maintain that this protects the right of Ohio Consumers, so they are not mandated to purchase an electric or hybrid motor vehicle over a fossil fueled vehicle, and state that The California Plan to eliminate internal combustion vehicle purchases, in that state, by 2035, is a plan that is impossible to achieve without damaging our economy and hurting low-income citizens.

My major opposition to the proponents here is that all in the proponent list for this bill fail to mention what is a reasonable timeline for making the transition to no carbon burning vehicles.

Why are not the leadership and proponents clearly stating what is a reasonable timeline? The California Plan provides a 12-year transition period. What's Ohio's Plan?

The Science is clear on carbon emissions. Those emissions are killing us. No one in their right mind would stay in an enclosed building with an internal combustion engine running. Our atmosphere is an enclosed area. Our environment is an enclosed area. Just sit in traffic at rush hour, any day on any of our highways and then tell me we are not destroying our atmosphere and our environment.

We need a moon shot on our climate crisis. When JFK stated in 1962, that we were going to the moon by the end of the decade, there were huge obstacles to reach that goal. We didn't have the computer power, at that time, that many of us own on our personal computers today. That goal was reached 7 years later.

What is The Ohio Plan on addressing carbon emissions?

HB201 proponents state that they are protecting the consumer against discriminatory government mandates on motor vehicle choice. If that is true, why do any Ohioans purchasing a hybrid vehicle pay an extra \$100 per year to register, and an extra \$200 per year to register an Electric Vehicle? Who makes those rules? Why the extra charge?

HB 201 is vaguely written, and unless you add an Ohio Plan for reasonable transition from polluting carbon emission vehicles and stop charging Ohioans extra, who want to purchase hybrids and EVs, you are protecting the Oil and Gas Industry, not Ohio consumers. I am opposed to HB 201 for the reasons mentioned above, and I welcome any questions or comments you may have.

Mike Halaiko