



September 25, 2007

Mary Bomar
Director
National Park Service
1849 C. Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20240

Dear Ms. Bomar:

As you may know, last Thursday Ms. Pamela Underhill of the National Park Service testified in Maine in opposition to the proposed Black Nubble wind power project. Her testimony before Maine's Land Use Regulation Commission (LURC) included threatening, dismissive, and combative language that was totally inappropriate for a federal official.

Ms. Underhill's opening remarks asserted that information about global warming was "essentially irrelevant" to consideration of the project. This is inaccurate and Ms. Underhill knows this. We are sure that the National Park Service does not hold the position that global warming is irrelevant to decisions about renewable energy projects. We also are confident that Ms. Underhill understands that LURC's "demonstrated need" criterion encompasses the need by society to develop clean sources of energy that help reduce the risks of climate change.

During the Black Nubble hearings last week, the Conservation Law Foundation presented Dr. Cameron Wake of the University of New Hampshire as an expert witness in support of the Black Nubble project. Dr. Wake provided a summary of the results of the Northeast Climate Impacts Assessment – the most current assessment of the potential environmental and economic impacts of global warming on the Northeastern United States. This highly peer-reviewed report is the product of more than 60 scientists and technical experts. Ms. Underhill came across as unprofessional and out of touch by dismissing the importance of global warming and claiming that statements about Black Nubble's clean energy benefits were simply "sound bytes and cute little statistics."

Ms. Underhill also lashed out at one of us (NRCM Advocacy Director Pete Didisheim) by name in her remarks, and threatened NRCM with the following statement that was below the dignity of a federal official: "I do not know why the Natural Resources Council of Maine decided to toss the Appalachian Trail under the bus, but it is not something we will forget anytime soon." NRCM spent several years analyzing and developing its position on the Black Nubble project, and its 10,000 members and supporters take offense at this type of threat from a public official. Does the National Park Service allow its senior employees to publicly attack by name individuals and organizations who may disagree with their position?

We and many others who attended last weeks hearings believe that Ms. Underhill behaved in a fashion that was completely unacceptable for a public official paid for by American taxpayers. Individuals involved in the Black Nubble hearings have strongly held positions, but the discussion about wind power needs to be civil and based on facts. Ms. Underhill was not civil and did not present facts. Her testimony was unprofessional and inappropriate. Explaining that the Appalachian Trail was like her "third child," as she did, was not an acceptable excuse. Rather, it simply revealed that Ms. Underhill cannot be objective in her evaluation of this project.

We request a response from you about whether Ms. Underhill's comments were authorized by you and whether you approve of this type of public testimony by a senior National Park Service employee.

Sincerely,



Pete Didisheim
Advocacy Director
Natural Resources Council of Maine



Sean Mahoney
Vice President
Conservation Law Foundation

cc: Pam Underhill
Rep. Michael Michaud
Rep. Tom Allen
Sen. Susan Collins
Sen. Olympia Snowe