

**STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**

and

**STATE OF MAINE
LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION**

IN THE MATTER OF:

CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY)
25 Municipalities, 13 Townships/Plantations,)
7 Counties)

L-27625-26-A-N)
L-27625-TB-B-N)
L-27625-2C-C-N)
L-27625-VP-D-N)
L-27625-IW-E-N)

CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY)
NEW ENGLAND CLEAN ENERGY CONNECT)
SITE LAW CERTIFICATION SLC-9)

) APPLICATION FOR SITE LOCATION OF
) DEVELOPMENT ACT PERMIT AND
) NATURAL RESOURCES PROTECTION
) ACT PERMIT FOR THE NEW ENGLAND
) CLEAN ENERGY CONNECT

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF GREG CARUSO OF PRE-FILE TESTIMONY
OF ROBERT MEYERS (GROUP 3)
AND LARRY WARREN AND JOSEPH CHRISTOPHER (GROUP 7)**

1 ***Rebuttal of Pre-filed Direct Testimony of Robert Meyers, Maine Snowmobile Association***

2 On page 2, paragraph 4, Bob Meyers writes “I have never heard a single complaint about seeing
3 or snowmobiling in the vicinity of a power line.” There is no doubt that he IS hearing complaints
4 from MSA members about the potential scenic impacts of the powerline in the Coburn/Johnson
5 Mountain trail system but is choosing to ignore them. Mr. Meyers has a seemingly uncaring
6 attitude toward his membership and the Coburn/Johnson Mountain trails systems including ITS
7 87, 89, the Coburn Mountain Connector, the North Shoulder Bypass and the Coburn Summit
8 Trail. In fact his membership, myself included, understand the riding public would be inundated
9 with obtrusive views in an upper alpine environment with the line crossing the trails at least eight
10 times and incurring large, in-your-face elevation changes from the time the trail crosses Route
11 201 until it reaches the Spencer Road.

12 One can appreciate having access on private land, but by industrializing it from a working forest,
13 the very nature of the use is changed - and with it, the remote character of the tourist destination
14 such as the Coburn/Johnson Mountain area. Such a change of designation demands that at the
15 very least, the line should be placed underground in critical areas where scenic impacts are high
16 and have a large draw of tourism. None of this have been proposed by CMP or asked as a
17 concession by Mr. Meyers. In addition to that, there have been no use studies by CMP with the
18 thousands upon thousands of snowmobilers that visit this area each year.

19 As a groomer, snowmobiler and MSA member for well over 20 years, I can attest that
20 powerlines, when used on snowmobile trails, are only used as means of egress to a destination
21 when absolutely no other option exists. They are bypassed regularly whenever possible because
22 they are an unimproved surface that doesn't hold snow well, is boulder-strewn, full of spring
23 holes and swamp mud.

1 Coburn/Johnson Mountain area is the destination. The proposed line will not be part of the trail
2 but crisscross and fragment that very destination.

3 ***Rebuttal to Pre-filed Direct Testimony of Larry Warren, WM&RC***

4 Page 4, paragraph 1 states that “as noted by CMP, snowmobilers are accustomed to seeing
5 transmission corridors and traveling in cleared corridors. So it is unlikely that the project would
6 have an impact on their continued enjoyment of the snowmobile trails.” This statement begs the
7 question, was there any user study completed in critical destination areas that this line would
8 affect? The answer is NO. In my professional experience, snowmobilers are not accustomed to
9 seeing powerlines in remote alpine, non-industrialized areas. It would most certainly diminish
10 their experience if the transmission line dramatically affects the very destination they are
11 planning on traveling to. He also states on page 4, paragraph 1, “that hikers experiences should
12 also not be adversely impacted by the project.” To which again, begs the question, were any user
13 studies done? Who did they ask? Would a transmission line above the Maine Huts and Trails
14 system affect the hikers there as it would on Coburn Mountain or Number 5 Mountain?
15 He goes on to say on page 4, paragraph 2, “In areas where hikers may see or pass under the
16 Project, the Project does not adversely impact existing scenic aesthetic and recreational uses and
17 employs buffers where necessary to minimize impact.” Again, there are no buffers from the top
18 of Coburn, Number 5, Pleasant Pond, Moxie Bald or other mountains where hikers frequent.
19 And again there was no attempt to bury the lines from view in these destination areas.
20 Mr. Warren also states in page 6, paragraph 2 that “the existing forest are hardly in pristine or
21 wilderness condition.” While Mr. Warren points out that the working forest of the area has been
22 overworked, it is still a remote wilderness area, pristine in the fact that it is not industrialized and
23 scarred by unnatural materials inconsistent with existing uses. Mr. Warren, of all people,

1 understands that but chooses to ignore it to benefit his huts and trails system. Why has he not
2 arranged to place new huts or trails in or on the NECEC corridor? After all, according to Mr.
3 Warren and CMP, “hikers should not be adversely affected by the Project.”
4 The hypocrisy of this testimony is overwhelming.

5 ***Rebuttal to Pre-filed Direct Testimony of Joe Christopher, WM&RC***

6 On page 4, paragraph 2, Joe states: “The characterization by intervenors that these areas are
7 ‘pristine,’ ‘untouched,’ and ‘natural’ are misleading and simply not true.”and that “CMP has
8 proposed the NECEC in a manner that seeks to minimize adverse impacts of the project upon the
9 experience of hikers, hunter, rafters, anglers or other users of the wilderness whose activities
10 may take them into the vicinity of the NECEC.” I ask, “How?” The working forest has been cut
11 over but is not industrialized with steel and concrete. So by saying something is pristine,
12 untouched or natural, that is referring to the LACK of any manmade industrial structures.
13 Trees, stumps, brush, gravel, and water are all natural...steel and concrete, 100’ towers are NOT.
14 This is a dramatic change of usage that should require at the very least an underground
15 alternative.

16 Page 4, paragraph 3 also says “CMP has proposed to site the line in a manner that seeks to avoid
17 the impact on these areas and have proposed buffers to help ensure that water bodies are
18 protected.” When looking at the maps of the line over Coburn/Johnson Mountain, the line would
19 make dramatic elevation changes along high alpine areas, full of springs and swamps and
20 headwaters to important streams and brooks with abundant brook trout habitat. Herbicide spray
21 to keep miles of powerline clear will most certainly end up in these water bodies. So how are
22 they being protected by an overhead line? Burying the lines under the current logging roads
23 would remedy this, but it is obvious that CMP has not considered this option.

1 Paragraph 3, Joe states “the project also proposes other buffers that will allow for the movement
2 of animals between important habitats and help shield adjacent uses from unsightly
3 developments...” This statement is overwhelmingly false. By CMP not considering an
4 underground option under current logging roads, further fragmentation of forest areas in the
5 Coburn/Johnson Mountain area will be abhorrently evident with the dramatic elevation changes
6 and crisscrossing of logging roads. In addition, the line will be carved through existing buffers
7 between current cutting areas, assuring that animal movements between important habitats are
8 further degraded. Furthermore, the suggestion that the project buffer “will help shield adjacent
9 uses from unsightly development” is an oxymoron. Considering the high visibility, high
10 elevation, 100’ towers with red, blinking lights, crisscrossing of snowmobile trails and
11 dramatically wide linear shape, they are assuring existing uses such as snowmobiling, hiking,
12 hunting, fishing, leaf-peeping or anything else will be ANYTHING but shielded!

13 As is clear in regards to scenic impact and existing uses, these testimonies along with CMP have
14 taken a shallow and narrow minded view of a dramatic change in use and skyline. They have not
15 given gravity to significant changes to mountain and forest, to 53 miles of wilderness area at risk
16 of industrial development. There has been no ample consideration or studies done with regards to
17 burying the line or at the very least in areas of high recreation value with maximum scenic and
18 environmental impact. The DEP and LUPC must consider the value of these remote places to our
19 fragile economy and thriving ecosystems in much more detail than these testimonies suggest
20 when charged with protecting Maine’s environment.

Date: 3/15/19

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
nt Name: Greg Caruso

By:

Pri

STATE OF Somerset
COUNTY OF Maine

Personally appeared before me on the above- named Greg Caruso, who being duly sworn, did testify that the foregoing testimony was true and correct to the best of his/her knowledge and belief.

Before me,

[Signature]

Notary Public/ Attorney at

Law

My Commission expires _____

