

## Townsend, Erle

---

**From:** Cayting, Lynne A  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 23, 2024 9:47 AM  
**To:** 'John Anthony'  
**Cc:** Townsend, Erle  
**Subject:** RE: Comment on proposed rule--Chapter 127-A

We received your comment for the record.

Lynne Cayting, Chief  
Mobile Sources Section in the Bureau of Air Quality  
Department of Environmental Protection  
(207)-287-7599  
[www.maine.gov/dep](http://www.maine.gov/dep)

---

**From:** John Anthony <mackerelcovemaine@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 22, 2024 10:53 PM  
**To:** Cayting, Lynne A <Lynne.A.Cayting@maine.gov>  
**Subject:** Comment on proposed rule--Chapter 127-A

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

Dear Ms Cayting,

Thank you for receiving my call last week and helpfully responding to my inquiry regarding submission of comments to the Board. Please forward this public comment to the Board's coordinator who receives and processes such input. I provide both text (this message) and a Word document (attached) for your use. Kindly acknowledge receipt. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
John Anthony  
Bailey Island, ME  
833-7325

---

Re: Proposed technical rulemaking action for Chapter 127-A: Advanced Clean Cars II Program

I submit this public comment to the Board for consideration on the subject proposed action.

I OPPOSE the proposed action and urge the Board to REJECT its adoption.

First and foremost, the proposed rule is an executive edict that is offensive to the liberty of a free people. Our free market must allow manufacturers to make available products that are in their and the consumer's best interest. For the executive to establish rules that dictate rather than permit what the open market shall be is an illegitimate exercise of their authority. This is the characteristic of tyranny. If the people wish to impose rules and restrictions on their liberty they are free to do so. But the avenue to do this is by public debate and vote, typically as a legislative measure. The

scope of the proposed rule is so extensive and the unintended consequences of its implementation are potentially more destructive than beneficial that to term it a “technical” action that avoids the scrutiny of debate is an irresponsible, even devious, characterization.

Second, pragmatically, implementation and enforcement of this rule is impractical. Other commenters have contributed countless details that buttress this assessment. I simply add to these the more recent news of Hertz disposing of its rental fleet of EVs for both economic and practical reasons, the unsatisfactory utility of EVs in cold weather experienced in Chicago and other locations and the numerous unacceptable economic and catastrophic property losses that result from fires caused by batteries and associated systems. A personal acquaintance recently lost their \$1M house when the EV loaner car the dealership provided them ignited in the garage through no fault of their own. Regardless of the pace of technology, there is and will remain a substantial number if not a majority resisting this mandate, resulting in problematic enforcement. When this leads to circumventions and outright violations will the state choose to respond with increasing tyrannical force and penalties to keep the people in line? I submit that this circumstance will result if this rule is implemented in the face of widespread opposition.

Finally, the ostensible goals to influence the amount of a trace but essential-for-life gas in our atmosphere are misguided at best or devious at worst. Misguided because emissions from Maine vehicles contribute a miniscule, even negligible contribution to our immense and complex atmosphere that knows no borders. So-called greenhouse gases, of which water vapor is overwhelmingly predominant and is governed by the oceans, not human activity, are vital to keep earth suitable for life. Further, a goal of reducing the amount of a substance in nature is meaningless when (1) there is a yet to be determined amount as the ideal, if that even exists; (2) there is no mechanism to calculate cause and effect, only a belief; and (3) there is no objective method to determine neutrality success or failure, only inexact, pliable and elastic variables that may be manipulated to yield almost any desired result. Devious because in light of these numerous impracticalities, a determined course to implement these mandates can only be understood as a measure to control a population under the guise of elusive betterment. Such is the substance of tyranny.

Respectfully submitted,  
John Anthony  
Bailey Island, Maine



Virus-free. [www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)