

Legislative BULLETIN

A PUBLICATION OF MAINE MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

Vol. XXIV No. 7

February 15, 2002

Tax Committee Retreats From Local Option

A couple of weeks ago the Taxation Committee voted on a local option sales tax proposal that would have provided Maine's service center communities with an opportunity to raise revenue for regionally important economic development capital projects through a targeted local sales tax rather than on the property tax. LD 883, the *Debt Avoidance Act*, would allow the voters in a municipality to adopt by referendum a local sales tax of up to one penny to fund specific projects at specific costs for limited durations of time. The poster child for the need for some mechanism like the *Debt Avoidance Act* is the City of Bangor which needs to find some mechanism other than the over-strapped property tax to finance the Bangor City Auditorium or else shut it down.

At the public hearings on this bill, service center communities from across the state explained the incapacity of the property tax to meet the needs of the capital projects that should be located in their communities for the benefit of much larger economic regions. Except for the Bangor Area Chamber of Commerce, which clearly sees the connection between the Bangor Auditorium and economic vitality of Penobscot County and beyond, Maine's business advocacy groups are in lock-step opposition to any local option opportunity.

The Taxation Committee took its first vote on LD 883 a couple of weeks ago and came out almost evenly divided with a 7-6 ought not to pass report. In the two week interim since that preliminary vote the service cen-

ter municipalities, the administration of Governor King and other proponents of a local option authority prepared an amendment to the bill that would even further restrict the ability of municipalities to exercise the local option authority. The amended version would require specific legislative approval of each and every local option proposal before it could even be pre-

sented to the local voters for their consideration at referendum.

In all the 32 states in this nation that authorize local option sales taxation there could not possibly be a more limiting piece of enabling legislation than this amendment proffered by the service center communities that are in need of some help.

Illogically, the vote on this more-limited local option proposal was more sharply negative than the earlier vote on the broader proposal. If logic ruled the day in the Legislature it would

(continued on page 2)

Tax Reform – Now or Maybe Never

Maybe it's just property tax relief you're after, pure and simple, because there are people in your community who really can't afford to pay their property tax bills and they're too proud to apply for a government check. You should be interested in comprehensive tax reform.

Maybe it's because you don't think the way that state subsidy for K-12 education is distributed to your community is particularly fair. Maybe you're in the middle of a fight with the other communities in your school administrative district over how the school bill should be portioned out among you. You should be interested in comprehensive tax reform.

Maybe you think it's very odd as a matter of public policy that you try to attract economic development to your community only to have to work out complicated and sometimes controversial Tax Increment Financing programs to shelter that new value from the education subsidy formula. Maybe you're in a community that doesn't get that economic development, and think the system of sheltering value accomplished by your neighboring community is unfair to you. Maybe you think it's kind of weird that businesses pay the communities their personal property taxes and then the state turns around and pays the businesses back. Maybe you think there's a more coherent way to assess personal property tax in Maine. You should be interested in comprehensive tax reform.

Maybe you don't like assessing high property taxes on undeveloped property because you think it pushes that property to become developed. You should be interested in comprehensive tax reform.

Maybe you think the state and the community should be able to get their arms around the costs of K-12 education in Maine so that we can predictably plan for those expenses and be able to gauge when not enough

(continued on page 5)

General Assistance Compromise Struck

LD 1963, *An Act to Amend the Laws Governing Eligibility for General Assistance* was submitted to the Legislature by Rep. Richard Duncan (Presque Isle) for the purpose of resolving a fundamental contradiction in General Assistance (GA) law.

At issue is the treatment of "lump sum" income, especially with respect to an initial applicant. An initial applicant is a person that has not applied for GA for at least a year.

In 1993, GA law was comprehensively reformed with a common theme of increasing expectations of personal responsibility among GA recipients. Along with many reforms enacted that year, one change would prevent recipients of large lump sum payments (workers compensation settlements, inheritance, lottery winnings, etc.) from receiving local welfare benefits for a period of time proportionate to the size of the lump sum payment. The system of implementing that policy is called the "proration" of lump sum income.

Although this new policy in 1993 was expressly enacted to apply to initial as well as repeat GA applicants, a parallel change to the definition of "lump sum payment" was not made because of an oversight in drafting the new law. Because that parallel change was not enacted, a conflict about whether lump sum proration should be applied to initial applicants exists in

current GA law.

LD 1963 was submitted to correct that oversight by conforming the definition of lump sum payment to the policy of prorating those payments as usable household income over time.

At the public hearing on LD 1963 on January 31st, advocates for people of low income tried to convince the Human Services Committee to reconcile the contradictory statutes in the other direction, by abandoning the policy of holding initial GA applicants accountable for how they spend a large lump sum windfall.

The Human Services Committee asked the Department of Human Services, the municipal welfare directors and the advocates for the poor to attempt to work out a compromise, and they did. On February 7th, the Human Services Committee accepted the result of the negotiations, which achieve the following results:

1) The intention of LD 1963 will be retained. The contradiction in General Assistance law will be reconciled so that the lump sum payments received by an initial GA applicant can be reasonably prorated in the process of determining that applicant's eligibility for assistance.

2) An initial applicant who is not eligible to receive assistance solely on the basis of a proration of lump sum income will be eligible to receive emergency assistance to address an immediate need. Upon subsequent applications for GA, that applicant's eligibility will be subject to all the qualifying standards of GA law.

3) The lump sum income proration rules will be clarified to ensure that they are reasonably applied. Specifically, if an applicant has spent lump sum income repaying a loan and it can be verified that the loan was provided to the applicant to pay for basic necessities, the value of the loan repayment will be subtracted or "disregarded" from the value of the lump sum pay-

ment before proration. In addition, the lump sum value will be divided by the household's actual monthly costs for basic needs to determine the duration of the lump sum proration, or 150% of the federal poverty level for that household, which ever yields a shorter period of proration.

Finally, the amended version of LD 1963 directs the Department of Human Services to convene a stakeholder's group of municipal welfare directors and low income advocates to review the adequacy of the existing overall maximum levels of basic needs established in GA laws – another element of the 1993 General Assistance reforms. (GH)

LOCAL OPTION (cont'd)

make no sense. Legislators who supported the more easily available local option opportunity two weeks ago would have no reason to vote against this more narrowly tailored version a fortnight later, but they did. Among the Taxation Committee members present at the time of the vote the proposal went down 7-3 and after the absent members of the Tax Panel register their votes it will be at least 8-5 if not 9-4 against the proposal.

The municipalities are asking only one question. *If not this, then what?* The legislative process is naturally a frustrating one. To a degree it is designed to be that way. Proposals to change the status quo, in taxation or in any other area of public policy, are forced through the crucible of the legislative process to be winnowed out or ultimately strengthened by something akin to natural selection, so that only the strongest ideas will survive. At the same time it is undeniable that with respect to tax policy something needs to be done, that the state's urban areas are being strangled by the Legislature's over reliance on the property tax.

But it becomes clearer and clearer with each passing day that nothing will bring this Legislature together to solve the problem, as the members race to adjourn this legislative session and go home to campaign for reelection in November. (GH)

Legislative Bulletin

A weekly publication of the Maine Municipal Association throughout sessions of the Maine State Legislature.

Subscriptions to the *Bulletin* are available at a rate of \$20 per calendar year. Inquiries regarding subscriptions or opinions expressed in this publication should be addressed to: *Legislative Bulletin*, Maine Municipal Association, 60 Community Drive, Augusta, ME 04330. Tel: 623-8428.

Editorial Staff: Geoffrey Herman, Kate Dufour, Kirsten Hebert, and Laura Veilleux of the State & Federal Relations staff.

Barrier to Affordable Housing?

On Wednesday this week the Transportation Committee heard public testimony on LD 1982, *An Act to Reduce the Economic Impact of Seasonally Posted Roads*. As proposed, LD 1982 would allow all vehicles to travel on posted roads. Municipalities would be authorized to issue permits to travel on posted roads and to assess fees for those permits to pay for any damage caused to the roads. The permit fees, however, would be set by the Department of Transportation.

Rep. Nancy Sullivan (Biddeford), who sponsored the bill on behalf of the manufactured housing industry, provided testimony outlining three reasons why LD 1982 is important. First, Rep. Sullivan believes that road posting standards, to the extent that they are necessary, should be uniform in all municipalities. Second, she believes that without perfect uniformity, the manufactured housing industry will continue to experience economic hardships. According to Rep. Sullivan, this industry virtually closes down six to eight weeks during the "spring thaw" months, because of posted roads. Finally, Rep. Sullivan believes that LD 1982 would promote affordable housing by preventing municipal officials from posting roads which they allegedly do to block modular and mobile homes from their communities.

Although the public hearing process provides an opportunity for any person to state their opinion on a particular bill, MMA believes that the testimony provided by the bill sponsor was inaccurate. First, although roads are posted, it does not necessarily mean that all travel is prohibited. For example, in those communities that have adopted MMA's model ordinance, there is an exemption for travel over posted roads that are "solidly frozen". Other communities may have exemptions that allow for travel so long as other conditions are met, such as limiting travel to certain hours in the day, requiring the posting of bonds, requiring parties to travel with partial loads, and so on.

MMA is also concerned with the claim that municipal officials post roads

for the purpose of preventing modular and mobile housing developments in their communities. The law authorizing both the state and the municipalities to protect their road investments during spring thaw runs very deep in Maine's history. Municipal officials post their roadways, in parallel with the state, to protect the public investment...period.

Other proponents of the bill included representatives from the modular housing industry. Most of the testimony focused on stories regarding the economic hardships caused by the posting of local roads. Although Senate Chair Christine Savage (Knox Cty.) and Rep. Gary Wheeler (Eliot) pressed for examples, no substantiated evidence was provided to illustrate that municipal officials were unwilling to work with interested parties to assist in alleviating specific delays caused by road posting. As a matter of fact, in two instances it was brought to light that the manufactured industry representatives had not talked to their municipal officials regarding the need to travel over posted roads. Most of the proponents of the bill promised to bring additional information to the work session.

In addition to MMA, the Maine Oil Dealers Association (MODA) and Maine Better Transportation Association (MBTA) provided testimony in opposition to the bill.

MMA's opposition focused on the need of municipalities to protect the road infrastructure. According to MMA's 2001 Fiscal Survey, it is estimated that statewide municipalities invest \$186 million to maintain and improve the nearly 14,000 miles of local roads. Based on the fact that it is the responsibility of the local legislative body to raise the funds necessary to maintain and improve the local infrastructure, municipal officials cannot support any initiative that will relax laws and limit the local authority, as is proposed in LD 1982, to appropriately protect the taxpayers transportation investments.

MODA opposed LD 1982 on the basis that it would undo the changes to the posted road laws that were passed by

the 119th Legislature. In 2000 the posted road laws were amended to allow any truck delivering home heating fuel and operating in accordance with a DOT permit to travel over any town or county road in Maine without a local permit to drive over posted roads. Prior to the amendment, and as proposed in LD 1982, home heating fuel delivery trucks were required to obtain a municipal permit as well. The MODA representative felt that the change would undo all of the work municipal officials and oil dealers had undertaken to reach this compromise.

The Department of Transportation (DOT) testified "neither for nor against" LD 1982. The Department believes that since the roads in question are local, the state should not be held responsible for determining permit fees. The DOT representative suggested instead that DOT, through its Local Road Center, could provide municipalities with assistance in informing the general public about the road posting and un-posting process. MMA supports this recommendation.

The work session on LD 1982 is scheduled for Tuesday, February 26th at 1:30 PM in room 126 in the State House. (KD)

Posted Road Survey

On Monday, February 11th MMA mailed a survey regarding posted roads to all municipalities in Maine. The survey is being used to gather information on the processes used by municipalities to post roads and authorize travel on those posted roads.

Our intent is to use the information collected in the survey to create a road posting database. The database will list the road posting process used by the municipality, whether a paper permit is needed to travel on posted roads, and appropriate local official to contact for each municipality.

As of the printing of this article, we had received surveys from 130 municipalities. We want to take this opportunity to thank all of you who have participated and to encourage others to send in their surveys. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Kate Dufour at 1-800-452-8786 or at kdufour@memun.org.

Growth Management Redux

The Natural Resource Committee held public hearings on Monday this week covering an assortment of six growth management bills. All of this legislation was recommended by an *ad hoc* growth management study committee that was created in 2001 by the Legislature.

Of all the bills consumed at the public hearing, the one that generated the most discussion was LD 2062, *An Act to Clarify the Use of Municipal Rate of Growth Ordinances*. LD 2062 is a reiteration of LD 1643, *An Act to Provide Criteria for the Municipal Use of Rate of Growth Ordinances* (Sponsor, Rep. Bob Daigle of Arundel), which was carried over from the last legislative session. The first iteration prohibited a municipality from enacting an ordinance that caps the number of building permits issued in a year unless the cap was used for the duration of only one year and only once within a five year period. Ongoing growth cap systems could only be used as part of an integrated growth management strategy that included both a comprehensive plan and a capital investment plan. Rep. Daigle's bill allowed the use of an ongoing building permit limit within the municipality's designated rural area.

The growth management study committee amended the original bill into LD 2062, which includes the following restrictions on growth cap ordinances. LD 2062 allows the use of an ongoing building permit limit in areas designated by the municipality's comprehensive plan as "rural". The bill also requires the municipality's comprehensive plan to justify the need for a growth cap, which is now current law. The bill directs the State Planning Office (SPO) to create the formula that would determine the number of building permits the town may issue within a year. If the building permit limit calculated by SPO doesn't work for the municipality, LD provides that the municipality could apply a building permit limit in the growth zones for a

time not to exceed two years in any ten-year period.

The Maine Association of Realtors testified in support of the bill with the claim that growth caps have resulted in sprawl in southern Maine. The realtors say these caps contribute to the affordable housing crisis and shift growth from one town to the next. The developers say that growth caps are responsible for pushing development away from available services, resulting in more traffic that contributes to air pollution.

The SPO provided testimony that LD 2062 would help provide guidance

in balancing an individual community's interest with the surrounding communities as well as the interests of the state taxpayers, who are responsible for footing the bill for the schools that follow the shifting population.

MMA testified in opposition to the bill for two primary reasons. Just nine months ago, the Legislature enacted LD 1693, *An Act to Amend the Comprehensive Planning and Land Regulation Laws*, which restricted the use of rate-of-growth ordinances to only those municipalities with a consistent comprehensive plan. That law provided SPO with the clear authority to determine whether or not any particular growth cap ordinance is an appropriate tool in the implementation of a

(continued on page 5)

Solid Waste Facilities

In a 7 to 4 vote, the Natural Resource Committee voted LD 2005, *An Act Ensure the Public Benefits of Solid Waste Facilities* (Sponsored by Rep. Glenn Cummings of Portland) "ought not to pass". LD 2005 would extend the applicability of the public benefit determination test to include large commercial transfer stations and would also require solid waste disposal facilities that currently have a license for a particular classification of waste to receive a determination of "substantial public benefit" prior to accepting another class of waste.

The Committee entertained an amendment that would require the DEP to find a substantial public benefit in siting new transfer stations and would also require a facility that is seeking to handle a significant increase in the amount of MSW at an existing solid waste facility would be reviewed as a new application, and therefore must have a finding of substantial public benefit.

The representative from the DEP stated that the language in the proposed amendment was more narrowly defined as to apply only to transfer stations rather than sludge spreading facilities and composting facilities. However, the DEP also expressed concern that the public benefit determination was a crude way to protect municipal investments.

Senator John Martin (Aroostook Cty.) said that he reviewed information from the DEP that tracked the quantity of MSW that had been sent to the quasi-municipal waste to energy facilities and he determined that these facilities were receiving a sufficient amount of MSW to remain competitive with the private market. Senator Martin went on to say that though the State may have mandated the municipalities close the landfills, it was the individual municipalities that elected to establish a waste to energy facility, and therefore the consequence of those decisions properly rests with them.

Before the vote, there was a discussion that perhaps Committee members would be willing to further investigate the need for reviewing the public benefit determination when a disposal facility submits an application for accepting an expanded class of waste. The Committee's vote, however, speaks for itself. (KH)

GROWTH (cont'd)

municipality's overall growth management plan. If the municipality cannot justify a growth cap system, it can't use the ordinance. That extremely pertinent change to the law hasn't even had a chance to be implemented, and the real estate developers, in concert with the State Planning Office, are already looking for further restrictions on local regulatory authority.

MMA also testified that growth cap ordinances are legitimate planning tools necessary to comply with the mandate that municipalities monitor and control growth. A building permit limitation ordinance in the municipalities that need them is the equivalent of a speed limit; it ensures traffic will move along at a speed that will prevent gridlock and it is critical for safety on hazardous roads or conditions. Growth caps are similar in nature and purpose; the caps regulate the rate of growth within a community, thus preserving the limited infrastructure capacity that is necessary to accommodate existing and new residential structures. Such infrastructure includes school capacity, roads, water systems, sanitary systems, transfer stations and solid waste disposal capacity, police, as well as fire and emergency services.

Growth caps are being used in very limited and targeted ways by just 14 municipalities (less than 3%) in Maine today. The majority of the fourteen communities that have enacted growth cap ordinances are border towns and have experienced a heavy immigration of residents. Many of these residents are moving into Maine from Massachusetts since it is possible to commute to work within an hour's drive.

When the Home Builders Association took the Town of Eliot to court in an attempt to overturn its building permit limitation ordinance, Maine's Supreme Court responded in a decision that supported the town by saying that the Homebuilders' attempt to restrict Eliot's ordinance "would have an effect on communities across this State that currently use reasonable growth management ordinances to manage – but not to halt – development...The towns actions have complied with the

legislative mandate to 'encourage orderly growth and development'." (Home Builders Association v. Town of Eliot, 750 A2d 572).

The Law Court's observation still rings true.

Other growth management legislation in the study committee's six bill package includes:

LD 2049, *An Act to Authorize the Transfer of Development Rights*. This bill would drop a one-liner into the Growth Management Act saying that municipalities could regulate development by adopting transfer of development rights ordinances. This type of regulation, which municipalities can already adopt under their home rule authority, requires developers to purchase development rights in rural areas of the community in order to create development in the growth area. Among other duties of the municipality in implementing such an ordinance, it must ensure that the extinguished development rights in the rural areas are never resurrected.

LD 2094, *An Act to Encourage Regionalism in Municipal Growth Management*. Among other additions to the Growth Management Act provided by this bill, the word "municipality" would be effectively struck from growth management law, to be replaced by the term "planning district". This change would purportedly encourage regional approaches to land use planning.

LD 2061, *An Act to Establish a Pilot Program to Provide Incentives for Multimunicipal Development*. This bill would create yet another special preference to gain access to the capital grant resources in the Municipal Investment Trust Fund (MITF), which has never been capitalized in any meaningful way by the Legislature in its 10-year history. Under the terms of this bill, up to five multi-municipal consortiums that receive special approval by a group of state agency commissioners (the "Land and Water Resources Council") would have preferential access to the MITF.

LD 2070, *An Act to Establish the Community Preservation Advisory Committee*. This bill would create a

semi-permanent Growth Management Study Committee, on the apparent theory that the *ad hoc* committees that have been created thus far are either not prolific enough with their recommendations or lack endurance over time. The 13 members of this Committee would include three Senators, four House members, the Director of the State Planning Office, and representatives from the Maine State Housing Authority, a statewide environmental organization, the real estate developers, a service center municipality and a rural municipality. The duties of the proposed Committee include providing assessments, advice, and recommendations to streamlining local and state land use rules and regulations to permit or encourage efficient neighborhood and economic development in growth areas.

The work sessions for the growth management bills will be on Monday the 25th at 9:30. (KH)

TAX REFORM (cont'd)

or too much money is put into an individual school system. Maybe you think school funding should have a rational basis other than historical spending levels. You should be interested in comprehensive tax reform.

Maybe you think the voters of Maine should have a right to chart which course they wish to take with respect to the state's tax code. Maybe you think it won't be long before the voters exert that right, whether the Legislature wants to craft a responsible initiative or not.

The package of comprehensive tax reform legislation is found in LD 2086 and LD 2087. The public hearing on this proposal is Tuesday, February 19th at 1:30 in room 127 of the State House.

As to whether or not you should attend this public hearing, the test is a simple one.

Maine's property, sales and income tax code is just fine and should not be substantially altered.

The legislature should undertake the development of responsible comprehensive tax reform.

Check the box.

IN THE HOPPER

(The bill summaries are written by MMA staff and are not necessarily the proposed bill's summary statement or an excerpt of that summary statement. A more comprehensive list of LDs (of municipal interest) that have been put in the Hopper can be found on MMA's website, www.memun.org)

Education and Cultural Affairs

LD 2103 – An Act Regarding Essential Programs and Services. (Reported by Rep. Richard for the Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs pursuant to Joint Order 2001, H.P. 1579)

This bill would establish a chapter of Maine law to govern the "Essential Programs and Services" (EPS) funding model for K-12 public education, as well as a series of directives to the State Board of Education and Department of Education to plan out the transition for the current General Purpose Aid to Education (GPA) model to the EPS model. Specifically, the bill would: (1) define EPS as "those educational resources that must be provided for all students to meet the standards in the 8 content standard subject areas of the system of learning results"; (2) establish a joint state and local funding obligation to support EPS, without indicating the share of the state's financial responsibility; (3) establish which elements of

an overall school budget will be supported by EPS on a per pupil basis and which will not, specifically identifying school personnel, supplies and equipment, specialized services, and administrative services as all subsidizable on a per pupil basis, while identifying transportation costs, bus purchases, vocational education, small school adjustments, teacher educational attainment, and the several existing special adjustments to GPA (Geographic Isolation, special education for state agency clients, etc.) as educational services which are subsidizable on some basis other than a per pupil basis; and (4) requiring modified or weighted per pupil guarantees for special education students, limited English proficiency students, economically disadvantaged students and students in Kindergarten through grade 2.

This bill would also direct the Commissioner of Education to calculate two recommended state spending levels for K-12 education for the FY 04 fiscal year, one on the basis of the current GPA system, and the other on the basis of the EPS system. The directives of this bill would further require the full implementation of EPS by FY 08 and the development of a phase-in plan that would show what it would take for the state to be financially participating in K-12 education at least at the 50% level (exclusive of federal funds) by that full implementation date.

Centralized Voter List

On Thursday, February 14th, the Legal and Veterans Affairs Committee listened to a presentation by Secretary of State Dan Gwadosky outlining the report of a task force, created during the last legislative session, to study the feasibility of establishing a centralized voter registration database system in Maine.

The 13-member task force, was charged with studying the requirements necessary to develop and implement a centralized voter registration database. The goal for creating the centralized voter database was to eliminate duplicate registrations, administer automatic changes of address, provide for systematic list maintenance and produce current voter registration statistics. The task force consisted of municipal representatives, the League of Women Voters, members of the public, the political parties, the state information officer, state election officials and the Secretary of State,

After four meetings and several months of work the task force concluded that the system should be fully implemented by December 31, 2007 and used by every municipality in Maine. To assist communities with the

transition, the task force proposal requires the Secretary of State to develop a pilot program in order to address all possible concerns prior to requiring all communities to participate in the program. The task force proposal also establishes an advisory committee to monitor the implementation phase to ensure that all interested parties are integrated into the process. Furthermore, the proposal requires the Secretary of State to adopt major substantive rules, establish a voter identification process, to determine the pricing, accessibility and availability of information contained in the database, and establish an incremental implementation plan for municipalities to participate in the database.

Although there may be a cost to municipalities associated with the development of the centralized voter registration database system, there are some benefits. First, this system would improve the integrity and accuracy of voter information by ensuring that each person is registered to vote in one place only. It is expected that the statewide database would automatically remove voters from previous lists as they register to vote in a different community.

Second, the system, which would be regularly updated, would provide for administrative efficiencies, particularly when validating signatures on citizen initiated petitions. Third, the system would allow for the electronic transmission and tabulation of election results. Finally, the process developed by the task force provides for ongoing monitoring and comments from interested parties, both through the establishment of the advisory committee and through the rulemaking process. As designed by the task force, municipal officials will have ample opportunities to help design a database system that takes into consideration their needs.

MMA's 70-member Legislative Policy Committee will not take a position on the recommendations of the task force until its February 28th meeting. If you are interested in receiving a copy of the task force report, please contact MMA's Laura Veilleux at 1-800-452-8786.

The Legal and Veterans Affairs Committee also unanimously voted that LD 2063, *An Act to Require Timely Consideration of Appeals of Decision of the Registrar of Voters* ought not to pass. As proposed, LD 2063 would require that all appeals of the registrar of voters be heard prior to the closing of the polls on an election day. (KD)

LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS

NOTE: You should check your newspapers for Legal Notices as there may be changes in the hearing schedule. Weekly schedules and supplements are available at the Senate Office at the State House and at the Legislature's web site at <http://janus.state.me.us/legis>. If you would like to be notified by e-mail of updates to the schedule and web page, send your name, e-mail address, and a message that includes "ANPH UPDATE" to the Senate Webmaster at webmaster_senate@state.me.us.

Tuesday, February 19

Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry

Room 206, Cross State Office Bldg., 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-1312

LD 2096 – Resolve, to Promote the Interests of the People of Maine when Public Funds are Used to Acquire Conservation Easements. (Reported by Rep. McGlocklin for the Committee to Study)

Access to Private and Public Lands in Maine pursuant to Joint Order 2001, H.P. 1387)

LD 2097 – An Act to Implement the Recommendations of the Committee to Study Access to Private and Public Lands in Maine. (Reported by Rep. McGlocklin for the Committee to Study)

Access to Private and Public Lands in Maine pursuant to Joint Order 2001, H.P. 1387)

Taxation

Room 127, State House, 1:30 p.m.

Tel: 287-1552

LD 2086 – An Act to Implement the Recommendations of the Education Funding Reform Committee. (Reported by Rep. Green, for the Education Funding Reform Committee pursuant to Public Law 2001, chapter 439, Part SSS)

LD 2087 – Resolution, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine to Allow the Legislature to Establish Classes of Property for Purposes of Taxation and to Exempt Personal Property from Taxation if there is an Excise Tax on Certain Personal Property. (Reported by Rep. Green, for the Education Funding Reform Committee pursuant to Public Law 2001, chapter 439, Part SSS)

Wednesday, February 20

Natural Resources

Room 437, State House, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-4149

LD 1887 – An Act to Permit Underground Storage Tanks in Low-risk Areas. (Sponsored by Sen. Small of Sagadahoc County; additional cosponsors)

LD 2016 – An Act to Facilitate Compliance with Spill Prevention Requirements and Authorize Reimbursement for Certain Oil Spill Remediation Expenses. (Sponsored by Rep. Crabtree of Hope; additional cosponsor)

LD 2084 – An Act Regarding Workers' Compensation and Liability

Immunity Coverage for Emergency Management Forces. (Reported by Rep. Duplessie for the Commission to Study the Implementation of a Unified Emergency Response for Emergency Releases and Spills of Toxic or Hazardous Materials pursuant to Resolve 2001, chapter 65, section 7)

LD 2076 – Resolve, Regarding Legislative Review of Amendments to Chapter 305, Permit by Rule Standard and Chapter 310, Wetland Protection Regarding Cutting and Removal of Vegetation, Major Substantive Rules of the Department of Environmental Protection. (Emergency) (Reported by Rep. Cowger for the Department of Environmental Protection pursuant to the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 5, section 8072)

Transportation

Room 126, State House, 1:30 p.m.

Tel: 287-4148

LD 2092 – An Act to Make Additional Allocations from the Highway Fund and Other Funds for the Expenditures of State Government and to Change Certain Provisions of State Law Necessary to the Proper Operations of State Government for the Fiscal Years Ending June 30, 2002 and June 30, 2003. (Emergency) (Governor's Bill) (Sponsored by Rep. Fisher of Brewer; additional cosponsors)

Thursday, February 21

Education & Cultural Affairs

Room 214, Cross State Office Bldg., 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-3125

LD 2103 – An Act Regarding Essential Programs and Services. (Reported by Rep. Richard for the Joint Standing Committee on Education and Cultural Affairs pursuant to Joint Order 2001, H.P. 1579)

Labor

Room 220, Cross State Office Bldg., 1:30 p.m.

Tel: 287-1333

LD 2098 – An Act to Protect the Rights of Maine Citizens Under Collective Bargaining Agreements. (After Deadline) (Emergency) (Sponsored by Rep. Dunlap of Old Town; additional cosponsors)

Friday, February 22

Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry

Room 209, Cross State Office Bldg., 9:00 a.m.

Tel: 287-1312

LD 1920 – An Act to Address Liquidation Harvesting. (Sponsored by Sen. Kilkelly of Lincoln; additional cosponsors)

Business & Economic Development

Room 208, Cross State Office Bldg., 11:00 a.m.

Tel: 287-1312

(Possible Work Session to follow public hearing)

LD 2099 – An Act to Provide for Livable, Affordable Neighborhoods. (Reported by Rep. Koffman for the Joint Study Committee to Study Growth Management Pursuant to Joint Order 2001, H.P. 1330)