



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION



PAUL R. LEPAGE
GOVERNOR

PAUL MERCER
COMMISSIONER

IN THE MATTER OF

CENTRAL MAINE POWER COMPANY)
 NEW ENGLAND CLEAN ENERGY)
 CONNECT) APPLICATION FOR NATURAL
 25 Municipalities, 13 Townships/Plantations,) RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT PERMIT
 7 Counties (listed Appendix A)) AND SITE LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT
 L-27625-26- A-N) ACT PERMITS
 L-27625-TB-B-N) PUBLIC HEARING
 L-27625-2C-C-N) FIRST PROCEDURAL ORDER
 L-27625-VP-D-N)
 L-27625-IW-E-N)

This First Procedural Order (Order) sets forth the Presiding Officer’s decisions with respect to Petitions for Leave to Intervene and sets a date for the first pre-hearing conference in this matter.

1. On October 13, 2017, the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (Department) accepted as complete for processing an application submitted by Central Maine Power Company (CMP) for a *Natural Resources Protection Act* (NRPA) permit pursuant to 38 M.R.S. §§ 480-A – 480-JJ and a *Site Location of Development Act* (Site Law) permit pursuant to 38 M.R.S. §§ 481 – 490.
2. Pursuant to the Department’s *Rule Concerning the Processing of Applications and Other Administrative Matters* (Chapter 2 § 7(B)), on November 17, 2017 the Commissioner determined that a public hearing will be held on this permit application. The Commissioner designated Christina Hodgeman, an employee of the Department, as the Presiding Officer for the purpose of carrying out the hearing on the application.

PETITIONS FOR LEAVE TO INTERVENE

3. On June 27, 2018, the Presiding Officer issued a notice setting July 19, 2017 as the deadline to submit petitions for leave to intervene in this licensing matter.
4. The Maine Administrative Procedure Act provides that a petition for leave to intervene will be granted if the petition shows that the petitioner is a person who is or may be substantially and directly affected by the licensing proceeding, or is a member of a class which is or may be substantially and directly affected by the licensing proceeding, or is

AUGUSTA
17 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0017
(207) 287-7688 FAX: (207) 287-7826

BANGOR
106 HOGAN ROAD, SUITE 6
BANGOR, MAINE 04401
(207) 941-4570 FAX: (207) 941-4584

PORTLAND
312 CANCO ROAD
PORTLAND, MAINE 04103
(207) 822-6300 FAX: (207) 822-6303

PRESQUE ISLE
1235 CENTRAL DRIVE, SKYWAY PARK
PRESQUE ISLE, MAINE 04769
(207) 764-0477 FAX: (207) 760-3143

an agency of federal, state, or local government. 5 M.R.S. § 9054(1). The Department has discretion to allow other petitioners to intervene as a full or limited party to the proceeding. 5 M.R.S. § 9054(2).

5. The Department received 23 petitions for intervenor status. On July 24, the Presiding Officer requested more information from four petitioners. On July 31, three of those intervenors provided the appropriate information to meet the requirements and one, the Sierra Club, withdrew its petition.
6. The following is a summary of the entities that petitioned the Department to intervene on this matter along with their concerns, listed in the order they were received:
 - a. The Old Canada Road National Scenic Byway is a non-profit organization interested in the National Scenic Byway in the project area. The organization asserts that travelers on their road segments would be impacted by the visual effects of the project.
 - b. Mr. Ed Buzzell is a business owner in Moxie Gore. Mr. Buzzell asserts that the project will be visible to him and his guests at his Lodge on the Moxie Road. He also expressed concerns about environmental harm from the proposed project.
 - c. The City of Lewiston asserts that the project would substantially and directly affect the City given that CMP is proposing to construct a direct to alternating current converter station within the City and install new lines and upgrade existing transmission lines within the community.
 - d. The Friends of Boundary Mountains is a non-profit organization that works to safeguard the Boundary Mountains. The organization asserts that there should be more discussion on the proposed mitigation plan, impacts on tourism and recreation at the Kennebec Gorge and Appalachian Trail (AT), impacts and effects of the new corridor proposed to be cut through the wildlife habitat of the Boundary Mountains.
 - e. The Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC) is a non-profit organization that promotes the protection of natural resources in the northeast. AMC members use the Kennebec River Gorge and the AT for recreation. They are interested in the scenic aspects of the proposed project, the Gorge crossing, conservation and management of the proposed new corridor, and best practical mitigation techniques for this proposed project.
 - f. The Western Mountains & Rivers Corporation (WM&RC) is a non-profit organization with a board comprised of interested persons who have first-hand knowledge of the aesthetic and environmental importance of the Kennebec

Gorge region and surrounding areas. WM&RC is interested in the environmental, natural resource, aesthetic, recreational, economic and community impact the proposed project would have on this area.

- g. Nextera Energy Resources, LLC (Nextera) is a limited liability company that owns renewable generating projects in the immediate vicinity of the project. Nextera asserts that it has concerns about buffering, impacts to natural resources, practicability of the project location, alternative location impacts and the project impact on Nextera.
- h. Hawk's Nest Lodge is a small business in West Forks, Maine that hosts year-round recreational guests. Hawk's Nest Lodge asserts concerns with visual impacts, appropriateness of environmental mitigation, impacts to brook trout habitat, and visual impacts at the Kennebec River Gorge crossing.
- i. The Industrial Energy Consumer Group (IECG) is a group interested in diversification of the sources of energy and lowering the cost of energy in New England. IECG is interested in addressing the issues of existing uses of resources, scenic character, air and water quality. They also assert that there are no reasonable and practicable alternatives to the proposed project.
- j. The Natural Resources Council of Maine (NRCM) is a non-profit organization dedicated to protection of Maine's environment. NRCM is interested in addressing potential visual impacts, impacts to streams, impacts to wildlife and habitat among other environmental concerns.
- k. The Town of Caratunk asserts that the visual impacts and the crossings of the Kennebec River along with other significant river segments by this proposed project will affect their community.
- l. The Maine State Chamber of Commerce is a non-profit organization that advocates on behalf of business interests. The Chamber would like to address the following issues, and assert its views as follows: that the project would have no unreasonable effect on scenic, aesthetic, recreational or navigational uses of resources; no reasonable alternative for the project exists; and the project would result in no adverse effect on the natural environment.
- m. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW) is a labor organization which states that it has many employees who would be affected by this project. IBEW asserts that there would be no unreasonable interference with existing scenic, aesthetic, recreational or navigation uses of resources; no reasonable alternative for the project exists; and adequate buffering has been proposed.

- n. Ms. Ashli Coleman of West Forks, Maine, states that she would be directly impacted by the project. Ms. Coleman asserts that her concerns are relative to the site development and the Kennebec River Gorge crossing.
- o. Maine Guide Services, LLC is a business operating in Caratunk, Maine and operating in the Forks, West Forks and Caratunk. This business is concerned with the visual impacts and the Kennebec River Gorge crossing.
- p. Brookfield White Pine Hydro, LLC owns the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licensed hydropower project area involved in the alternatives proposed by CMP. Brookfield asserts that there is no practicable alternative to the proposed project that would be less damaging to the environment.
- q. Trout Unlimited is a national conservation organization whose mission is to conserve, protect, and restore North America's trout and trout watersheds. Trout Unlimited asserts its interests in the impacts of the project on habitat for cold water fish from construction and maintenance activities; adequate buffering areas around crossed waterbodies; and visual impacts to the Kennebec River Gorge crossing for those using the river for recreational purposes recreation.
- r. Mr. Chris Russell represents Kennebec River Angler located within the proposed project area in Caratunk, Maine. Mr. Russell asserts the project affects native brook trout habitat and is also concerned with the visual impacts on the Kennebec River Gorge crossing.
- s. The Nature Conservancy (TNC) is a non-profit organization dedicated to natural resource conservation. TNC asserts concerns with siting of the proposed project, impacts to wildlife species, and habitat effects of the proposed project.
- t. Maine Wilderness Guides Organization is a non-profit organization that speaks on behalf of the professional wilderness guides. The organization asserts its concerns with potential impacts on habitat provided by the streams and rivers, potential impacts to deer wintering areas, and potential scenic impacts on recreational use.
- u. The Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) is a non-profit environmental advocacy organization. CLF would like to address and provide its assessments of potential environmental and natural resource impacts, and scenic impacts.
- v. Mr. Mike Pilsbury of Caratunk, Maine is a Maine Guide and business owner in the project area. Mr. Pilsbury asserts concerns with potential impacts on river crossings and mitigation issues. Mr. Pilsbury submitted a petition after the

deadline; however, the Presiding Officer allowed the petition to be considered as it was submitted less than one hour after the deadline.

7. The 22 entities or persons listed above have met the requirements for Intervenor status set forth in Chapter 3§11 (A)(1) and all petitions are approved. A list of Intervenors and contact information can be found in Appendix C.
8. All Intervenors are expected to comply with deadlines and filing requirements established by the Presiding Officer. Failure to comply may result in appropriate sanctions, including the rejection of argument, evidence or testimony the party seeks to offer.

EX PARTE COMMUNICATION

9. No person, Intervenor or party may communicate directly or indirectly with the Commissioner or Presiding Officer concerning any issue of fact, law or procedure, except upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate. This bar on ex parte communications does not prohibit the Commissioner and Presiding Officer from having the aid and advice of counsel and Department staff and does not apply to communications between the Commissioner or Presiding Officer and counsel or Department staff.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS

10. If they have not already, each Intervenor must designate one person as the contact person for the purpose of this proceeding. All filings related to this matter should be sent to Jim Beyer (contact information below) and the persons on the service list must be copied. The service list along with contact information can be found in Appendix C.
11. The Presiding Officer provides that any communications in this matter may be filed with the Department by electronic mail (email). Once an email communication has been sent to the members on the service list, service is deemed complete. Any person who does not readily have access to email and wishes to receive documents by U.S. mail in paper form, instead of email, may request that form of service.
12. The Department has established a listing for this project on its website at <http://www.maine.gov/dep/land/projects/necec/index.html>. The application and supporting materials, as well as significant filings by other persons, including the Intervenors will be posted on this site.

13. The Department requested certain necessary additional information from CMP pertaining to the application. Some of the requested information has been submitted; however, the Department is awaiting certain requested information from CMP including, but not limited to, the following:
 - a. Northern Bog Lemming and Roaring Brook Mayfly habitat assessment results. Sampling to confirm the presence of these organisms will be done in September if there is suitable habitat that may be impacted.
 - b. Historic site and archeological management summary.
 - c. Updated natural resources maps.
 - d. Total impact numbers for freshwater wetland and vernal pool impacts as well as the calculations for payment of fees as part of the proposed mitigation.
 - e. A mitigation plan for impacts to cold water fisheries and other protected natural resources.
 - f. Survey results for unusual natural areas and rare plants.
14. The applicant has represented that it will submit this information CMP by **August 13, 2018**. The Department will review the information submitted and post it to the project website at: <http://www.maine.gov/dep/land/projects/necec/index.html>.
15. If a person wishes to intervene on this matter as a result of any information submitted in response to those requests after the original deadline for filing a petition for Intervenor status, the Presiding Officer will approve new petitions that meet the requirements under Ch. 3 which demonstrate they are substantially and directly affected by those matters.

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

16. A pre-hearing conference will be held on **Friday, September 7, 2018 at 10:00 a.m.** in Room 118 (Door D7 entrance) of the Marquardt Building, 32 Blossom Lane, Augusta, Maine. All parties must have a representative in attendance at the conference. Any Intervenor not present waives its right to object to matters discussed and resolved by way of a procedural order following the conference. Members of the public may attend the conference, but may not otherwise participate.
17. For convenience of the applicant, the Intervenors, and the public, this conference, subsequent meetings, a portion of the public hearing and at least one public comment session will be held jointly with the Maine Land Use Planning Commission (the

Commission). The Commission will be considering whether the proposed project meets its separate criteria; however, due to the overlap of some issues and required analysis, the administrative procedures will occur jointly to some extent.

18. The purpose of the public hearing is for the Department to collect additional information for the record to help inform a licensing decision, for the public to have the opportunity to participate more directly by submitting oral testimony, and having the opportunity to cross examine witnesses. Due to the large scope of this project, time at the hearing cannot be devoted to all of the statutory criteria this proposed project must meet in order to obtain the sought after permits. Not all of the statutory criteria are of equal interest to the Intervenor and members of the public. The Department does not envision a need to hear live testimony and questioning for all of the statutory criteria. Therefore, at the pre-hearing conference, the Presiding Officer will discuss narrowing of scope of hearing to the statutory criteria and topics which are the most significant and contentious. Even though the hearing may be focused on only a few of the licensing criteria, the applicant will be required to meet all of the statutory criteria, and the regulatory requirements under the statutes, in order for the permits to be granted. Intervenor and any member of the public may submit written comments on those criteria that are not the subject of the hearing until the close of the record at the end of the hearing.
19. To begin the process of narrowing the issues that will be addressed at the hearing, by **Monday, August 27, 2018**, the Intervenor must submit the following: a specification of the statutory and regulatory criteria that they wish to address at the public hearing; the specific, significant or contentious topics or subject matters under those criteria relating to the project that they wish to address; and whether the Intervenor is generally in favor of, or against a permit being issued for the proposed project, or neither for nor against the proposed project being permitted. The parties should be mindful that the limited hearing time should be devoted to an in-depth examination of the issues most likely to elicit conflicting evidence or technical testimony that warrants a closer examination than could be had on documents alone. Intervenor may request additional time if review of certain additional information identified in paragraph 13 of this order is necessary for making these submissions. The list of statutory and regulatory criteria the Department will be considering for this project can be found in Appendix B.
20. Consolidation of Intervenor will also be discussed at the pre-hearing conference. The Presiding Officer may limit participation to one representative per party. The Presiding Officer will likely consolidate Intervenor with substantially similar interests or contentions. Intervenor are strongly encouraged to consolidate voluntarily if they have substantially similar interests. If parties plan to consolidate voluntarily, they must notify the Department by **Monday, August 27, 2018**.

LICENSING FILE

21. The full licensing file will be maintained at the Department's Eastern Maine Regional Office located at 106 Hogan Road, Bangor, Maine and will be available for public inspection upon request and with reasonable notice. Requests to examine the licensing file may be directed to Jim Beyer at Jim.Beyer@maine.gov or at (207) 446-9026.

Dated: August 13, 2018


Christina Hodgeman
Presiding Officer

**APPENDIX A: LIST OF MUNICIPALITIES, TERRITORIES
AND COUNTIES IN THE PROJECT AREA**

Municipalities:

Alna
Anson
Auburn
Caratunk
Chesterville
Cumberland
Durham
Embden
Farmington
Greene
Industry
Jay
Leeds
Lewiston
Livermore Falls
Moscow
New Gloucester
New Sharon
Pownal
Starks
Whitefield
Wilton
Windsor
Wiscasset
Woolwich

Townships/Plantations:

Appleton Township
Beattie Township
Bald Mountain Township
Bradstreet Township
Concord Township
Hobbstown Township
Johnson Mountain Township
Lowelltown Township
Parlin Pond Township
Skinner Township
T5 R7 BKP WKR
The Forks Plantation
West Forks Plantation

Counties:

Androscoggin
Cumberland
Franklin
Kennebec
Lincoln
Sagadahoc
Somerset

APPENDIX B: RELEVANT REVIEW CRITERIA

These excerpts from applicable statutes and regulations are provided to aid the parties as they determine which criteria and topics they will request be addressed during the public hearing. The parties are strongly urged to review the complete statutes and regulations as they prepare their requests and prepare for the hearing.

Site Location of Development Law Applicable Licensing Criteria

From 38 M.R.S. § 484.

- 1. Financial capacity and technical ability.** The developer has the financial capacity and technical ability to develop the project in a manner consistent with state environmental standards and with the provisions of this article.
- 3. No adverse effect on the natural environment.** The developer has made adequate provision for fitting the development harmoniously into the existing natural environment and that the development will not adversely affect existing uses, scenic character, air quality, water quality or other natural resources in the municipality or in neighboring municipalities.
 - A. In making a determination under this subsection, the department may consider the effect of noise from a commercial or industrial development.
 - H. In making a determination under this subsection regarding a development's effects on significant vernal pool habitat, the department shall apply the same standards applied to significant vernal pool habitat under rules adopted pursuant to the Natural Resources Protection Act.
- 4. Soil types.** The proposed development will be built on soil types that are suitable to the nature of the undertaking.
- 5. Ground water.** The proposed development will not pose an unreasonable risk that a discharge to a significant ground water aquifer will occur.
- 6. Infrastructure.** The developer has made adequate provision of utilities, including water supplies, sewerage facilities and solid waste disposal, required for the development, and the development will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on the existing or proposed utilities in the municipality or area served by those services.
- 7. Flooding.** The activity will not unreasonably cause or increase the flooding of the alteration area or adjacent properties nor create an unreasonable flood hazard to any structure.
- 9. Blasting.** Blasting will be conducted in accordance with the standards in section 490-Z, subsection 14, unless otherwise approved by the department.

Regulation Interpreting the Site Location of Development Act:

**Chapter 375: NO ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECT STANDARDS OF THE
SITE LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT ACT**

This regulation describes the scope of review of the Department in determining a developer's compliance with the "no adverse effect on the natural environment" standard of the Site Location Law (38 M.R.S. § 484(3)).

1. No Unreasonable Adverse Effect on Air Quality
2. No Unreasonable Alteration of Climate
3. No Unreasonable Alteration of Natural Drainage Ways
4. No Unreasonable Effect on Runoff/Infiltration Relationships
5. Erosion and Sedimentation Control
6. No Unreasonable Adverse Effect on Surface Water Quality
7. No Unreasonable Adverse Effect on Ground Water Quality
8. No Unreasonable Adverse Effect on Ground Water Quantity
9. Buffer Strips
10. Control of Noise
11. Preservation of Historic Sites
12. Preservation of Unusual Natural Areas
13. Access to Direct Sunlight
14. No Unreasonable Effect on Scenic Character
15. Protection of Wildlife and Fisheries
16. Adequate Provision for Solid Waste Disposal
17. Adequate Provisions for the Control of Odors

Natural Resources Protection Act Applicable Licensing Criteria

From 38 M.R.S. § 480-D.

- 1. Existing uses.** The activity will not unreasonably interfere with existing scenic, aesthetic, recreational or navigational uses.
- 2. Soil erosion.** The activity will not cause unreasonable erosion of soil or sediment nor unreasonably inhibit the natural transfer of soil from the terrestrial to the marine or freshwater environment.
- 3. Harm to habitats; fisheries.** The activity will not unreasonably harm any significant wildlife habitat, freshwater wetland plant habitat, threatened or endangered plant habitat, aquatic or adjacent upland habitat, travel corridor, freshwater, estuarine or marine fisheries or other aquatic life.

In determining whether there is unreasonable harm to significant wildlife habitat, the department may consider proposed mitigation if that mitigation does not diminish in the vicinity of the proposed activity the overall value of significant wildlife habitat and species utilization of the habitat and if there is no specific biological or physical feature unique to the habitat that would be adversely affected by the proposed activity. For purposes of this subsection, “mitigation” means any action taken or not taken to avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate or compensate for any actual or potential adverse impact on the significant wildlife habitat.

- 4. Interfere with natural water flow.** The activity will not unreasonably interfere with the natural flow of any surface or subsurface waters.
- 5. Lower Water Quality.** The activity will not violate any state water quality law, including those governing the classification of the State’s waters.
- 6. Flooding.** The activity will not unreasonably cause or increase the flooding of the alteration area or adjacent properties.
- 8. Outstanding river segments.** If the proposed activity is a crossing of any outstanding river segment as identified in section 480-P, the applicant shall demonstrate that no reasonable alternative exists which would have less adverse effect upon the natural and recreational features of the river segment.

Chapter 310: WETLANDS AND WATER BODIES PROTECTION

This rule interprets the Natural Resources Protection Act as it applies to the alteration of a coastal wetland, great pond, freshwater wetland, river, stream, or brook.

5. General Standards.

- A. Avoidance.** The activity will be considered to result in an unreasonable impact if the activity will cause a loss in wetland area, functions, or values, and there is a practicable alternative to the activity that would be less damaging to the environment. The applicant shall provide an analysis of alternatives (see Section 9(A)) in order to demonstrate that a practicable alternative does not exist.
- B. Minimal Alteration.** The amount of wetland to be altered must be kept to the minimum amount necessary.
- C. Compensation.** Compensation is the off-setting of a lost wetland function with a function of equal or greater value. The goal of compensation is to achieve no net loss of wetland functions and values. Every case where compensation may be applied is unique due to differences in wetland type and geographic location. For this reason, the method, location and amount of compensation work necessary is variable.
- D. No Unreasonable Impact**
 - (1) Even if a project has no practicable alternative and the applicant has minimized the proposed alteration as much as possible, the application will be denied if the activity will have an unreasonable impact on the wetland. “Unreasonable impact” means that one or more of the standards of the Natural Resources Protection Act, 38 M.R.S. § 480-D, will not be met.

**Chapter 315: ASSESSING AND MITIGATING IMPACTS TO EXISTING SCENIC
AND AESTHETIC USES**

This regulation interprets the Natural Resources Protection Act criterion and describes the process for evaluating impacts to existing scenic and aesthetic uses resulting from activities in, on, over, or adjacent to protected natural resources subject to the Natural Resources Protection Act, pursuant to 38 M.R.S. § 480-D(1).

4. **Scope of Review.** The potential impacts of a proposed activity will be determined by the Department considering the presence of a scenic resource listed in Section 10, the significance of the scenic resource, the existing character of the surrounding area, the expectations of the typical viewer, the extent and intransience of the activity, the project purpose, and the context of the proposed activity. Unreasonable adverse visual impacts are those that are expected to unreasonably interfere with the general public's visual enjoyment and appreciation of a scenic resource, or those that otherwise unreasonably impair the character or quality of such a place.

8. **Mitigation.** In the case where the Department determines that the proposed activity will have an adverse visual impact on a scenic resource, applicants may be required to employ appropriate measures to mitigate the adverse impacts to the extent practicable.

9. **Determination.** It is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed design does not unreasonably interfere with existing scenic and aesthetic uses, and thereby diminish the public enjoyment and appreciation of the qualities of a scenic resource, and that any potential impacts have been minimized.

Chapter 335: SIGNIFICANT WILDLIFE HABITAT

This regulation interprets the Natural Resources Protection Act criterion on significant wildlife habitat. It applies to an activity that takes place in, on, or over a significant wildlife habitat, or adjacent to a significant wildlife habitat contained within a freshwater wetland.

3. General standards

- A. Avoidance.** An activity that would degrade the significant wildlife habitat, disturb the subject wildlife, or affect the continued use of the significant wildlife habitat by the subject wildlife, either during or as a result of the activity, will be considered to have an unreasonable impact if there is a practicable alternative to the project that would be less damaging to the environment.

- B. Minimal alteration.** Alteration of the habitat and disturbance of subject wildlife must be kept to the minimum amount necessary by, among other methods, minimizing the size of the alteration, the duration of the activity, and its proximity to the significant wildlife habitat and subject wildlife.

- C. No unreasonable impact.** Even if the activity has no practicable alternative, and the applicant has minimized the proposed alteration as much as possible, the application will be denied if the activity will have an unreasonable impact on protected natural resources or the subject wildlife. “Unreasonable impact” means that one or more of the standards of the NRPA at 38 M.R.S. § 480-D will not be met. In making this determination, the department considers the area of the significant wildlife habitat affected by the activity, including areas beyond the physical boundaries of the project and the cumulative effects of frequent minor alterations of significant wildlife habitats.

- D. Compensation.** Compensation is the off-setting of a lost habitat function with a function of equal or greater value. The goal of compensation is to achieve no net loss of habitat functions and values. Every case where compensation may be required is unique due to differences in habitat type and geographic location. For this reason, the method, location, and amount of compensation work necessary is variable.

APPENDIX C: SERVICE LIST

<u>Organization</u>	<u>Name of Spokesperson</u>	<u>Email address</u>
INTERVENORS		
Old Canada Road National Scenic Byway	Bob Haynes	oldcanadaroad@myfairpoint.net
none	Ed Buzzell	ebuzzel@hotmail.com
City of Lewiston	Ed Barrett	ebarrett@lewistonmaine.gov
Friends of the Boundary Mountains	Robert Weingarten	bpw1@midmaine.com
Appalachian Mountain Club	David Publicover	dpublicover@outdoors.org
Western Mountains & Rivers Corp.	Ben Smith/Russell Walters	Benjamin.Smith@SoltanBass.com
NextEra Energy Resources, LLC	Joanna Tourangeau, Brian Murphy	JTourangeau@dwmlaw.com
Hawk's Nest Lodge	Peter Dostie	hawksnestlodge@gmail.com
Industrial Energy Consumer Group	Anthony Buxton	ABuxton@preti.com
Natural Resources Council of Maine	Sue Ely	sely@nrcm.org
Town of Caratunk	Elizabeth Caruso	caratunkselectmen@myfairpoint.net
Maine State Chamber of Commerce	Dana Connors	Amorin@mainechamber.org
IBEW Local 104	Tim Burgess	burgess@ibew104.org
Town of West Forks	Ashli Coleman	ashli.goodenow@gmail.com
Maine Guide Service, LLC	Greg Caruso	gcaruso@myfairpoint.net
Brookfield Renewable	Nicolas Bosse	Nicolas.Bosse@brookfieldrenewable.com
Trout Unlimited	Jeff Reardon	Jeffrey.Reardon@tu.org
Kennebec River Angler	Chris Russell	info@kennebecriverangler.com
The Nature Conservancy	Rob Wood	robert.wood@TNC.ORG
Maine Wilderness Guides Organization	Nick Leadley	leadley@myfairpoint.net
Conservation Law Foundation	Phelps Turner,	pturner@clf.org
Kennebec River Angler	Mike Pilsbury	mspils15@hotmail.com

APPLICANT		
Central Maine Power Company	Gerry Mirabile	Gerry.mirabile@cmpco.com
Central Maine Power Company	Matt Manahan	mmanahan@pierceatwood.com
Central Maine Power Company	Mark Goodwin	magoodwin@burnsmcd.com
DEPARTMENT STAFF		
Department of Environmental Protection	Christina Hodgeman Presiding Officer	Christina.S.Hodgeman@maine.gov
Department of Environmental Protection	Jim Beyer Project Manager	Jim.R.Beyer@maine.gov NECEC.DEP@maine.gov
Department of Environmental Protection	Mark Bergeron Land Bureau Director	Mark.Bergeron@maine.gov
ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL		
Attorney General's Office	Peggy Bensinger	Peggy.Bensinger@maine.gov

Attorney General's Office	Lauren Parker	Lauren.Parker@maine.gov
OTHER STATE AGENCY STAFF		
Inland Fisheries and Wildlife	Bob Stratton	Robert.D.Stratton@maine.gov
Maine Natural Areas Program	Kristen Puryear	Kristen.Puryear@maine.gov
Maine Historic Preservation Commission	Megan Rideout	Megan.M.Rideout@maine.gov
Land Use Planning Commission	Nicholas Livesay	Nicholas.Livesay@maine.gov
Land Use Planning Commission	Bill Hinkel	Bill.Hinkel@maine.gov
FEDERAL AGENCY STAFF		
Army Corps of Engineers	Jay Clement	Jay.L.Clement@usace.army.mil
Department of Energy	Melisa Pauley, DOE	Melissa.Pauley@hq.doe.gov