September 13, 2018

Thomas Michaud & Deanne Munich-Michaud

281 Danville Corner Road

Auburn, Maine, 04210

207-740-7618 e-mail dmichaud35@roadrunner.com

We would like this letter to be included into the public record and authorize Sandra Howard to include it in her testimony on our behalf.

LUPC Members,

 We have been paying very close attention to this project and are opposed to the NECEC proposed by CMP for a number of reasons.

1. We do not believe there is a need associated with Maine for this project. This project is a merchant line that has no benefit to Maine rate payers. In fact, we believe there will be greater detriment to Maine rate payers due to the suppression of other renewables, most notably solar which CMP is lobbying against.
2. We believe property values, ours included, will be negatively impacted by this proposed line.
3. We believe Maine’s tourism economy will be negatively impacted. People come to Maine for it’s scenic beauty. This proposed project harms this scenic beauty. We also feel that the selection of the route directly over Coburn Mountain is just plain wrong. In our opinion being so bold as to go directly up and over any mountain is a mistake.
4. We have concluded based on our research that CMP has significantly down played the negative impacts to tourism, the environment, and property values. One of many glaring examples of this is CMP’s submission to the PUC of the Visual Impact Survey that **failed to include the actual** **towers and transmission lines.** At every turn we see CMP providing half truths and as this VIS was presented directly to the PUC, it appears you are seeing half truths also. Please continue to be vigilant with peer review.
5. We have also concluded based on our research that CMP is inflating the tax benefits to cities and towns along the proposed route. Cities and towns along the route listened to CMP’s facts and figures early in this process. Many are reviewing what they have been told by CMP and either have already rescinded any support for this project or are considering doing so.
6. We believe CMP is also inflating the information on jobs associated with this project.
7. While not big fishermen ourselves, we do believe that anything that would impact the native trout population should be given the highest consideration. We are happy to see Trout Unlimited as an intervenor. We are confident that herbicides spread along this route can only be detrimental to the native trout population.

 New Hampshire Regulators thoroughly reviewed and then rejected Northern Pass. Northern Pass is similar to NECEC in almost every way. NH Regulators determined the proposed project in NH was not beneficial for NH. We see no significant reason why this project should not be rejected by Maine Regulators for all of the same reasons. Thank you for consideration of our findings and concerns.

 Thomas and Deanne Michaud