



**Testimony of the Efficiency Maine Trust
Michael D. Stoddard, Executive Director**

**IN SUPPORT OF
LD 385 - An Act To Amend Conflicts in and Make Other Changes To the Laws Governing the Efficiency Maine Trust**

Presented to the Joint Committee on Energy, Utilities and Technology

May 12, 2021

Senator Lawrence, Representative Berry, and Members of the Committee on Energy, Utilities and Technology, the Efficiency Maine Trust (the Trust) testifies today **in support of LD 1437 - LD 385 - An Act To Amend Conflicts in and Make Other Changes To the Laws Governing the Efficiency Maine Trust.**

The Trust appreciates Rep. Kessler proposing this bill to clean up several minor conflicts in the Efficiency Maine Trust Act (the EMT Act) and to bring that section of the statute up to date, and for working with the Trust to develop the language in the bill amendment that was circulated last Friday.

I am pleased to offer the following explanations for why we think the provisions of this bill should be approved.

Section 1 – Update the goals to be pursued in the Trust’s triennial plan.

In Section 1, the bill proposes updates to certain goals. These are the goals that the Trust is directed to incorporate into its triennial plan process and to pursue through its program implementation. The original EMT Act was passed in 2009 and at that time, most goals for the Trust were set for 2020. That decade is now behind us, and it is timely to update the goals looking out across the next decade to 2030. As to specific goals for the sub-sections of 35-A MRS §10104(4)(F), the bill proposes to incorporate relevant targets or standards established in other recent legislation and in the climate action plan of the Maine Climate Council (MCC). Specifically:

- The weatherization goals reflect the targets established in the MCC plan;
- The savings goal for energy (also sometimes called “supply”) reflects the suite of changes in the EMT Act over recent years directing the Trust to pursue the “maximum achievable cost-effective” efficiency savings standard. It is appropriate to update the goal here to meet the new standard. The amount will reflect the best available information on energy prices, technology performance, technology costs, and what is going on in the marketplace. This is

a rational approach to establishing the goal and is an improvement from the arbitrary target that was originally set.

- The peak-load reduction reflects the same rationale as noted above for energy savings goal.
- The goal of creating stable jobs remains the same except the deadline of 2020 is removed.
- The goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions remains the same except the reference to the relevant section of statute (38 MRS §576) for the amount to be reduced is updated, and a reference to the MCC plan is added. A conflicting provision having the outdated statutory reference to the State’s GHG reduction targets is removed.
- The goals for installation of high-performance heat pumps references the targets contained in the MCC plan.
- The goal for the purchase of electric vehicles (EVs) references a target contained in the MCC plan.

Section 2 and Section 3 – Resolve conflict in section numbering in developing the triennial plan.

In 2019, the Legislature enacted multiple bills amending the EMT Act. Two different bills added new provisions regarding the triennial plan but by accident, both new provisions were assigned the same paragraph letter (¶G). The two provisions address different topics and both provisions should be retained; the second one simply needs to be assigned the correct lettering (¶H). To accomplish this, the bill repeals the duplicate ¶G and then adds it back in with the correct new lettering.

Section 4 – Resolve conflict of duplicate definitions of electricity “conservation programs.”

In 2019, the Legislature enacted two bills containing a definition of “conservation programs” in the section of the EMT Act section (§10110) governing electricity conservation programs. They are nearly identical, but the version amended through PL 2019, c. 365, §2 is slightly more detailed and preferable. The bill would keep this version and delete the less detailed version.

Section 5 – Resolve conflict of duplicate definitions of electricity “conservation programs.”

In 2019, the Legislature enacted two bills containing duplicative directives that the PUC give consideration to various funding sources when developing the portion of the Trust’s electric conservation program budgets that is to be paid from utility rates. The statutory provisions are very similar, but the version amended through PL 2019, c. 306, §5 is slightly more detailed and preferable. The bill would keep this version and delete the less detailed version.

Section 6 – Broaden the Trust’s authority to conduct training for trades in the energy space.

In developing the MCC plan, stakeholders identified a desire to expand training for trades and various professionals engaging in the energy space. The EMT Act already provides some explicit authority for certain types of energy services, but the bill would extend that authority to other types of energy services and would extend making it available to code enforcement officers, inspectors and other professionals involved in

designing, marketing, regulating or educating about energy equipment.

It would be beneficial to the efficient and effective development of the Trust's three-year plan, and the administration of its programs, if these changes were made to the EMT Act.

I appreciate your considering of these comments and for the opportunity to testify in support of the bill. I would be pleased to take any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/MDS

Michael D. Stoddard

Executive Director