Acadia Center
Advancing the Clean Energy Future
PO Box 583 • Rockport, ME 04856-0583

October 19, 2025

Nora Healy, Amy Olfene, and Hailey Rizzo
Hearing Examiners
Maine Public Utilities Commission
18 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0018

Docket No. 2025-00218, Central Maine Power Company Request for Approval of Rate Change 35-A M.R.S. § 307; Intervenor Compensation Funding Petition of CMP Ratepayers Unite

On October 8, 2025, Laura Loomis on behalf of herself and the Central Maine Power ("CMP") customers in the Facebook group, CMP Ratepayers Unite ("Petitioners"), filed a Petition for Preliminary Determination of Eligibility for Intervenor Funding ("Petition") in Docket 2025-00218, CMP's Request for Approval of a Rate Change - 307. This filing was made pursuant to Chapter 840 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations, and it requests between $168,750 and $190,750 intended to pay for expert witness fees and attorney fees. Acadia Center agrees with previously filed comments from the Office of the Public Advocate ("OPA"), Our Power, and The Natural Resources Council of Maine ("NRCM") in support of the Petitioners' eligibility to receive funding pursuant to statute and Commission rule. Acadia Center will not duplicate the points made in the aforementioned comments but will instead seek to respond to the comments submitted by CMP that appear to be in opposition to the Petition.

CMP opines that OPA is "is statutorily charged with representing the very customers in this rate case proceeding that constitute CMP Ratepayers Unite."[1] However, CMP Ratepayers Unite is a subset of the "using and consuming public"[2] that has actively sought intervenor status in this case, an action that the Petitioners identified they have taken because, through intervention, they have an opportunity to expand the record in this docket with expert testimony that more closely represents their interests. Additionally, the OPA submitted in its Comments on the Petition that "the OPA *does not* represent Petitioners' position adequately in this case[, as t]he determination of rate of return is subject to interpretation by expert analysis"[3] (*emphasis* added). It is not clear to Acadia Center why OPA's determination that a subset of ratepayers would be better represented by sponsoring their own testimony than relying on OPA's would be insufficient to determine the Petitioners' satisfaction of criterion A,[4] particularly given the subjectivity the OPA identifies.

Regarding criterion B,[5] CMP states that the Petitioners propose "to offer testimony from *yet another* witness…"

[1] CMP Comments on Procedural Order Regarding Intervenor Funding at ¶¶ 4.
[2] Maine Rev. Stat. tit. 35-A, § 1702 (introductory clause) (2025)
[3] Comments of the OPA on Intervenor Funding Request at ¶¶ 3.
[4] 35-A M.R.S. § 1310-A; 65-407 C.M.R. Chapter 840 (2). "A. The position of the intervenor or participant is not adequately represented by the Office of the Public Advocate or commission staff"
[5] *Id.* "B. The intervenor or participant is likely to substantially contribute to the proceeding and to assist in the resolution of the issues raised in the proceeding"

(*emphasis* added). First, Acadia Center understands that the Commission is interested in a fulsome record upon which it can base its decision, from which it necessarily follows that there is value in intervenors providing a spectrum of positions and expert analyses from which the Commission can draw evidence enough for an eventual determination. CMP's position appears to indicate that CMP Ratepayers Unite being able to offer additional testimony may in some way lead to too much testimony on the critical Rate of Return topics. CMP continues: "the Commission must assess whether offering expert testimony on a topic that will also be covered by the OPA and Commission Staff, *but in a different manner*, means that the Commission Staff and the OPA cannot adequately represent the interests of CMP's customers in this regard on that topic" (*emphasis* added). Here CMP seems to contradict itself by stating that the expert testimony Petitioners intend to provide will be cover the same topics as the OPA and Commission Staff, "but in a different manner." If the testimony both more closely reflects the Petitioners' interests and is different than that which would otherwise be submitted into the record, then it appears to Acadia Center that the testimony will be a substantial contribution to the proceeding.

As to whether the Petitioners' sponsored testimony will "assist in the resolution of the issues raised in the proceeding,"[6] the Petitioners are intending to sponsor expert and relevant testimony. Though CMP appears to question the credence due to the witness's economic analysis,[7] Mark Ellis, the expert witness the Petitioners intend to contract, was formerly the Chief Economist at Sempra, one of the largest public utility holding companies in America, and has previously given expert testimony on Rate of Return issues in utility rate cases across the country. Acadia Center would contend that this witness is highly credible and relevant, given his experience and expertise. To make informed decisions on such critical topics, the Commission should have access to a wide scope of credible evidence from which to draw its conclusions. Acadia Center believes that the Petitioners' intended witness will 1) make an invaluable contribution to the record and 2) assist in the resolution of issues raised in this proceeding. As such, Acadia Center strongly supports the Petitioners' request for Intervenor Compensation Funding.

Respectfully Submitted,



Noah Berman
Senior Policy Advocate & Utility Innovation Program Manager
Acadia Center
PO Box 583
Rockport, ME 04856
Email: nberman@acadiacenter.org
Tel: 207-236-6470 x107

---

[6] *Id.*

[7] CMP Comments on Procedural Order Regarding Intervenor Funding at ¶¶ 6.