



# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0002  
(207) 287-1440  
TTY: (207) 287-4469

## **Mathew McIntyre**

78 Tannery Road  
Lowell, ME 04493  
(207) 680-0678

[Mathew.McIntyre@legislature.maine.gov](mailto:Mathew.McIntyre@legislature.maine.gov)

Senator Lawrence, Representative Sachs and Esteemed Members of the Joint Standing Committee on Energy, Utilities and Technology, I am Mathew McIntyre and I humbly serve as the Representative for Maine's House District 18 comprising 16 towns and four Unorganized Territories spanning portions of Penobscot, Hancock and Washington counties. Today I offer my testimony as the sponsor of **LD 300**, a "Resolve, to Direct the Public Utilities Commission to Study Expanding the Use of Hydroelectric Power and the Development of a Geothermal Power Plant in the State".

As I begin, I offer my presentation today is a direct result of listening to the good People of District 18, and I serve proudly in carrying their voices here for your respectful consideration.

We have all heard the adage it is unwise to place all of one's eggs in one basket. Maine's current energy policies and priorities appear to go against this, and today I encourage all of us to consider that a wiser strategy is to balance and diversify our tax-payer funded investments amongst a broader swath of available and emerging technologies that I believe are better suited for our regional environment.

At present in Maine there is a significant amount of time and money being consumed by debate focused specifically on "wind and solar", two technologies which many categorize as "renewable" sources of energy production. For transparency, at this point I will share with you that I am a geek. I am a graduate of the US Naval Nuclear Propulsion Training program. At taxpayer burden I was afforded the opportunity to learn a whole lot about one specific technology, which yes, I declare I am a proponent of and personally am glad that parallel conversations to that topic are occurring. Today's discussion, however, is about the exigent need for us to prudently and earnestly explore all available technologies that may help our State to establish a better footing for a more comprehensive, reliable and resilient energy portfolio. Furthermore, I believe it critical that we begin to look at our energy investments through the lens of "cradle to grave" evaluation. Every technology has a lifecycle, some shorter, some longer; from concept to prototype, from design to test and evaluation, and from implementation to eventual decommissioning. I assert it is in the best interest of Maine that we revitalize our investments in large-scale hydroelectric power, and also to determine the feasibility of geothermal technologies. We should direct the Public Utilities Commission to conduct a prioritized study which can help us to ultimately create an expanded and robust energy production portfolio which is tailored to the specific geographic and environmental realities of Maine.

In closing I offer these final points for your consideration, as based upon initial research of information in the public domain, and what I saw with my own two eyes as I traveled over 45,000 miles through District 18 during my 2024 campaign;

1. The State of Alaska meets almost 25% of its electricity demands through hydroelectric power sources<sup>1</sup>, while realizing negligible impact on the ecologies of vital fisheries<sup>2</sup>
2. The State of Maine has multiple rivers and miles of waterways which flow year-round, representing virtually limitless environmentally-friendly power production opportunities
3. The ratepayers who fund our currently prioritized investments are growing more and more concerned by seeing idle wind turbines on the hilltops and solar panel fields covered in snow
4. I do not have x-ray vision, so I cannot personally say what opportunities are beneath our State's crust, however I am confident the Public Utilities Commission has the expert contacts that could determine this for us, and help us to decide if geothermal is plausible for Maine, or not
5. Contained in the "Strategy A Key Actions" section of the January 2025 Governor's Energy Office report, there is language which directly supports the intent of this proposed Resolve

I thank you for your time today, and look forward to continuing this discussion during future work sessions. I will be glad to address any questions you may now have.

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.alaskarenewableenergy.org](http://www.alaskarenewableenergy.org) (Renewable Energy Alaska Program/REAP)

<sup>2</sup> [www.adfg.alaska.gov](http://www.adfg.alaska.gov) (Alaska Department of Fish and Game)

### **Strategy A Key Actions**

- Design and establish a CES that is compatible with similar policies in other New England states and complementary to Maine's existing RPS by creating a new class that allows for energy generated by clean electricity resources (such as nuclear, clean fuels, large-scale hydropower, or other innovative technologies) defined by an emissions-based threshold to compete in Maine. This CES would phase in over time to ensure compliance with Maine's goal of 100 percent clean energy by 2040.
- Pursue state policies and regional market structures to enable deployment and unlock value from emerging resources such as long-duration energy storage, which has the potential to cost-effectively address capacity and resource adequacy needs in the coming decades.
- Continue to monitor and report on the progress of the state's RPS and future CES policies through statutorily required reports, the biannual State Energy Plan, and a new online dashboard that provides data on installed generation resources.
- Monitor and evaluate market trends to inform Maine's approach to clean fuels (such as green hydrogen, or other renewable or bio-based fuels), geothermal, and other emerging technologies, and plan for them in the future through the development of roadmaps, pilots, or targeted opportunities analyses.

