

Tax Reform/Tax Relief

Tax Reform Working Group Makes Progress

As reported in last week's *Bulletin*, legislative leadership convened a bipartisan, ad hoc working group of legislators for the purpose of trying to find a nugget of consensus around the approach to take in the quest for a tax reform/tax relief recommendation.

The working group made some very significant progress during its two meetings this week; municipal and school officials should take notice.

First, the working group reacquainted itself with the Essential Programs and Services (EPS) school funding model and the issues associated with establishing a school funding distribution system based on the concept of a maximum local mill rate effort to support education. The working group also looked at several proposals to fund EPS, including current law, the Legislature's own "1B" competing measure proposal, and a more aggressive and straightforward funding "ramp-up" recommended by MMA and the Maine Education Association.

The working group is now poised to recommend that the foundation of any property tax relief proposal is the adoption of a firm commitment by the Legislature to fund 55% of the cost of K-12 education, as measured by EPS, and to achieve that level of state support according to a coherent, steady, predictable ramp of commitments beginning in this upcoming fiscal year (FY 05) and concluding no later than 2010.

Among the gaggle of tax relief or tax reform proposals that blossomed-

forth over the last several weeks – a conspicuous result of the certification of the 1% tax cap petition circulated by Carol Palesky – municipal and school officials have been dismayed by the seeming absence of any connection being made between property tax burden and school funding decisions at the state level.

That is what makes the finding of this working group so significant. All property tax problems are not solved

by this proposal. Massive property tax relief will not be immediately forthcoming because of this proposal. It is not glitzy and does not offer a free lunch to anybody. Its strength, however, is that it is the real thing, and not a huge Christmas tree loaded with ornaments and baubles. By recommending that the priority tax-relief investments should be committed to EPS, the working group recommendation focuses on a root cause of property relief pressure rather than symptoms. More on the working group's recommendations will be reported in the weeks ahead, but if it is embraced by the Legislature as the foundation of its tax relief enactments in 2004, that will be a huge step in the right direction.

One Mandate at a Time

On Tuesday of this week, the House narrowly defeated passage of LD 419, *An Act to Repeal Outdated and Unfunded Municipal and Education Mandates* by a margin of 69-68. As reported in several previous editions of the *Bulletin*, the amended version of this bill would create a twelve-member commission charged with identifying, examining the need for, and potentially redesigning the mandates the state places on municipalities, counties, schools and other quasi-municipal districts.

During the debate in the House, proponents of the bill, which included bill sponsor, Rep. Sawin Millett of Waterford, and Stephen Bowen of Rockport, commented on the importance of LD 419 for potentially reducing property taxpayer burden and mending the relationship between state and municipal officials.

Rep. Millett believes that that mandates the state places on municipalities and schools are part of the reason the burden on property taxpayers is so high. If the state does not make a significant effort to address the mandate issue, Rep. Millett believes that the Legislature will send the message to Maine residents that the state is not sympathetic to the burden it has placed and continues to place on property taxpayers.

Rep. Bowen believes the actions of the state over the last two years have generated an "us versus them" atmosphere, which the state could constructively address by enacting LD 419. In order for municipalities and the state to work together on tax reform and regionalization efforts, the relationship between the two levels of governments

Calculating the Palesky Impact: A Workbook

MMA has received many inquiries about analyzing the impact of the 1% property tax cap proposal advanced by Carol Palesky and headed for the statewide ballot either on June 8 or November 2 at the option of the Legislature. The municipal officials want to be able to provide solid information to the citizens in their community about the impact of the proposal, but since the initiative is grafted from California law, uses term that are not defined in Maine law, contains redundant and overlapping provisions, and is generally poor-quality legislation from a drafting perspective, it presents numerous technical, legal and even constitutional problems that make a clean analysis very difficult.

The following step-by-step process is provided as a work-book to help towns assess in a fair way the impact of the 1% tax cap. The idea is to encourage municipal officials to develop a parallel budget that would be enacted if the Palesky proposal were the law of the land at the same time as municipalities and schools are developing their regular budgets for the upcoming fiscal year. The parallel budgeting exercise presents a perfect opportunity to constructively study and provide information to the voters about the Palesky impact.

As a starting point, it should be pointed out that if the Palesky proposal is adopted by the voters in 2004, it will become effective for the tax year that begins on April 1, 2005. It is the April 1, 2005 date of assessment that forms

the financial foundation for municipalities with either a 2005 calendar year budget or a “fiscal year” budget that begins on July 1, 2005 and ends on June 30, 2006. For the purpose of the impact analysis, however, it makes sense to assess the impact of the Palesky proposal as though it was the law in Maine for this upcoming budget cycle (based on the April 1, 2004 date of assessment) so that voters can be provided clean information about the scope of the impacts on municipal services and can make an informed judgment about the vote they will be asked to make on the 1% tax cap in either June or November.

Step #1. Reasonably project what the municipality’s 2004 property tax base will be.

There are two ways to perform this calculation.

Step 1-A. Assuming the unconstitutionality of the limited assessment valuation system. Some legal experts are convinced that a large chunk of the 1% tax cap initiative is straightforwardly unconstitutional, and it doesn’t make a lot of sense to pretend that the portion requiring a “valuation freeze” can become law through this initiative. Specifically, the Palesky proposal would force towns to assess properties at 1996 values and would limit all valualational increases to no more than 2% per year, with adjustments for new construction and when there are property sales. There is a 1994 opinion of the Maine Attorney General’s Office – an opinion that is shared by MMA’s Legal Services Department — that the limited assessment valuation process would be in direct and fatal conflict with Maine’s Constitution, which requires all real and personal property to be assessed at its “just” or “market” value. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the entire “valuational freeze” assessing scheme would be ultimately struck out of the initiative by Maine’s courts. Having said that, the 1% — or 10 mill — cap is not unconstitutional and represents the primary element of the Palesky initiative that could be enacted into law.

How to calculate the 2004 property tax base for your municipality. Municipal assessors and the municipal officers know their 2003 tax base. They also know the prevailing municipal “assessment ratio”, which is determined annually by Maine Revenue Services for each municipality on the basis of a sales ratio analysis. To calculate the projected 2004 property tax base, the 2003 tax base should be divided by the most recently-calculated assessment ratio. That adjusted value should then be adjusted once again to reflect the projected value of new construction that has likely occurred in the municipality over the past year. For most municipalities, the annual new-construction value can be estimated with a fair amount of confidence on the basis of past trends.

Step #1-B. Assuming the full proposal will become law regardless of its constitutional problems. The other way to calculate the 2004 property tax base for your municipality under the Palesky proposal is to apply the full force of the initiative as it was written, which includes the limited assessment valuation system. This approach will require the following steps.

1. Begin with the municipality’s 1996 “true and perfect” list of assessments.
2. Adjust that list for each property by the municipal assessment ratio that was applicable for 1996. This adjustment should effectively “equalize” that value.
3. Amend each property valuation to reflect increases in value that may have occurred due to new construction *between 1999 and the present* by adjusting each account by the full market value of the new construction in the year the new construction occurred.
4. For any property that may have been sold outside of the family between 1996 and the present, amend the property valuation to reflect the market value of the property at the time of sale.

(continued on page 3)

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. Website: www.memun.org

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

There are dozens of questions raised by this system, all attributable to the remarkably poor drafting of the law. A few examples include: How does personal property or other property that clearly depreciated since 1996 get treated under this system? What adjustments are made for “new construction” that occurred between 1996 and 1999? When “new construction” is embedded within existing construction, is the entire property subject to the updated valuation or just the embedded portion? The list goes on.

Despite the questions, this adjusted 1996 “true and perfect” assessment list will become the new property tax base for the municipality if the Palesky proposal is adopted. Going forward from its effective date, the proposal would then allow increases to the 1996 valuations as long as those increases do not exceed 2%. In that same going-forward manner, valuations may also be reduced to reflect substantial damage, destruction or other factors negatively affecting value.

Step #2. Calculate the mill rate effort that would be necessary to pay off the municipality’s annual debt service. The Palesky tax cap proposal prohibits a mill rate over 10 mills, except that the service of pre-existing debt *that has been approved by the voters* is not constrained by that cap. This element of the analysis, therefore, involves calculating the mill rate effort that would need to be applied to service all municipal debt that has been previously approved directly by the voters. Debt that was approved by a municipal council, as a representative body, could not be included in this calculation.

According to the initiative, future capital debt may or may not be constrained by the 10- mill cap depending on how it is approved by the local voters and by the strength of that vote. Specifically, it is only the service on future capital debt that is approved by at least two-thirds of the voters in a “general election” that would not be constrained by the 10 mill cap.

According to the data collected by MMA for the development of its annual *Municipal Fiscal Survey*, the mill

rate effort necessary to pay off the average municipality’s existing annual debt service is one-half of one mill in the smaller communities and up to one-and-one-half mills in the larger communities.

Step #3. Determine the municipality’s maximum allowed mill rate. The Palesky initiative caps property taxes at 1% — or 10 mills — of property value. Therefore, the allowed debt service mill rate to cover pre-existing debt (as calculated under Step #2) should be added to 10 mills. This will be the municipality’s maximum allowed, full value mill rate. For example, the maximum full value mill rate in a smaller town, perhaps with a population of 2,000, might be 10.5 mills, representing the 10 mill cap plus one-half a mill to cover the debt service on existing debt.

Step #4. Determine how much property tax revenue would be available for the budget year. Multiply your municipality’s projected 2004 “full value” (Step #1-A) or its “limited assessment value” (Step #1-B) by the municipality’s maximum allowed mill rate (Step #3). The result will be the property tax revenue that would be available for this upcoming budget cycle if the Palesky initiative were the law today.

Step #5. Apportion the available revenue between the municipal and school budget. The next step in the impact study is to figure out some rational way to apportion the available property tax revenue available under the Palesky tax cap between the municipal and school budget. For municipalities that are within School Administrative Districts (SAD) or Community School Districts (CSD), that apportionment decision is decided by the level of the SAD or CSD assessment. For many of those communities, the school district’s assessment will demand more property tax revenue than the tax cap will allow, and so there will be no property tax revenue for the municipal side of the budget. The point to be made is that under current law a school district’s assessment has first priority on a participating municipality’s revenue, after debt. In

some cases, the school district’s assessment will consume all the property tax revenue and begin digging into motor vehicle tax revenue and municipal revenue sharing until there will be little or no revenue of any kind in those communities to provide any municipal services. The impact analysis regarding municipal government in those cases, although as bleak as it gets, is easy to calculate.

In municipalities with municipal school systems, the apportionment process will be different. For the purposes of the impact analysis, one approach is to figure how much of the property tax revenue currently is used to support the education and the non-education sides of the municipal budget, and to provide those pro-rated shares of the property tax revenue under the Palesky proposal to each. For example, if 60% of all property taxes have been going to the schools, the impact analysis would allocate 60% of the property tax revenue provided under the 1% cap to the schools, to measure the budget effects. In this way, the nature of the impacts to the schools (increased class size, program cut backs, school fee increases, etc.) and the service cut backs on the municipal side can be fairly described and assessed by the voters to see if the result is the type of community in which they want to live.

MANDATES (cont'd)

must be repaired. He believes that a study and an understanding of how mandates impact municipalities, schools and property taxpayers could play a large part in bridging cooperation between state and local government officials. Without acknowledging the pressures state government has placed on municipalities, getting municipal officials to assist in broader issues of statewide importance will be understandably difficult, according to Bowen.

Perhaps admitting to the fact that the State has placed a significant number of mandates on other levels of governments, the opponents of LD 419 expressed concerned with the full-

(continued on page 5)

Freedom of Access Study Report

Committee Deliberates on Recommendations

As reported in previous editions of the *Bulletin*, eleven recommended changes to the Right to Know law have been submitted to the Legislature by a study committee. The study committee was formed by the Legislature last year after the “Freedom of Access Coalition” conducted a municipal and school “Freedom of Access audit” in November 2002 and used the results of that “audit” to make the claim that there was widespread noncompliance with Maine’s Right to Know law on the local level. The Judiciary Committee began deliberating on the several recommendations at work sessions this week.

Thus far, the Judiciary Committee members have accepted the study committee recommendations that were non-controversial or, in the alternative, amended the study committee recommendations to remove the controversy.

The stumbling-block recommen-

dation that the Committee is wrestling with, however, is the proposal to:

1. cap all photocopying fees charged by selected, non-exempt government agencies at 20 cents a page;
2. prohibit those selected governmental agencies from charging any fees to cover the labor of researching an extensive Freedom of Access request for the first two hours and then capping the maximum allowed labor rate after that point at \$10/hour; and
3. prohibiting those agencies from asking for any payment in advance for extensive Freedom of Access research unless the agency would have to invest at least \$250 of labor and photocopying costs, which under the proposed caps would be two full days of labor and 500 photocopies.

The selected governmental agencies affected by these proposed caps and mandatory free-labor requirements are becoming, increasingly, just mu-

nicipal government and the schools. The study committee recommendations expressly allows statutorily-imposed document fees to be exempt from the proposed caps, and the list of state and county agencies that would enjoy that exemption is growing by the day. The courts are entirely exempt, state police background reports would be exempt, the counties are exempt with respect to the fees charged at the registries, law enforcement accident reports would become exempt under the recommendation, and the state police are lining-up for an exemption for their investigative reports. As a matter of fact, to address state budget problems just within the last year, both court document fees and the fees for State Police background check documents have been significantly increased.

Setting aside the ever-expanding discrimination at play, that expressly condones raising revenue for some

Town	County	Population	Per page photocopy fee
Abbott	Piscataquis	630	25 cents
Auburn	Androscoggin	23,203	15 cents
Biddeford	York	20,942	50 cents
Brunswick	Cumberland	21,172	25 cents
Casco	Cumberland	3,469	25 cents
Cooper	Washington	145	15 cents
Deer Isle	Hancock	1,876	No fee assessed
Ellsworth	Hancock	6,456	25 cents
Frenchville	Aroostook	1,225	25 cents
Greenwood	Oxford	802	25 cents
Holden	Penobscot	2,827	25 cents
Kingfield	Franklin	1,103	50 cents
Kittery	York	9,543	25 cents
Litchfield	Kennebec	3,110	15 cents
Mars Hill	Aroostook	1,480	25 cents
Monmouth	Kennebec	3,785	\$1.00
Newcastle	Lincoln	1,748	25 cents
Orland	Hancock	2,134	25 cents
Peru	Oxford	1,515	\$1.00
Richmond	Sagadahoc	3,298	50 cents for residents; \$1.00 non-residents
Scarborough	Cumberland	16,970	\$2.00 for first; 25 cents each additional
South Thomaston	Knox	1,416	20 cents
Stoneham	Oxford	255	10 cents
Union	Knox	2,209	20 cents
Waterville	Kennebec	15,605	\$1.00
Wilton	Franklin	4,123	20 cents
York	York	12,854	50 cents

*This data was collected by the Maine FOI Coalition by calling towns, at random, listed in the Maine Municipal Directory.

ACCESS (cont'd)

public documents and prohibits it for others, the Freedom of Access Coalition's assertion that municipal photocopying rates are widely disparate is also looking pretty thin. The only evidence upon which the entire recommendation was based is that Caribou charged \$6.00 for a police log and that Presque Isle charges \$8.00 for the first page of any public document. According to the entire record contained within both the "Freedom of Access" audit and the study committee's final report, it was on the basis of those two alleged charges that this statewide cap on photocopying rates must be imposed.

It is true there are deep disparities, but they do not seem to exist on the municipal level. The real disparities are the double standard between the charges on the municipal level, which are minimal, and the charges that are assessed by the counties, the courts, and some state agencies, which are

deliberatively revenue-producing... but that is apparently o.k.

In apparent response to MMA's observation that no systematic assessment of the "widely disparate" municipal photocopying fees had been conducted, the Freedom of Access Coalition conducted a random, after-the-fact survey of municipalities. That survey was provided to the Committee just this week and is included verbatim as a sidebar to this article. This survey was not in the hands of the study committee when it determined that capping municipal photocopying charges at 20 cents a page should be a high legislative priority. The survey shows very clearly that municipalities as a general rule charge very reasonable fees for photocopying public documents.

Some members of the Judiciary Committee seem to see through the allegations and rhetoric and are seeking a

flexible standard that would allow reasonable rate-setting at the local level rather than a top-down mandate from Augusta, especially where the Legislature is simultaneously condoning revenue-raising rates for broad sectors of state and regional government. Senator Peggy Pendleton (Cumberland Cty.) and Senator Chandler Woodcock (Franklin Cty.), Rep. Rod Carr (Lincoln) and Rep. Roger Sherman (Hodgdon) are all pushing for a standard that establishes limits on inappropriate rate-setting without fixing into law a set-in-stone, fixed-in-time mandate. Other members of the Committee seem intent on fixing strict cents-per-page and labor rate caps, apparently all on the basis of the "evidence" – such as it is – in the side-bar to this article.

MANDATES (cont'd)

scope magnitude of the proposal's holistic approach. Opponents do not believe it is feasible for a single group to address all state mandates. Rather than requiring a collaborative effort among all the parties to identify and discuss the relevance of mandates, opponents believe that an incremental, mandate-by-mandate approach is more appropriate.

Rep. Janet McLaughlin of Cape Elizabeth believes that the existing process – the submission of legislation and review of that legislation by one the Legislature's committees of jurisdiction — allows for discussion among those who are most knowledgeable about the mandate. For example, she believes the Natural Resources Committee would have a more appropriate knowledge base to address an environmental mandate. The Criminal Justice Committee would be in a better position to address public safety related mandates, and so on.

Rep. George Bunker of Kossuth

Township illustrated his support for the incremental approach, as he urged his colleagues in the House to "kill the sucker (LD 419) dead as you can."

Another argument raised against LD 419 was time. Rep. Chris Barstow of Gorham stated that the State and Local Government Committee had not had enough time to properly address the bill. Although the bill has been in the Committee's hands since February 2003, more time was needed to properly address the mandate issue. Rep. Barstow further suggested that the newly created *ad hoc* Regionalization Committee might be in a position to address the mandate issue.

The bill is now tabled in the Senate. Please take this opportunity to contact your Senators and ask them to support the minority "ought to pass as amended" report on LD 419. It is imperative that the Legislature understands that this bill is important to municipalities and local property taxpayers. Members of the Senate can be

reached at 1-800-423-6900.

The House roll call vote on LD 419 is available on the Internet at the address listed below. *The question to the House in this roll call vote was support for the majority "ought not to pass" recommendation. Therefore, in this roll call a no vote is a vote in support of LD 419.* For a paper copy of the roll call, please contact SFR's Laura Veilleux at 1-800-452-8786. <http://janus.state.me.us/legis/LawMakerWeb/rollcall.asp?ID=280008533&chamber=House&serialnumber=307>

Regionalism: Mixed Messages

As the Legislature's Committee on Regionalization and Community Cooperation continues to meet and gather information, it is difficult to determine how their research will help in developing a plan for providing governmental services regionally. The Committee has heard presentations from county officials, academia, school administrators, private sector consultants, councils of governments, public safety providers, service center communities, and an economist, and so far the only point all the speakers have agreed on is that regionalization is a good idea.

Some of the experts invited to provide information to the Committee are supportive of county governments taking the lead as regional service providers, while others support councils of governments. Some speakers support the abolishment of special districts, such as wastewater and water districts, while others support the creation of special districts. Some speakers support the incremental, voluntary approach to regionalization while others support a more structured and mandatory approach. Some speakers believe bigger is better, while others wholeheartedly disagree. Some speakers believe that cost saving associated with regionalization efforts will dwindle over time, while others believe that only with time will significant cost savings be realized.

It is becoming clear that a simple answer does not exist. Approaches to, and the success of, regionalization efforts directly depend on the type, demand and location of the governmental service being provided. The success of a regionalization plan will be directly related to its flexibility. If nothing else, it should be clear to the members on the Committee that developing the one-size fits all, cookie cutter plan for regionalization will not work. Instead, the Committee should focus its attention on developing mechanisms that foster communication between service providers, provide flexibility in the design of regionalization plans, and provide state assistance both in terms of technical assistance and

funding to the entities designing and implementing a regional plan.

In spite of being bombarded with these mixed messages, the Committee continues to collect information about the successes and barriers to regionalization. Since last Thursday, the Committee has heard presentations from councils of governments, state and county law enforcement officials, an economist, and service center communities, each providing a different perspective on how to make regionalization efforts successful.

The representatives from the councils of government advised that seed money and access to technical assistance for studying the benefits of regional service delivery models are imperative. State and county law enforcement officials spoke of the need to restructure the responsibilities of state, county and local officers to eliminate the duplication of services. Charlie Colgan, Muskie School economist, stressed the importance of taking regionalization efforts slowly. John Melrose, representing the Maine Service Center Coalition, spoke of the importance of identifying which level of government is best equipped to provide a service and ensure that the entity has the authority necessary to regulate, fund and provide the service.

On this Thursday this week, a new and invigorating source of regionalization advice was tapped as the Committee took its information gathering process on the road. Through the marvels of interactive technology, over eighty municipal, county and school officials gathered in Caribou, Bangor, Farmington and Auburn had the opportunity to share their opinions on regionalization.

Through the use of eight framing questions, participants were asked to think about the impacts regionalization efforts have had in their municipalities, counties and schools. Specifically, participants were asked to comment on the types of services currently being provided regionally, what other services could be provided regionally, the barriers to regionalization, why

regionalization efforts have been successful and how the state can assist in strengthening the success of the regionalization efforts.

During the course of the four-hour discussion, four distinct themes on regionalization materialized.

First, the concept of regionalization is not new. Although often unseen, overlooked and unadvertised, municipalities, schools and counties have been working together to provide services more efficiently for decades.

Second, the state should assist in strengthening existing regionalization efforts rather than mandate some predetermined form of regionalization. Many of the participants believe that regionalization is working, because it is developed at the local level. If the state is serious about regionalization, then it should look at what municipalities, counties and schools are already doing and assist in those efforts. However, the state assistance provided must go beyond the provision of financial incentives. For example, the state could assist local regionalization efforts by provide technical assistance or changing state laws that prohibit entities from working together.

Third, the state must honor its commitments and fund its mandates. Several speakers agree that the current property taxpayer crisis is in part due to the state's inability to fund its education and community corrections mandates, and the continued adoption of new unfunded mandates. Participants believe that the state should study how its action or inaction impacts municipalities, counties and schools as it begins to develop policies around regionalization. The actions of the state are an important element in successful regionalization.

Fourth, bigger is not necessary better. Several participants urged the members of the Regionalization Committee to objectively examine the claim that bigger is better. On paper it may appear as though larger systems save money, but at what cost are the savings

(continued on page 7)

REGIONALISM (cont'd)

achieved? Will larger, regional service delivery models provide for direct citizen involvement? Will these larger, regional models disenfranchise the thousands of volunteers that work on municipal and school boards? Will these larger, regional models maintain student test scores, graduation rates and post secondary education achievement rates that students from smaller high schools currently achieve? Several of the participants believe that factors, other than cost savings, will help to determine the success of a regionalization effort.

Although it will be several days before the Committee reconvenes to focus its attention on the outcome of the interactive statewide meeting, we know that the members of the Committee appreciated and heard the comments of municipal and school front-line practitioners. MMA would like to thank all the municipal officials who took the time to participate in Thursday's meeting.

On Tuesday, the Committee will continue to focus its attention on municipal issues when John Edgecomb (town manager of Castle Hill, Chapman

and Mapleton), Bill Shane (Cumberland town manager), Craig Bowden (Bucksport fire chief), and Bill Van Tuinen (an assessor for multiple municipalities) meet with the Committee to discuss their experiences with regionalization.

LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS

Monday, March 1

Taxation

Room 127, State House, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-1552

LD 1850 – Resolve, Regarding Legislative Review of Chapter 31: Affordable Housing Development District – Recovery of Public Revenue, a Major Substantive Rule of the Maine State Housing Authority. (Reported by Rep. Sullivan of Biddeford for the Maine State Housing Authority)

Utilities & Energy

Room 209, Cross State Office Building, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-4143

LD 1860 – An Act To Amend the Charter of the Mount Desert Water District. (Emergency) (Sponsored by Rep. Koffman of Bar Harbor; additional cosponsors.)

Wednesday, March 3

Appropriations & Financial Affairs

Room 228, State House, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-1316

LD 1878 – An Act To Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of \$65,000,000 To Finance the Acquisition of Land and Interest in Land for Conservation, Water Access, Outdoor Recreation, Wildlife and Fish Habitat and Farmland Preservation; To Fund Capital Improvements to State Parks and Other Historic Public Areas; and To Access \$30,250,000 in Matching Contributions from Public and Private Sources. (Governor's Bill) (Sponsored by Rep. Richardson of Brunswick; additional cosponsors.)

Education & Cultural Affairs

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

Tel: 287-3125

LD 1861 – An Act To Require School Administrative Units To Report Their Costs for Legal, Consulting and Other Professional Services to the Department of Education. (Sponsored by Sen. Brennan of Cumberland Cty., additional cosponsors.)

Thursday, March 4th

Appropriations & Financial Affairs

Room 228, State House, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-1316

LD 1875 – An Act To Authorize Department of Transportation Bond Issues in the Amount of \$18,250,000 To Match Available Federal Funds for Improvements to and Development of Highways and Bridges; Airports; Ferry Vessels; Port Facilities and Marine Infrastructure; Rail Corridors and Structures; Intermodal Facilities; and Trail and Pedestrian Facilities. (Governor's Bill) (Sponsored by Sen. Damon of Hancock Cty.; additional cosponsors.)

LD 1876 – An Act To Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of \$16,600,000 To Construct and Upgrade Water Pollution Control Facilities, To Remediate Solid Waste Landfills, To Clean Up Uncontrolled Hazardous Substance Sites, To Provide Municipal Stormwater Management Assistance, To Investigate and Remediate Municipal Brownfields, To Construct and Upgrade Public Water Systems and To Remediate Lead Paint in Low-income Households. (Governor's Bill) (Sponsored by Sen. Martin of Aroostook Cty.; additional cosponsors.)

LD 1877 – An Act To Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue in the Amount of \$20,000,000 To Sustain and Improve Maine's Economy. (Governor's Bill) (Sponsored by Sen. Cathcart of Penobscot Cty.; additional cosponsors.)

Natural Resources

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

Tel: 287-4149

LD 1863 – An Act To Provide Additional Financing for Costs Associated with the Remediation of a Waste Oil Handling Facility Site in Plymouth. (Sponsored by Sen. Martin of Aroostook Cty.; additional cosponsors.)

LD 1866 – An Act Relating to Storm Water Management. (Reported by Sen. Martin of Aroostook Cty. for the Joint Standing Committee on Natural Resources.)