MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the

LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY

at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library

http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib



Reproduced from electronic originals

(may include minor formatting differences from printed original)

Legislative Record

House of Representatives

One Hundred and Thirty-First Legislature

State of Maine

Daily Edition

First Special Session

Beginning April 5, 2023

Beginning with Page H-277

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

Representative TERRY of Gorham moved that the House **RECONSIDER** its action whereby Bill, "An Act Relating to Net Energy Billing and Distributed Solar and Energy Storage Systems"

(S.P. 815) (L.D. 1986)

FAILED PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED.

Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECONSIDER** the House's action whereby the Bill **FAILED PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Reconsideration of the House's action whereby the Bill Failed Passage to be Enacted. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 338

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Bell, Boyle, Brennan, Bridgeo, Cloutier, Collings, Copeland, Crafts, Craven, Crockett, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Fay, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Hasenfus, Hepler, Hobbs, Jauch, Kuhn, Lajoie, Landry, Lee, Lookner, Madigan, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Millett R, Milliken, Montell, Moonen, Moriarty, Murphy, O'Connell, Osher, Paulhus, Perry A, Perry J, Pluecker, Pringle, Rana, Reckitt, Roberts, Roeder, Runte, Russell, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Shaw, Sheehan, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Williams, Zager, Zeigler, Madam Speaker.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Blier, Boyer, Bradstreet, Campbell, Carmichael, Cluchey, Costain, Cyrway, Davis, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Faulkingham, Foster, Fredericks, Galletta, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Millett H, Morris, Ness, Newman, Nutting, O'Neil, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Pomerleau, Quint, Riseman, Sampson, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Theriault, Thorne, Underwood, Walker, Warren, White B, White J, Wood, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Adams, Andrews, Carlow, Collamore, Cray, Gifford, Gramlich, Kessler, LaRochelle, Parry, Rielly, Rudnicki, Worth.

Yes, 73; No, 65; Absent, 13; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

73 having voted in the affirmative and 65 voted in the negative, with 13 being absent, and accordingly the House **RECONSIDERED** its action whereby the Bill **FAILED PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED**.

Representative ARATA of New Gloucester **REQUESTED** a roll call on **PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winter Harbor, Representative Faulkingham.

Representative **FAULKINGHAM**: I figured I'd take the opportunity to speak, Madam Speaker. I think we all know that right now, this State has a huge problem with our electricity bills. It is absolutely devastating, punishing our people on fixed incomes, poor people. We're all in here, regardless of party, supposed to be working for those people. There's just no hiding it. I mean, these electric bills have become insane and when you look at the numbers that have come out of the Office of the Public Advocate on how much money is going to get heaped on top of the ratepayers from this program, it's clear that we need to do something. And it has become abundantly clear within the last few days and especially today that there are two competing measures and one plan, the plan currently before us, is an absolute joke and I think we all know it. Do not support this plan because there's a better one coming.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Embden, Representative Dunphy.

Representative **DUNPHY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, just in terms of numbers, the impacts of NEB and this bill doesn't do a whole lot for us. It's around $20,000 for hospitals, $15,000 for nursing homes, $8,000 for sewer districts, papermills and grocery stores in excess of $100,000 a year. That's a lot of money and it's paid for by our constituents either directly or indirectly. When you go shopping, when you drive your car, everything that utilizes electricity, that cost is passed on. So, I don't remember what the vote was because it was a few minutes ago and I'm old, but nonetheless, how is it that we are allowing non-elected, non-accountable special interest groups to change the minds of people in a short time? I mean, I get it, it's politically driven, but this is impacting our constituents. The hired guns in the hall don't give a rat's backside about our constituents. They're concerned about their own special interests. And to be flipping votes based on pressure from some organization like the NRCM or the --

Representative **ROBERTS**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Berwick, Representative Roberts.

Representative **ROBERTS**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Member is questioning the motives about other Members.

On **POINT OF ORDER,** Representative ROBERTS of South Berwick objected to the comments of Representative DUNPHY of Embden because he was questioning the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Chair will remind Members to not question the motives of other Members or to impugn their characters.

The Chair reminded all Members that it was inappropriate to question the motives of other Members of the House.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **DUNPHY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't challenging anyone's motives; I'm challenging the behavior of the hired guns in the hall. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Vassalboro, Representative Bradstreet.

Representative **BRADSTREET**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd just like to state briefly that voting yes on this particular bill could conceivably cost the ratepayers in this State around $100 million. I certainly don't want to go on record as sticking the ratepayers for $100 million and I hope most of us don't as well. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fort Kent, Representative Theriault.

Representative **THERIAULT**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I only try to rise when I think there's an opportunity to sway Members. It was commented a few days ago on this bill that it could save 10%, maybe 20% at the best; electricity bills is one of the things that I get contacted daily. I had a grocery store just show me a bill for $20,000 for last month and they haven't even started to see the effect of net energy billing. That's coming soon. So, I think that this is a bipartisan issue and we should signal by voting no on this that we want more than 10%

or 20% for our constituents. Every vote matters and sometimes, a vote is a signal to the direction our Body and our Chamber wants to go. And I know that the Chief Executive will take this vote into account as well. So, I would urge Members to stick with their original vote so that we could signal to the constituents that we're actually going to do the work for them and not give them 10% of what's going to be $220 million of extra cost added to a majority of out-of-State interests.

I understand that there are some people who have businesses who benefit from this locally but try telling that to your constituents. Try telling that to a poor middle-class family or an elderly family or elderly couple who's going to open up their bill in three to four, five, six months from now and realize that they're paying for a couple interests that it's just not fair. And the Good Representative from Scarborough, I give her a lot of credit for working diligently on this issue and we can do a lot better. And so, I hope that we send a bipartisan signal that we do not support this legislation because it doesn't go far enough for the poor and the middle class, who are going to be suffering under net energy billing in the years to come. So, I would hope that some follow my light and so we can send a good signal that we can do much better.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Warren.

Representative **WARREN**: I just wanted to rise very briefly just to say again that I oppose the pending motion. I would ask that you follow my light. I believe that we've got to address climate change, that we need to meet our State's ambitious and necessary climate goals, but we can do it in a way that protects ratepayers at fair and reasonable prices. This is not that bill. That measure is possible, it can be bipartisan if we can work together, I think that we can come up with a reasonable and equitable solution on this very complex, important topic. But this is not that bill. I hope that you'll follow my light.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Alfred, Representative Sampson.

Representative **SAMPSON**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I did this this morning when we were in caucus talking about these bills. I wanted to hear from constituents and specifically; I mean, I've heard from a lot of individual constituents and just for reference's sake, I'm from the town of Alfred, the oldest town demographically in the State of Maine. That means I've got the most number of people on fixed incomes. Their electric rates are terrifying them. But I went ahead and I contacted various businesses in my area and in a matter of minutes, I was getting responses and I'm going to put the challenge out there for everyone to do this. It's very eye-opening. But bills that literally have doubled and the comments; I didn't ask for comments, I just said what was it last year, the average, what is it now. It was very simple. I said I want to compare apples with apples. And they've increased essentially on average twice as much. So, if you were paying $1,700, you're paying 34, 35, and in one case, $3,800. So, it's more than double. And this is unsustainable and these small businesses; I mean, stop and think about it, this could drive our little businesses to close and there goes the little restaurant, there goes the convenience store, there goes the farm store, all of these services that we have become accustomed to that serve our communities are going to not be able to sustain this and I implore you let's reconsider this and stick to your vote from earlier. Our constituents; we need to send a message that says we hear you, we hear you, we are trying to help you. I ask you please to consider that and take this to heart. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Carmel, Representative Thorne.

Representative **THORNE**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to the pending motion and to echo what the Good Representative from Alfred said. I did just that. My brother and my nephew own a few ice cream businesses here in Maine. I had a stent, so I'm a little emotional at times when things hit home. My nephew sent me the electricity bills from one location. In January of '21, his electricity bill was $1,000. In January of '22, the electricity bill was $2,264. That's over double. In January of '23, the electricity bill was $3,319. And he finally sent it to his Uncle Jim, a legislator, a Representative of the people of Maine, because in March of 2023, his electricity bill in Ellsworth was $4,533. Madam Speaker, you have to sell a lot of ice creams to pay for an electricity bill of $4,533 in one store. I don't know what to tell him. All I can tell him is that I will vote against the pending legislation and I hope for the sake of small businesses other legislators in this room will follow my light and vote no on this pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from York, Representative Runte.

Representative **RUNTE**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, I think it needs to be abundantly clear that yes, all the rates have gone up considerably for lots of different reasons. But none of it has anything to do with net energy billing. Zero. The issues with the current bills have everything to do with what's happened to supply and rate cases that deal with the delivery charges, and that's it. And if we're going to make comparisons with the other bill that people are talking about and we're going to talk about lobbyists, that bill was prepared entirely by a single special interest group and they didn't bother to take their authorship off the --

Representative **LANIGAN**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sanford, Representative Lanigan.

Representative **LANIGAN**: It seems that we're referring to another bill. I'd like to ask the Member to stay germane to this bill currently. Thank you so much.

On **POINT OF ORDER,** Representative LANIGAN of Sanford asked the Chair if the remarks of Representative RUNTE of York were germane to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would remind the Member to speak directly to the motion and the bill before us.

The Chair reminded Representative RUNTE of York to stay as close as possible to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The Representative may continue.

Representative **RUNTE**: Yes. What this bill doesn't do is it doesn't retroactively affect the 33,000 customers that are in solar programs now. It doesn't deter further development of solar in the State by putting a pale over our commercial reliability. There will be an impact of the existing problem and the existing problem is recognized on a bipartisan basis, that the method that's being used right now is a real problem and it needs to be fixed. But we need to fix it in a way that both solves the problem and allows us to continue moving towards our goals without looking at short-term issues. We can quibble about what the specific number is that needs to be recovered based on what's happened so far. That number is going to come out, it's coming out July 1st in the most recent rate case and it's a small fraction of the overall rate increase that's been applied for and approved in the settlement. But we need to have a forward look to this and to take this short-term view that we're going to do radical changes, it flies in the face of us trying to meet the climate goals that we've established for the State and for reliable

and affordable electricity supply system in the State and, yeah, this is a very complex issue, it's difficult for a lot of people to get their hands around and, unfortunately, when that happens, a lot of misinformation is out and it's a vehicle to exploit people. So, what I'm urging everyone to do is consider 1986 as the appropriate vehicle to both deal with the very high compensation that's being given to developers now but look forward, look to our future in terms of how we deal with this longer term. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dexter, Representative Foster.

Representative **FOSTER**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For five years, I have prided myself on standing in this Chamber and providing facts to other Members of this Chamber, of this House, to consider as they look at voting on different energy bills how they should vote. I have given you many facts as they come out of the Office of the Public Advocate's Office and others, as close as I can provide. To say that we are going to change the course of our fight against climate change if this bill is not passed is not a fact. As I have said before, the PUC said back in 2019 we can get all of the solar that we need by competitively bidding for it without the cost of net energy billing. As a matter of fact, many times Mr. Stoddard, the director of the Efficiency Maine Trust, has sat in our Committee room over the last five years and when we have passed bills has reminded us, because most of them do, if not all, that when we pass a bill that raises the cost of electricity in the State of Maine, we make his job that much harder to get people to convert over to efficient items, whether it's EVs or whether it's LED lightbulbs, which will save ratepayers in the long run because it will reduce the need for electricity.

Madam Speaker, this bill does nothing to address the cost of net energy billing going forward. The Office of the Public Advocate has come out with the numbers, $220 million additional over the next 20 years and that has been backed up by the Public Utilities Commission as being derived from legitimate information. This bill does not address the fact that yes, energy costs have risen greatly because of the tie to natural gas and other fossil fuels. It does not do anything to stop that. So, if we consider the fact that we can get all the competitively bid solar that we need at four cents on average per kilowatt hour and that we're still going to be dependent on fossil fuels and it's going to be tied directly to the standard offer and that if this bill passes, it does nothing to reduce the amount of net energy billing that people will be paying for, why would we support this bill? When we talk about the 33,000, approximately, customers who have signed up for net energy billing solar who would be affected because they may lose their 15% reduction in their bill coming from the solar companies, we have to remember that at least some of those would not be affected because they are below what the limits of other bills might address. But we also have to consider that if, on average, they're going to receive something around $220 off annually as a result of being signed up for these programs, we also have to consider the, what, one million plus people that are out there that are paying for it who, because of net energy billing it's been established will have to pay an additional $275 each annually to pay for net energy billing for those 33,000 current customers. Doesn't make sense to me. I can't go to my community, where very few people can afford to put solar panels on their roof, and tell them that that's a good deal.

I came here to represent my constituents, most of which in the Penquis region are low-middle income to lower-income folks. Many of them are also dependent on many government programs, including LIHEAP. I can't go back there and ask them to pay for those mostly in southern Maine who can afford to put solar on their roofs. But in a bipartisan manner, I will probably have to do that because net energy billing will not be dead in any measure, as I said, that has come out of the Energy Committee this year that has passed out of committee Ought to Pass. Net energy billing will not go away for rooftop, backyard and small community solar. So, that's a myth. We will continue to march forward but we can do so with much less expensive net energy billing solar for the people of Maine in the future, still get our acres of solar panels that we need to convert over, and the only ones that we'll lose are those who are out-of-State interests who have financed these programs, Madam Speaker, going forward. I ask that you follow my light and vote down the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Albion, Representative Cyrway.

Representative **CYRWAY**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just had to stand up because I've had constituents that I talk to at the grocery store, at the diner, at the hardware stores. They all say the same thing; our electric bill is atrocious. One grocery store told me their bill was running around $3,500 and that was right before COVID struck and then, all of a sudden, it went up to $6,000, and then it was to $10,000 and now with this net energy billing, it's hard to say how much more it's going to be. They said if there's anything you can do to slow that down because if you don't, all this goes onto the customers and so, we're not saving, we end up spending twice as much, we're spending on electric bills but we're also spending on the food we have to buy, we're spending on the items we have to build with, we have to spend it on fuel, we have to; everything's gone up, up, up. And it doesn't stop until we stop. And so, I'm just asking for all of us to stop spending, and this is a spending bill because it's costing customers, our constituents, money. I've got a friend who, you know, he gets about $1,300 a month and he's lucky if he's got one light on at night and a TV and it's gone up. He says I can't keep spending like this, he says, my grocery bill, my heat, everything and he's disabled. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Windham, Representative Pringle.

Representative **PRINGLE**: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in favor of the motion. I'd like to add that I've heard from more constituents asking me to vote in favor than against this bill. I have had constituents on both sides but I would say that I've had at least two-thirds asking me to vote in favor, perhaps even three-quarters. I'd also like to say that I'm somewhat hurt by the statement that I don't care about electricity costs for my constituents because I'm voting in favor of this. I actually care deeply about the electricity costs for all of us. I've listened to the testimony of experts and the Committee and recognize that we live in a very complex world with a lot of things affecting our energy costs and it seems to me, and I'm old enough to have learned to be pragmatic and to realize that sometimes my passions make me vote for something hoping it's going to solve a problem that I'm angry about and then realize that I shot myself in the foot because the solution really wasn't the best long-term solution. So, the art of the long view, I actually had a little education on that when I did executive education at the Wharton Business School and some of them who pointed out that yeah, sometimes you have to do things looking way into the future and I think we've heard that from our Members of the Energy Committee. And I love the passion of our younger climate savers but I'm a little worried that some of their ideas are not as pragmatic and not as effective. So, I hope that you will listen to our experts who came together and not respond to the concerns

about who's making money about our past mistakes. That's water over the dam. Let's look at how to invest our money the right way over the long view to get all of our costs down. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Windham, Representative Bagshaw.

Representative **BAGSHAW**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also serve in Windham and I'm having quite the opposite; people contact me that are struggling and don't want this. So, I just think things on the other side of Windham are different and they don't want this. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Montville, Representative Zeigler.

Representative **ZEIGLER**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise but would also like to say that there are many lobbyists out there, there always are many lobbyists, and they are on both sides. So, I would suggest that we are all lobbied by many different individuals. I hear from my constituents and many have asked me to vote for 1896. I am a member of AARP. I am on a fixed income, I realize that. We need to look at the future and we need to work towards electrifying our State so we can reduce our use on fossil fuels. The Good Representative from Scarborough says she believes in this but she feels this isn't the bill. I disagree. I think this is the bill. We are going after federal funding to reduce the cost. We looked at stranded costs so we could reduce the cost of NEB. This will reduce the cost. Electric bills are not expensive because of NEB right now, they are expensive because of natural gas. So, I hope that people realize that we need to move forward and this bill will move us forward and it will help the ratepayers in this State. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Embden, Representative Dunphy.

Representative **DUNPHY**: I would just like to state the obvious. If we continue with the net energy billing the way it is or with this bill, we won't need to worry about decreasing our energy consumption because businesses will be leaving the State in droves. What we are doing is unsustainable, in my opinion it's unethical and it's immoral to be dumping these costs for a very few businesses on our constituents. It's unfair and it's unjust. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sanford, Representative Lanigan.

Representative **LANIGAN**: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just would like to pose a question through the Chair. And just because I might want to switch my vote, too, is in the last hour that we were sitting here, is there something different in the bill that I'm not catching that is making us change our minds? Just if anyone has that knowledge, thank you so much.

The SPEAKER: The Member has posed a question to anyone who cares to answer.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Passage to be Enacted. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 339

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Bell, Boyle, Brennan, Bridgeo, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collings, Copeland, Craven, Crockett, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Fay, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Hepler, Hobbs, Jauch, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Madigan, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Millett R, Montell, Moonen, Moriarty, Murphy, Osher, Paulhus, Perry A, Perry J, Pringle, Rana, Reckitt, Roberts, Roeder, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Shaw, Sheehan, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Zager, Zeigler.

NAY - Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Blier, Boyer, Bradstreet, Campbell, Carlow, Carmichael, Costain, Crafts, Cyrway, Davis, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Eaton, Faulkingham, Foster, Fredericks, Galletta, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Landry, Lanigan, LaRochelle, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, Millett H, Milliken, Morris, Ness, Newman, Nutting, O'Connell, O'Neil, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Pomerleau, Quint, Riseman, Russell, Sampson, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Theriault, Thorne, Underwood, Walker, Warren, White B, White J, Williams, Wood, Woodsome, Madam Speaker.

ABSENT - Adams, Andrews, Collamore, Cray, Gifford, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Kessler, Parry, Rielly, Rudnicki, Worth.

Yes, 63; No, 76; Absent, 12; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

63 having voted in the affirmative and 76 voted in the negative, with 12 being absent, and accordingly the Bill **FAILED PASSAGE TO BE ENACTED** and was sent to the Senate.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The following matter, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment Friday, June 23, 2023, had preference in the Orders of the Day and continued with such preference until disposed of as provided by House Rule 502.

SENATE DIVIDED REPORT - Majority (9) **Ought to Pass** - Minority (3) **Ought Not to Pass** - Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS** on Bill "An Act to Reduce the Enrollment Requirement for Minor Political Parties That Seek Official Party Status"

(S.P. 328) (L.D. 769)

- In Senate, Majority **OUGHT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED**.

TABLED - May 23, 2023 (Till Later Today) by Representative SUPICA of Bangor.

PENDING - **ACCEPTANCE OF EITHER REPORT**.

Representative SUPICA of Bangor moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass** Report.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

ROLL CALL NO. 340

YEA - Abdi, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Arford, Babin, Bagshaw, Bell, Blier, Boyer, Bradstreet, Bridgeo, Campbell, Carlow, Carmichael, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collings, Costain, Crafts, Crockett, Cyrway, Davis, Dhalac, Dodge, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Dunphy, Eaton, Faulkingham, Fay, Foster, Fredericks, Galletta, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Hasenfus, Henderson, Hepler, Hobbs, Hymes, Jauch, Javner, Lajoie, Landry, Lanigan, LaRochelle, Lee, Lemelin, Libby, Lookner, Lyman, Madigan, Mason, Millett H, Milliken, Morris, Ness, Newman, Nutting, O'Connell, Osher, Paul, Paulhus, Perkins, Perry A, Perry J, Pluecker, Poirier, Polewarczyk, Pomerleau, Quint, Riseman, Roeder, Russell,