

Kirkland, April

---

**From:** Diana Bowen <diana.bowen2@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 13, 2019 6:31 AM  
**To:** DEP, NECEC  
**Subject:** Comments on CMP's corridor proposal

**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.**

Hello,

I understand that the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) is accepting public comments on CMP's proposal, and I am submitting my comments about why I am concerned about the transmission line.

CMP's proposed corridor would fragment the North Woods, threaten key habitat for brook trout and deer, and stifle new clean energy projects in Maine. Most important to me, although CMP frequently claims that its proposal would reduce greenhouse gas emissions, no evidence has been presented that CMP's corridor would actually reduce global greenhouse gas emissions. I would like to see evidence supporting CMP's claim.

In addition, recent statewide polls show that Maine people do not support the CMP corridor (<https://www.nrcm.org/maine-environmental-news/statewide-poll-shows-strong-opposition-cmp-corridor/?eType=EmailBlastContent&eld=1c4e728d-abd2-4693-8ec9-40804072cb3a>). In fact, The survey shows that 65% of Mainers oppose the project, with only 15% expressing support. Twelve towns in western Maine now oppose the project or have rescinded their prior support, and more than 10,000 people have signed NRCM's petition in opposition to the corridor, which was submitted to the PUC for their consideration.

Given this opposition and lack of evidence supporting CMP's claims that the corridor would reduce global greenhouse gas emissions, it is apparent that this project isn't about benefiting Mainers: it's about making sure that Hydro-Quebec and CMP turn a profit for their shareholders.

Lastly, the Examiner's Report issued by PUC staff notes several critical findings reflective of this robust and growing opposition to CMP's project, including the fact that:

1. The project would have a "significant detrimental" impact on scenic and recreational resources, tourism, and the local economy;
2. CMP failed to evaluate alternatives, such as burying all or a significant portion of the line--CMP isn't even making the effort to compromise for the majority of Mainers, and
3. CMP has demonstrated an "unsettling disregard for certain members of the host communities."

When taken together, the evidence opposing the corridor is compelling and must be taken into consideration. Your efforts at taking these issues seriously and taking action based on this evidence are appreciated and, I would add, expected.

Regards,

Diana J Bowen

\*\*\*

--

Whatever causes night in our souls may leave stars -- Victor Hugo