

**Testimony in Opposition to LD 2004**  
**“An Act to Amend the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act Regarding the Application of**  
**Beneficial Federal Laws to the Wabanaki Nations”**

May 31, 2023

Peter Triandafillou

Senator Carney, Representative Moonen and distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee. My name is Peter Triandafillou, and I live in Orono. I am retired from Huber Resources Corp (HRC) based in Old Town. I am submitting testimony in opposition to LD2004.

LD2004 makes changes to a very complex and highly negotiated law, the Maine Indian Claims Settlement Act (MICS). The law was negotiated and happily agreed to by the Federal government, the State of Maine, and the Maine Tribes. As the name implies, the law settled claims by the Tribes, granted them significant funds to purchase lands, and created policy and regulatory stability within Maine.

Given the complexity of the issue, it is difficult to believe that the sweeping new policies and language in LD2004 are being heard and considered with less than twenty four hours' notice. This lack of notice leaves the Maine public and those with significant concerns with the bill's policy changes almost no time to react or formulate reasonable testimony. For this reason alone, the bill should be voted ought not to pass and left for another time to allow for proper and thorough debate.

At the time of passage of the MICS, it was expected that the Tribes would purchase lands in different parts of Maine, and this is what happened. In order to prevent regulatory chaos and conflict caused by the State and the Tribes enacting different environmental laws and regulations, the parties agreed that the Tribes be treated as municipalities within Maine. This was a reasonable approach, and it has worked very well in the decades since enactment of the MICS. It is impossible to fully understand the ramifications of LD2004, but it seems to me that it would unravel this essential part of the MICS, much to the detriment of Maine and private landowners.

LD2004 would enact sweeping changes to a law that has worked well for many years with no clearly articulated purpose. I am not aware of any specific regulatory or policy issues raised as the reason for this legislation. It therefore leaves the policy landscape wide open to change. I see no reason for Maine to agree to such sweeping changes when the results would almost certainly be detrimental to the State.

An open discussion of policy related to the MICS that includes all parties would be reasonable. It is often possible to reach amicable and positive outcomes when all parties participate. Rushing sweeping legislation that has seen no such discussion or debate, leaving the parties nearly no time to review and respond is unfair and entirely unnecessary. I urge you to vote ought not to pass on LD2004.

Thank you for your time.