



# REVISION ENERGY

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

March 4, 2026

*Testimony re: LD 897, "An Act Regarding the Calculation of Electric Rate Contracting Costs" 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 today boasts more than 200 co-owners across the state in 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. Our comments today reflect the fact that our community solar offering, called Member Owned Community Solar, is structured in such a way that our projects are wholly owned by customers.

We are present to speak in strong support of amending LD 897 by adding the exact language from Section 7 of LD 1966 to ensure such language makes it across the finish line this session, which is a vital requirement for ReVision's customers impacted by the Public Utilities' Commission's (PUC) interpretation of LD 1777 in its February 3 ruling in Docket #2025-00264.

As you know, LD 1777 included a provision intended to apply consumer protection standards to subscription-model community solar, not ownership-model community solar in which the customer owns the share outright in a similar manner to a homeowner owning the panels on their roof. However, the statute was drafted without such clarity. ReVision raised this concern during the debate over LD 1777's final language but was encouraged to raise the issue in rulemaking. Now, the PUC has released its final updates to Chapter 313, and the order outlined their decision to deny such an exception because of the narrow statute.

This leaves over 100 of our customers in an untenable situation in which they have purchased a second community solar share to cover additional load needs from electrifying their homes. Under this new rule, these customers will now be denied compensation for the power they produce with an asset they own. This constitutes a taking of private property.

Many of our customers were notified that they would soon be denied their credits last week, causing an outpouring of frustration as demonstrated through legislative outreach and a significant quantity of public comments filed in relevant PUC dockets. We'd like to characterize this issue with comments we've seen directly from customers:

*"Wanting to better manage ongoing electricity costs, we purchased a community solar share in 2021. We chose this option as our home's roof and siting does not support*



## REVISION ENERGY

*sufficient production for our energy requirements. Over the past five years, we have increased our electricity needs through the addition of electric vehicles and an additional heat pump for our barn for year round use. This led us to purchasing an additional 3.0kW share in 2025. Both shares were purchased with a portion of our hard earned retirement funds and are assets that we own that cannot be easily sold nor do we desire to do so."*

*"The effect of the actions of the Legislature, the PUC and CMP is to confiscate assets of mine that cost me almost \$30,000. I have been told by CMP that they will no longer deliver to me the output of my additional community solar shares. Since those assets will still exist and will continue producing energy and delivering it to the CMP system, some other entity will be receiving the benefit of my assets."*

*"If the Commission promulgates this rule as planned, it will effectively "turn off" the value of one of my physical assets. By preventing credits from multiple farms from accruing on my utility account, the PUC is not merely "adjusting a program," it is stripping the economic value of the property - the shares in the second project - that I rightfully own. In my opinion, promulgating the rule as drafted constitutes a regulatory taking."*

We very much agree with our customers. For that reason, we appreciate the PUC's willingness to pause implementation via Docket #2026-00048 while this body has a chance to act. We do believe the PUC has the authority to interpret the rule to exempt our customers, as noted in our petition for reconsideration in Docket #2025-00264, given LD 1777 demonstrates the intent to exclude customer owned projects. However, the Commission made it clear during their deliberations on Monday this situation will only be remedied through legislative action. For that reason, we implore you to act.

The legislation before you today essentially functions as a PUC clean-up bill, in which tweaks are made to existing law to ensure effective operationalization of policy. In that regard, we believe the addition of Section 7 from LD 1966 is germane, and we respectfully request that it is added, unchanged and without amendments, to LD 897 to definitively ensure a timely remedy for customers facing uncertainty regarding property they own.

Sincerely,

/s/ Lindsay Bourgoine

Lindsay Bourgoine  
Director, Policy & Government Affairs  
ReVision Energy