

Kirkland, April

---

**From:** Churchill, Julie M  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 11, 2019 1:28 PM  
**To:** Beyer, Jim R  
**Subject:** FW: Info DEP question/comment

-----Original Message-----

From: j.hutch7@yahoo.com [mailto:j.hutch7@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Thursday, April 11, 2019 1:22 PM  
To: Web DEP Info <infodep@maine.gov>  
Subject: Info DEP question/comment

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.

To: infodep  
From: James Hutchinson  
Email: j.hutch7@yahoo.com  
Phone:  
Other contact info:  
Reply requested by:

Question or Comment

To whom it may concern,

I was very disheartened but unsurprised to see that the ME-PUC approved CMP's permit for their NECEC project. I understand, however, that the line doesn't fall here. You still have the power to listen to the majority of your constituents and deny CMP the necessary land use permits for this project. The environmental concerns of this project - including but not limited to disrupting flow of streams/brooks that are critical brook trout habitat and contamination from herbicide runoff - are quite alarming.

Janet Mills wants to sell us out to CMP (subsidiary of a Spanish company-profits will not benefit Maine or even US-owned business) for next to nothing. This is essentially an extension cord from Canada to Massachusetts, don't be fooled thinking that any sizable amount of this energy is delivered to and distributed throughout Maine's grid. She claims that she "bargained" to make this deal good for Mainers: fact is, "reducing Mainer's electricity costs by \$40M/yr over 20 years" is NOTHING - residential electricity use was 4,372 GWh in 2010...using \$0.1315 avg per kWh in 2019 from Maine .gov, that's \$574.9M spent on electricity annually! That number is probably actually higher, assuming we use more electricity per capita now than in 2010. Plus-who here is spending more than \$0.1315/kWh? Many, many Emera Maine customers, that's who.

To summarize the above point, CMP is trying to tempt us with a measley 7% reduction in rates over a 20 year period - sorry, not good enough.

The other supposed benefits put forth by CMP are largely based off temporary job creation and they do not outweigh the environmental costs - herbicide runoff, erosion, ugly power line towers through wilderness and important fisheries and wildlife habitat.

NH rejected their plan, now it's ME's turn!

Respectfully,  
James Hutchinson

Bangor, ME

Data from [https:// www. maine .gov/energy/pdf/Maine\\_Energy\\_Profile\\_6-12.pdf](https://www.maine.gov/energy/pdf/Maine_Energy_Profile_6-12.pdf)