



Senator Mark Lawrence
Representative Melanie Sachs
Joint Committee on Energy, Utilities, and Technology
Legislative Information Office
100 State House Station
Augusta, Maine 04333

October 30, 2025

Testimony re: LD 1966, “An Act to Improve Access to Community Solar Programs in the State” from ReVision Energy

Senator Lawrence, Representative Sachs, and Members of the Joint Standing Committee on Energy, Utilities, and Technology:

Founded in Liberty in 2003, ReVision Energy has grown to more than 200 co-owners headquartered at our Montville and South Portland locations. As a certified B-Corporation, 100% employee-owned clean energy construction company, we develop, install, and maintain residential, community, and commercial solar, as well as storage, EV charging, and heat pumps. We are here today to speak in support of this legislation, particularly Section 1 and Sections 4-6. This testimony mirrors testimony we provided in support of LD 1949, “An Act Regarding Energy Fairness,” earlier this year.

Section 1: Utility Customer Billing Transparency

ReVision Energy strongly supports Section 1, which describes disclosure requirements to enhance the transparency of utility administrative charges. All utility customers deserve transparency and accuracy when billed for services beyond regular monthly electric service, such as services for interconnection or line extensions. This section requires that a utility bill of this nature must identify and disclose all administrative charges — defined as an administrative service charge, an indirect overhead cost, or a cost adder, but not including labor, materials, or supplies.

To be clear, this bill does not debate the validity of an administrative charge or dispute the level of the administrative support charge (ASC) that the Public Utilities Commission (Commission) has approved.¹ This bill simply asks the Commission to require disclosure to

¹ In 2005, the Commission opened Docket No. 2005-00520 to investigate administrative charges assigned to a customer seeking a line extension to service his new home. The customer had received a bill with a 26%



help ensure that approved administrative charges are applied accurately and transparently. In our experience, they are not.

An bill for interconnection costs received in 2023 offers an instructive example of our concern.² That bill, \$1.7 million for the interconnection a 1.5 MW AC facility, includes only four line items: contractors, labor, materials, and “other.” The invoice does not break out or label what is in each category, or what overheads or markups were applied. It is unclear what charges fall within “other.” Because that “other” category exceeds 16% of the bill, we assume it is not the standard ASC described in the utility’s approved Terms and Conditions. The only details we have are in the fine print, which notes an ASC was added “for miscellaneous services.”

This lack of information has prompted years of dispute resolution efforts to understand the source and reasonableness of charges on similar invoices. While we have received more information through that process, it has taken us nearly three years to do so. This is an unacceptable use of time and resources for all parties involved. Ultimately, we have learned that approximately 40% of the total costs for line extensions for interconnecting customers are indirect fees (a combination of the ASC, traditional overhead, indirect pooled costs, and allocations). More specifically, 22% is administrative charges and 18% is indirect overhead from contractors. We have been told that the 16% ASC is charged on top of each line item (except “other”), meaning there are places in which overhead is being charged on overhead. For invoices presenting final costs nearly double the utility’s initial estimate, we have learned that most of the cost increase results from expanded overhead costs rather than increased construction costs. This experience affirms the need to improve transparency in the billing process, especially for charges of this magnitude.

LD 1966 takes a critical step to improving utility billing by requiring utilities to adequately label customer bills and by clarifying that the Commission may require a utility to reimburse a customer for improperly assessed administrative charges. We believe this transparency should be the standard for all utility customers, and we thank the bill sponsor for advancing this issue.

‘administrative support adder’ and ‘profit adder.’ The customer argued this charge was arbitrary and an overhead rate that had not been scrutinized by the Commission. The docket ultimately resulted in the bill’s reduction and Commission approval of a 16% administrative adder, now known as an “Administrative Support Charge (ASC),” formally established in Central Maine Power’s (CMP) 2008 rate case in Docket No. 2007-00215. While the 16% charge was determined reasonable for coverage of overhead on line extensions specifically, CMP has continued its use of the charge for other services. Section 1.11 of CMP’s current Terms & Conditions reference both Docket No. 2025-00520 and Docket No. 2007-00215 in codifying the use of this 16% ASC.

² Exhibit 1, appended to this testimony, provides a redacted copy of the cost reconciliation statement.



Sections 3-5: Public Policy Charge

In a similar vein to our concerns above, some utilities have identified “public policy charges” on customer’s monthly electric bills. These bills and supplemental information provided by the utilities offer varying information about what these charges cover. In recent years, utilities have highlighted these charges as “Net Energy Billing” charges or “Solar” charges, when in fact stranded costs and other public policies funded through ratepayer bills include more than just net energy billing or solar. Such misinformation drives a false narrative and has had major political ramifications. LD 1966 respectfully asks that if a utility chooses to label such charges as “public policy charges,” that the utility accurately describes the costs and benefits of all components of these charges. We believe ratepayers deserve this transparency.

Sincerely,

/s/ Nat Haslett

Nat Haslett, Director, Utility & Regulatory Affairs
Lindsay Bourgoine, Director, Policy & Government Affairs
ReVision Energy Inc.



Exhibit 1: Redacted Sample Utility Bill for Interconnection

Company Data

Central Maine Power
83 Edison Drive
Augusta, ME 04336

Reconciliation Statement



Customer Data

Service Location

Statement

Statement Number:

Statement Date:

Customer Number:

Due Date:

Description:

Contract #:

This Reconciliation Statement includes the Total Distribution Cost of **\$1,693,485.19**, which refers to your payment in advance of your current IA Cost. This statement also serves as your invoice. Pursuant to Chapter. 324 §13 (J) payment is due on May, 11th 2023.

Payment instructions:

Description	Amount
Contractors	1,053,274.48
Labor	33,294.83
Materials	375,948.66
Other	230,967.22
Total Distribution Cost	\$1,693,485.19
Advanced Payment	\$739,859.00
Amount Due	\$953,626.19

Please reach out to CMP with any questions or concerns and communicate them back to me as we are available to discuss your invoice with you.

: CENTRAL MAINE POWER TERMS & CONDITIONS, PAGE 1.4, FIFTH REVISION, 1.11 b. - For services performed at the Customer's request, CMP will include in its costs a charge to recover indirect administrative and general expenses. An Administrative Support Charge to recover such costs will be applied as follows:
b. For miscellaneous services whereby CMP charges upfront for such services, the Administrative Support Charge will be 16% of the total cost of the service, excluding the Contribution in Aid of Construction as described in Section 1.8 of CMP's Terms and Conditions.

Internal Use