

Chair Lawrence, Chair Sachs and Fellow Energy Consumers of the EUT Committee

I support LD 1250 An Act to Provide That Portfolio Requirements for Renewable Electricity Resources Apply Only to Actual Retail Sales

Applying the “portfolio requirements” only to actual retail sales is common sense, but can get lost in the complexity of the REC market.

Why is the REC market lacking transparency. The PUC annual report on RECs are at least 18 months later than the actual REC purchases.

REC prices are marked up by CEPs and billed to ratepayers on the supply portion of monthly statements.

How long does a renewable project need to acquire money from RECs. 5 years?, 10 years? 20 years? For as long as they can enter output to the grid?

I was told RECs are to attract qualified resources by paying some of the capital costs for permitting, land acquisition and construction. Has anyone compared the payments received in RECs to the capital costs.

We know ratepayers in Maine pay over 80 million dollars per year for RECs and because the RPS increases REC obligations at 4% per year, the costs will increase.

How can renewable energy promoters claim Maine electricity is 61% renewable while ISO-NE reports 60% of New England generation is Natural Gas?

This brutal scam of Renewable Energy Credits is an over the top cost to ratepayers and unbelievable profits to developers.

Perhaps, it is time to re-evaluate the RPS. Fossil fuel generation is a vital part of the “National Energy Emergency” declared on January 20, 2025. and only by extremely overcharging Maine ratepayers or taxpayers to battle the National Energy Emergency orders will renewable developments continue their run.

This might not be a battle a legislature using common sense would want to fight. Nuclear power will rule, soon.

Thank You Clayton McKay Dixfield, The Only One