

Steven Ingalls  
Stetson  
LD 1868

I am neither for nor against this bill but offer the following comments for consideration:

1) On Page 2, Sec. 2 regarding the additional annual assessment, I would strongly encourage stating that this assessment is not a cost that can be charged to, or recovered from, Maine ratepayers. Allowing otherwise will simply add further costs that Maine ratepayers must then incur at a time when costs for Maine ratepayers are already escalating.

2) On Page 3, Sec. 6 regarding establishing the definition of a clean resource, I believe some further guidance for the GEO and the DEP on establishing this definition would be beneficial. The US DOE defines clean energy resources as a) solar, b) wind, c) hydro, d) geo-thermal, e) bioenergy (biofuels made from biomass), f) nuclear and g) hydrogen & fuel cells. Does the sponsor intend for bioenergy and nuclear to be within the possible definitions of a clean resource? If yes, why and if not why?

3) On Page 3, Sec. 6 regarding the discussion of a clean resource, I would suggest adding the following third criteria to A-4 for clarity: 3) can include being an energy storage system that is paired as a complimentary resource with a Class IA resource and either a) co-located with the Class IA resource, whether metered jointly with or separately from the Class IA resource; or b) located at a different location from the Class IA resource and the Governor's Energy Office finds that inclusion of the energy storage system would result in a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. (Note that this language can be found in Title 35-A, Section 3210-G subsection 1-D.)