

Greg Robie
Winslow/China, ME; Highland Mills. NY
LD 2266

Included in this filing is my LD 2266 Testimony (filed on March 17, 2024 just after 9 PM). This was not uploaded on the 18th when my other written testimony (an email outlining plausible DEP/Office of the Governor collusion and hydrogen) was uploaded. The 18th's filing was added as testimony to demonstrate a pattern that is applicable to a review of LD 2266, and as an ONTP. The email thread relates to LD 1775 and hydrogen.

Hydrogen is THE new PFAS.

Sunday's filing is again uploaded today. This is intended for it to be considered at the Governor's bill's workshop today. The second file is annotated screenshots demonstrating Sunday's filing.

Yesterday I filed as an addenda to a petition before our Board of Environmental Protection. What I offered the addenda to is for a review of the DEP Commissioner disingenuous determination concerning her staffs obfuscation of my effort to get information concerning the DEP and quarry in Winslow. LD 1775 indicates that Winslow Industrial Zone is a probable site that has been considered by the Governor's Office as a site for one of the three electrolysis plants that were in that bill's previous versions.

I petitioned the addenda due to this failure to upload testimony, which includes, among other things, includes a calling out our Executive Branches unconstitutional Executive Orders and rulemaking. Other things include the mapped wetlands on the included map, which, like the dune systems, may have been 'missed' in the review and planning that is alleged to proceed the filing and sponsorship of LD 2266.

Among my two filings and oral testimony, serious snookering is in play. The functional malfeasance from last year's #Beltway of Bills marches on:

(<https://legislature.maine.gov/committee/getTestimonyDoc.asp?id=10020807>)

An outline of what I recall were the salient points of my oral testimony follow:

1. I introduced myself as from Winslow & China, Maine, and Highland Mills, NY.
2. I also introduced my T-shirt in the context of a DEP appeal last year.
3. I also introduced myself as a petitioner of a §11112 reconsideration filing, noted that the first filing had been acted on by none of the membership (a must in law), and reminded them that they had until March 28th to do so.
4. I stated that the DEP's Repeal and Replace of its Administrative Rule Chapter 2 will render any appeal of a DEP decision impossible (this can and is already done now, BTW).
5. I stated that the rulemaking in the bill should be major substantive due to how the current practice creates routine technical rulemaking as those such was an outlawed practice to regulations (since 1977 and our MAPA).
6. I stated that the Office of the Governor overreached its executive branch power with its Executive Orders concerning rulemaking and reference Article III concerning this.
7. I stated that for Wells, and as an emergency rule was effected in a single BEP Meeting, and this with the agenda being amended the day before to accommodate this, and
 - 7.1. that this would involve dredged material, and
 - 7.2. that metal anchors and cables could be used, and
 - 7.3. acknowledged that this was an emergency rule that only applied for 90 days.
8. I stated that the Legislature had not completed there review of the major substantive rulemaking regarding dunes (or at least the Secretary of State database is still delivering the previous version of the Rule Chapter 355(?)).
9. I stated that hydrogen is the new PFAS (a reference to the previous public hearing).

10. I stated that the scope to the capacity of the renewables coming on line exceeds the needs of the State.
 11. I referenced how hydrogen is integral to a battery system that will allow the export of renewable energy out of state on a 24hr/day basis.
 12. I stated that I had submitted two written pieces of testimony.
 13. I stated that one was offered as an example of a pattern by the Governor's Office [& hydrogen] that is exemplary regarding the second [which is not uploaded].
 14. Given its content, please tell me what this is not strategic by someone, somewhere! <— or a one is paranoid only 'if they are not out to get you' thing. ;)
 15. (I think I skipped stating that the use of the plural is, particularly in the context that those representing the Governor's bill making it appear that it was intended for Wasumkik/Sears Island, the current version of this bill's text means that it can be applied anywhere and anytime ...and as law, not rule.)
 16. I stated that all the dunes are gone, and this due to [committed] sea level rise.
 17. I stated that with the shutdown of the AMOC the east coast will experience a 3' sea level rise (2025-2095 w/ 2050 the average), and that the Greenland Ice cap is irrevocably destabilized (since 2000), and West Antarctica is similarly destabilized but the data to confirm this is yet being crunched (now, and in the UK).
 18. I summarized that the causeway is history and a port would be intended for constructing and servicing off shore wind for longer than sea level rise will allow noting that Wasumkik is an island.
- I asked if there were any questions and made myself available for the workshop (this has to be made as a request by a committee member).
- Or at least that is what I am pretty sure I covered, and mostly in that order.