

CLAYTON MCKAY
Dixfield
LD 186

Chair Lawrence, Chair Sachs and other Honorable Members of the EUT Committee.

I oppose this bill, LD 186, An Act to Clarify the Public Utilities Commission's Authority to Establish Time-of-use Pricing for Standard-offer Service, because of what it could become with a simple amendment involving a couple word changes.

Time of Use for residential class customers is already an option for CMP customers on the delivery portion of their bills. If this option isn't attracting a majority of customers to switch to TOU, how can the PUC conclude TOU of the Standard Offer will?

CMP states in cases 2024-00231 and 2023-00019 "In fact, CMP has offered TOU rates for all customer classes since the mid-1980's. Under CMP's existing TOU rates for residential customers there are only about 4,600 residential customers choosing this rate option."

Most people default to the Standard Offer Supply to avoid having to make a decision in what is rightfully viewed as a very complicated process. They have been told the Standard Offer Suppliers factor varying costs associated with the time of day and provide the best deal for them at one set price. The truth is standard offer suppliers compete with each other so that customers will receive the lowest price and one set price without conditions.

I am not sure the legislature nor the PUC should be assessing the ISO-NE market to reduce costs for ratepayers. How are the legislative mandated long-term contracts working out for ratepayers? Sadly, to say, "Not Well". Long-term contracts had a net cost to ratepayers of \$17,781,554 from December 1, 2023, to November 30, 2024. The PUC presented these numbers in their recent presentation to the committee. Ignoring them is ignorance.

The PUC counters the issue of TOU participation with the following statement in case no. 2024-00231 "Inquiry of Time of Use Rates for Delivery and Standard Offer" "• The success of a TOU standard offer/delivery rate likely requires an opt out rate, as opposed to an opt-in or mandatory rate."

How many legislators in this room will read this as a reason to amend this bill by changing the word "may" in this bill to "shall" in paragraphs 4-B and 4-C and mandate an opt-out option?

In case no. 2024-00231 item 20, CMP responds "CMP appreciates the thoughtful comments submitted by interested parties in this proceeding. In CMP's view, one of the more important concepts at this time is whether the TOU program is opt-in, opt-out, or mandatory. CMP strongly supports an opt-in program, primarily because customers are making a conscious choice and are "buying in" to the program and for customer satisfaction reasons. Certain customers may not be in a position to alter their energy use to off-peak hours and others may be challenged to clearly understand complexities of the TOU program, both of which could lead to detrimental financial consequences. Additionally, some customers may view an opt-out program as an attempt by CMP or the MPUC to mandate lifestyle behaviors that are linked to their electricity usage patterns. While CMP recognizes that an opt-out program may, as some stakeholders have noted, increase participation, we urge the Commission to consider whether the benefits of increased participation outweigh the potential for customer dissatisfaction. Additionally, without the customer committing to the TOU program, the Company questions whether behavioral changes would, in fact, result.

This bill and the notion that electric costs will lower with "time of use and cost-effective demand response and energy efficiency into the supply of standard-offer service" is yet another fallacy conjured up by "experts" in the legislature and elsewhere. Policies in place like RGGI participation, Renewable Energy Credits, Net Energy Billing, Long Term Renewable Energy Contracts, the

Aqua Ventus debacle, the Northern Maine Renewable Energy Development Program and the rapid number of people on LIAP are distorting the market and retail price of Maine electricity to such an extent that any attempt to force Maine people to accept the premise of changing lifestyles and behaviors that this bill encourages will lower their bills is ridiculous. We are not your subjects. We demand freedom from your excessively abusive policies.

The PUC can do what they "May", but TOU "Should" remain an opt-in choice in both delivery and the Standard Offer Supply.

Thank You Dan McKay, Ratepayer