

**LPC Poll – February 14 & 18, 2025  
(N=28)**

	<b>LD 288 Amend Tax Laws</b>	<b>LD 337 Sunday Sports</b>	<b>LD 358 Deeds Fees</b>	<b>LD 401 Overboard</b>
<b>Support</b>	13%	79%	5%	39%
<b>Oppose</b>	35%	17%	62%	13%
<b>NFNA</b>	48%	-	29%	43%
<b>Track</b>	4%	-	5%	-
<b>No Position</b>	-	4%	-	4%

	<b>LD 413 Shoreland</b>	<b>LD 418 Probation</b>	<b>LD 422 Placements</b>	<b>LD 440 Seasonal Sales</b>
<b>Support</b>	12%	63%	24%	35%
<b>Oppose</b>	24%	4%	29%	25%
<b>NFNA</b>	40%	22%	19%	35%
<b>Track</b>	16%	-	-	-
<b>No Position</b>	8%	11%	29%	5%

	<b>LD 445 MUBEC</b>	<b>LD 461 Rural Patrol</b>	<b>LD 465 Discharge Fees</b>	<b>LD 477 Rural PS</b>
<b>Support</b>	13%	23%	38%	50%
<b>Oppose</b>	58%	41%	14%	27%
<b>NFNA</b>	25%	27%	29%	18%
<b>Track</b>	4%	-	5%	-
<b>No Position</b>	-	9%	14%	5%

	<b>LD 478 Speed Limits</b>	<b>LD 490 Rule Repeal</b>	<b>LD 494 Liquor Laws</b>	<b>LD 502 Wood Boilers</b>
<b>Support</b>	8%	17%	18%	13%
<b>Oppose</b>	67%	57%	18%	57%
<b>NFNA</b>	25%	26%	32%	17%
<b>Track</b>	-	-	23%	4%
<b>No Position</b>	-	-	9%	9%

	<b>LD 549 Exam Kits</b>
<b>Support</b>	57%
<b>Oppose</b>	-
<b>NFNA</b>	30%
<b>Track</b>	4%
<b>No Position</b>	9%

## Comments

LD 288 *An Act to Make Technical Changes to Maine's Tax Laws* (Sponsored by Rep. Cloutier of Lewiston)

### Support

- Cleans things up in the language.
- Good to review and update outdated tax laws.

### Oppose

- Without knowing how many assessors currently are CMAs and how many the state would need to fill the roles of those that are not, it would be short-sighted until we have that information.

### NFNA

- On the one hand, it's unclear to me whether (1) and (4) would have any impact on municipalities. On the other, (2) and (3) make good sense to me. In this day and age, we don't need printed applications (or we can print them ourselves from a digital version) and if there is a conflict, that should be corrected.
- I am opposed to the first aspect of the bill as outlined here. I support the remaining three. I would be happy to move my position to "support" if the bill was amended to remove the first portion and leave points 2, 3 and 4.
- I recommend taking the same position the Maine Association of Assessors recommends. Our assessor's office downloads the required forms or copies an unfilled form. No need for printed forms anymore.
- Would like to know how the assessors weight in. Are we down grading the qualifications of assessors. We obtain the homestead exemption application by printing them off their pages. Great to correct the due date.
- Numbers 2-4 appear acceptable, but not in agreement with #1, and believe it should be removed from this bill, to maintain current certification standards for assessors, not reduce the standards for full time assessors.
- Harder to hire, more town resources to provide forms.
- If items within the tax law need to be updated they should be.

LD 337 *An Act to Repeal the Sunday Amateur Sports Law, the Law Allowing Municipalities to Permit the Operation of Movie Theaters on Sundays and the Law Imposing a Fine or Imprisonment for Playing Games and Sports with Admission Charges on Memorial Day* (Sponsored by Rep. Morris of Turner)

### Support

- Yes, let's move into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

- Personal liberty.
- Looks like a housekeeping measure for a law from a bygone era.
- These Sunday-specific restrictions and penalties seem antiquated and overly/needlessly restrictive and punishing.
- It sounds like these provisions are old and should be removed.

### **Oppose**

- The bill diminishes local control.
- Erosion of home rule.
- Preserve home rule.

[LD 358](#) *An Act to Increase Fees Paid to Registers of Deeds* (Sponsored by Sen. Bennett of Oxford Cty.)

### **Support**

- Makes sense, inflationary indexing.

### **Oppose**

- Individual municipalities/counties should have direct control over their fees based on their direct knowledge of day-to-day processes rather than being subject to the whims of an elected body that changes every other year.
- The Sagadahoc Registry already charges the towns for copies after we print 500 pages, now they want to reduce it? This is double dipping; the towns already pay to operate the counties.
- Why decrease the electronic abstract for municipalities? We sometimes use 100 per month. What do the registrants think?
- This should already be covered by tax we pay the county.

### **NFNA**

- Is there a municipal cost?
- It's unclear to me what the impact on municipalities would be. If the fees are to be paid by private individuals, I have no issue with this. If the fees are to be paid by municipalities, we'd want to know what the financial impact would be, i.e. would \$45 (for instance) represent a cost increase or decrease? I assume the former, but you know what happens when one assumes.
- I don't know enough about the impact to take a position.

- Amend the bill to exempt municipalities (but no one else) from paying any fees to Registers of deeds. Leave the proposed schedule of fees intact for non-municipal Register customers. Municipalities already pay substantial county taxes that cover the costs of having a register's office. Fees should cover variable costs of that office, only, including the costs of providing copies.
- If the fees need to be updated, they should be.

LD 401 *An Act to Support Removal of Overboard Discharge Systems* (Sponsored by Rep. Hepler of Woolwich)

### **Support**

- Hard to believe they still exist, let's make progress on finishing their elimination.

### **Oppose**

- Not the state's role to pick winners and losers with financing or induce more work and funding on the part of the state (us).
- Pragmatically I think this is a good idea but that part the DEP may pay or commissioner may pay is to subjective, either do it or don't.
- Unnecessary added expense.
- Both actual and alleged violations should be disclosed.

### **NFNA**

- Will shift cost back to the homeowner.
- I live and work in lake communities, so I support anything that reduces pollution being released into waterbodies. But it's unclear to me whether the details of this bill relating to income levels would help or hinder a reduction in the use of these systems.
- Who can reasonably oppose weeding out OBD systems? The devil is in the details. I'm concerned about the budgetary impact the bill could have on DEP. Do we even know how many OBD systems are still in place and require removal?
- Don't poop in waterways. At least dig a hole.

LD 413 *An Act Regarding Disclosure by Sellers of Residential Real Property of Notices of Shoreland Zoning Ordinance Violations* (Sponsored by Rep. Ducharme of Madison)

### **Support**

- If they are aware then they should disclose that, as much as it's a buyer's due diligence it doesn't hurt to be honest.
- Makes municipal enforcement easier when landowner already knows.

## **Oppose**

- Potential property owners should be aware of problematic neighbors who may be alleging multiple false allegations.
- Alleged violations or actual...potential homebuyers ought to have access to the information in order to make an educated assessment of the property to be purchased. I'm thinking, in particular, of Mainers who could be prospective property owners.
- What if a violation has not yet been fully adjudicated before the property is sold? In that case, the violation is alleged ... and may well be true.
- Any kind of violation, actual or alleged, should be disclosed to the buyer. Alleged could still affect the buyer after the purchase of the property.

## **NFNA**

- On one hand, purchasers should be protected and provided with all important information (including documentation of even alleged violations, if applicable) about the property, to ensure they can make a well-informed purchasing decision. However, if the intent of this LD is due to the gray-area surrounding allegations, which may not be as easy to define nor document as an actual violation would be, this then could make some sense, to add clarity and/or improve feasibility.

[LD 418](#) *An Act to Remand Individuals with Pending State Probation Violations to the Department of Corrections Following Initial Proceedings* (Sponsored by Rep. McIntyre of Lowell)

## **Support**

- Does this shift the cost of that individual onto the DOC and away from the municipality and county?
- This is a simple move to reduce county jail populations and, thus, the costs that get passed on to local taxpayers.
- No more catch and release.
- They violated their bail, after having already been given an opportunity to avoid jailtime, therefore they need to be made to understand that there is a penalty for their actions.

## **NFNA**

- I'd want to know more about why McIntyre is proposing this legislation and to give MMA the flexibility to adjust its response as the process moves forward.
- Do we have the room to remand everyone who violates probation and how is that determined?

- I feel like if the person is a danger to themselves or others based on the probation violation, they should be remanded to avoid other crimes. This will take up space in our already crowded DOC facilities though.

### **No Position**

- Make sense, but county DAs have an increasingly bad habit of not prosecuting anymore, making the rule of the law here in Maine questionable, at best.

[LD 422](#) *An Act to Require the State to Obtain Municipal Approval Before Placing Noncitizens in the Municipality* (Sponsored by Rep. Swallow of Houlton)

### **Support**

- Although it looks bad on the surface, the municipality should know because of the other hidden financial burdens it may face to the placement (e.g., GA, translators, etc.).
- Cause individual harm, community harm, unpreparedness, nothing to joke about, not a game/chessboard to dilute a choice and induce problems.
- Some municipalities may or may not have the infrastructure to help people, they should be part of the conversation.
- The state should not be able to place noncitizens in a municipality who may or may not be financially able to shoulder the burden of their ongoing care and strain on resources.
- We had a situation here where over 600 folks were going to be brought from Portland to be housed at the now defunct Unity College campus. That's too massive a population and resource shift in one fell swoop. It didn't play well, for those folks being brought in to have full services provided in a struggling rural community. Communities need a heads up to make sensible decisions. Easy to frame this as xenophobia, but that shift in Unity (pop 1500 or so) would have just been too massive.

### **Oppose**

- Let's resist xenophobic movements and efforts to demonize people from other lands who want to tap into American opportunity.
- Really?

### **NFNA**

- I'm not comfortable with the flavor of this legislation and would prefer to see how it develops. It's arbitrary and potentially compromises those private individuals who wish to host non-U.S. citizens in their own homes. I don't see that a municipality has the right, by inference or otherwise, to limit the number of non-residents private citizens or non-profit groups wish to sponsor or support in any community.
- I have the sense that this matter may be quite complicated and may also have some Federal (vs. State) implications that should be taken into consideration. Although I

understand the possible intent of this LD, I think there are likely problematic issues with civil rights/legality and/or unintended consequences and/or discrimination, as written.

- I do think this is important to protect the municipalities resources. General Assistance and resources in these municipalities will be affected if the State just places non citizens there first without checking with the municipality.

LD 440 *Resolve, to Study the Economic Effects of Instituting a Seasonal Sales Tax* (Sponsored by Rep. Rana of Bangor)

### **Support**

- It can't hurt.
- More information is better than less.
- Could provide additional data to help inform ongoing/long-term tax reform considerations.

### **Oppose**

- I do not support paying to have a study done for a tax I would not support regardless. If individual municipalities are interested in such a tax, they can pay to have it done, don't place the financial burden of such a study on municipalities that have no interest in pursuing such.
- Do we need a study to show this will be a regressive tax? Increase occupancy if you want. Add ski tax? Or just allow local option.
- In order to avoid confusion for people the sales tax amount should be left the same all year long so I think a study is not needed. The Sales Tax Division is only open a half day as it is so if the change occurs who will municipalities contact for help and questions with the change.

### **NFNA**

- I'm not opposed to a study. I am wary about what the effects of a seasonal sales tax would be on year-round residents who could least afford the additional burden.
- This seems like it may end up being a report that gets placed on a shelf, but I'm not in enough to have strong feelings one way or another.
- The study could complement the efforts of the Tax Reform Working Group.

### **No Position**

- State discretionary efforts to gain knowledge.

LD 445 *An Act to Stimulate Housing Production by Increasing the Threshold Before Participation in the Maine Uniform Building and Energy Code Is Mandatory* (Sponsored by Rep. Ducharme of Madison)

## Support

- Less work for municipalities, more people housed. Just beware slumlords.

## Oppose

- This change would have significant negative consequences for the safety, economic stability, and long-term sustainability of Maine communities. First and foremost, weakening the enforcement of MUBEC would compromise public safety. Building codes exist to ensure that structures are constructed to withstand the environmental conditions of our state, including harsh winters, high winds, and flooding risks. By raising the enforcement threshold, thousands of residents in small and mid-sized municipalities would be left without the protections provided by standardized codes, increasing the likelihood of unsafe and substandard construction. Additionally, the economic impact of this change could be detrimental to Maine's housing market and workforce. Consistent building codes create a level playing field for contractors and developers, ensuring fair competition and reducing liability risks. Without MUBEC enforcement, inconsistencies in construction standards will emerge, leading to potential devaluation of properties in municipalities that no longer enforce the code. Furthermore, homebuyers and businesses seeking to invest in Maine may be deterred by the uncertainty of varying standards across different towns. This issue is further compounded by the fact that Maine does not currently require general contractors to be licensed. Without licensing requirements, there is already minimal oversight to ensure that contractors have the necessary skills and knowledge to build safe, code-compliant structures. If MUBEC enforcement is further weakened, it will create an even greater risk of poor construction practices going unchecked, leaving homeowners vulnerable to structural failures, costly repairs, and potential legal disputes. Instead of rolling back enforcement, Maine should be strengthening protections for residents by ensuring that all contractors are properly trained and licensed. From an environmental and energy efficiency standpoint, this proposal also presents serious concerns. MUBEC includes critical energy efficiency standards that help reduce heating and electricity costs for homeowners and businesses. Lastly, raising the enforcement threshold would create long-term disparities between large and small communities. While larger municipalities would continue to benefit from standardized, safe, and efficient construction practices, smaller towns, many of which are already struggling with infrastructure challenges would be left behind. This move could exacerbate rural-urban divides and hinder efforts to create sustainable, resilient communities statewide. For these reasons, I urge policymakers to reject any effort to weaken MUBEC enforcement by raising the population threshold. Ensuring that all Maine residents, regardless of the size of their community, have access to safe, energy-efficient, and high-quality buildings should remain a top priority.
- There shouldn't be a population threshold, the same standards should apply to every municipality regardless of population.
- My town has a population of just over 5,000. MUBEC is critical in this town to ensure the quality of new construction. The bill would stimulate the wrong kind of housing production.

- I consulted with our CEO, who argues that every Maine community should enforce MUBEC to ensure all construction is to a minimum standard, which protects the public. He noted that parts of the building construction trade are unlicensed and the quality of work can vary widely among those contractors. Plus, enforcing MUBEC does not require towns to hire inspectors; they can require that construction be inspected by third-party inspectors, with the contractor (and by extension its customer) footing that bill.
- Although Encouraging Housing Development is much needed and important, not at the expense of lowering or waiving building and codes standards that are in place to ensure future sustainability, safety, and quality.
- Municipalities have already adopted MUBEC based on the 4,000 back a few years ago when they were required to, so what is the point in raising the number now? So they can opt out and create more work changing ordinances, forms, etc. MUBEC helps create safe homes and I feel that is more important than ramping up production.

### **Track**

- This could potentially have unexpected costs to municipal interest.

[LD 461](#) *An Act to Fund Rural Patrol Services in Washington County* (Emergency) (Sponsored by Sen. Moore of Washington Cty.)

### **Support**

- State Police Presentation at Regional Meetings made a strong case to expand staffing in order to reduce overtime costs and avoid overworking existing staff.
- Statutes take care of the ponies. Four troopers for Washington county seems reasonable.

### **Oppose**

- This seems very specific to one part of the state if there is a need that part of the state should bear the burden.
- These should be paid for at the local/county level, not state.

### **NFNA**

- What's the potential impact on the budget? Is there a real need for patrol services in the county. What's the nature of the problems the patrol services are intended to address? Will increased patrol services, in fact, address the problem? Also, see LD247, which calls for 15 state trooper positions in a number of counties, including Washington County.
- If more patrol is needed then they should have it to protect the public.

### **No Position**

- This is, in my opinion, a question that is too hyper-local for the MMA to weigh in.

LD 465 *An Act to Update Waste Discharge License Fees* (Sponsored by Sen. Grohoski of Hancock Cty.)

**Support**

- Faster developing and more dense communities should carry more of that burden.

**Oppose**

- I am opposed to increasing fees as a general rule.
- Double taxation.

**NFNA**

- Okay with the fisheries addition, not sure of the impact to municipalities.
- As long as the fee is a mere \$1,306 for any municipality or utility district, I'm not opposed. I might feel otherwise depending on whether multiple licenses are required in communities.
- I don't know enough to feel strongly one way or another.
- I'd be interested in learning how the proponent intends to make the case for permit coverage for a separate municipal storm sewer system and how the exact fee of \$1,306 was derived.

LD 477 Hopper (CJPS-RG) *An Act to Enhance Public Safety in Rural Counties by Providing State Police Patrol and Policing Services* (Sponsored by Rep. Ducharme of Madison)

**Support**

- State Police Presentation at Regional Meetings made a strong case to expand staffing in order to reduce overtime costs and avoid overworking existing staff.
- This would enhance public safety and response time across a wide swath of the state.
- Some communities are too small to provide our own police, but still need protection. This may be the one area where I support centralization. I think most towns have those one or two addresses who require most of the resources—and these folks generally cross-town lines and make trouble in neighboring communities as well. Better for states to handle.

**Oppose**

- As with LD 461 this seems very specific to one part of the state if there is a need that part of the state should bear the burden.
- These should be paid for at the local/county level, not state.

**NFNA**

- See LD 461 above. The sponsors of the respective bills, at a minimum, need to talk to one another and come up with one bill that covers all counties of concern.
- If more patrol is needed, then they should have it to protect the public.

LD 478 *An Act to Reduce Maximum Speeds on Roads Close to Residences* (Sponsored by Rep. Henderson of Rumford)

### **Support**

- Our community is severed by a dangerous S-curve on a state route that needs pedestrian crossings. MEDOT is unsupportive in lowering speeds, providing devices to slow traffic, which hinders safe and sound planning.

### **Oppose**

- I'm not sure what this is trying to accomplish, maybe work with DOT in the area that this is attempting to fix.
- I find nothing wrong with the current method of establishing speed limits, which includes a study by MDOT engineers.
- Not a uniform law, too difficult for drivers to abide by. Too difficult to enforce.
- It's an infringement of local control.
- Will a municipality be obligated to post multiple speed limit signs for the different classes? The state is not going to pay for erecting or maintaining those signs. The state is not going to receive the PD calls for enforcement.
- Nobody told you to build right on the road or buy a house right on the road. It's a bummer that people aren't more courteous—but we would not have the resources to enforce this.

### **NFNA**

- Understand the reasoning but the speed limit should apply to everyone and not each have their individual limits.
- Although I understand and support the intent for enhanced safety, it appears to take away local control, which may be better informed by unique circumstances where a one-size-fits-all solution would not be ideal nor always appropriate.
- This could help with safety of residents and pets that may not have much room on their property. It might also lower the noise from vehicles.

LD 490 *An Act to Provide for a 5-year Automatic Repeal of Agency Rules* (Sponsored by Rep. Smith of Palermo)

### **Support**

- Rules are often not maintained, become irrelevant, need period of vetting for validity.

- Increased accountability.

### **Oppose**

- So even the good rules get repealed? No, thank you. Let's continue to review and revise rules that are no longer working well rather than tossing out babies with bathwater.
- Trust the agencies with the knowledge of the subject matter making the rules. The legislature often does not have that knowledge.

### **NFNA**

- Does it apply to municipalities? Isn't it going to create additional work?
- I don't know enough to feel strongly one way or another.
- Not sure what motivates the author of this bill and would like to learn more.
- Could lead to unintended consequences and difficult timing procedures, in which important rules may be repealed and not renewed in error.
- The wording is very vague. Does this include all rules or just some? I feel like it needs more specifics.

[LD 494](#) *An Act to Update and Clarify Certain Provisions of State Liquor and Lottery Laws*  
(Sponsored by Rep. Supica of Bangor)

### **Support**

- I have no issue with store owners being able to increase the amount of their advertising.

### **Oppose**

- I see nothing wrong with limiting signage in an effort to prevent garishness.

### **NFNA**

- I don't know enough to feel strongly one way or another.
- Is the concern about sign congestion or something else? And if there are concerns about sign congestion, why limit the bill to state lottery signs? Doesn't make a lot of sense.
- If the laws need to be updated then they should be.

### **Track**

- Any additional cost to municipalities?

[LD 502](#) *An Act to Promote Clean and Affordable Maine-sourced Bioenergy by Amending the Law Regarding Outdoor Wood Boilers and Outdoor Pellet Boilers* (Rep. Ardell of Monticello)

### **Support**

- I can't control the wind direction or choose who becomes my neighbor.

- Common sense and reasonable. Supports Maine’s topography, demographics, socioeconomic conditions, remoteness, lack of infrastructure/support, promote self-sufficiency and resiliency.
- Promotes Mainer’s renewable energy sovereignty without expensive state and federal subsidies to third party investors a la solar and wind.

### **Oppose**

- This bill seeks to amend regulations meant to respect and protect the rights of neighboring landowners. Those rights should continue to be protected.
- I have heard this argument for a long time, 15 years or better and the ability to smoke out your neighbor is a bad idea. The bill addresses initial install yes, but nothing on continued maintenance.
- Not interested in changing the emission limit, changing it would potentially cause untoward effects in close proximity neighborhoods.
- The state should not be allowed to determine how a municipality defines its setback requirements.
- Based on the summary it sounds like this bill would cause trouble for property abutters of people who own these boilers and municipalities that may have to deal with some of the complaints.

[LD 549](#) *An Act to Establish a Statewide Sexual Assault Forensic Examination Kit Tracking System and Update Certain Requirements Regarding Sexual Assault Forensic Examination Kits (Emergency)* (Sponsored by Sen. Bennett Oxford Cty.)

### **Support**

- Support the idea but question the additional cost.
- Standardized process.
- This isn’t exactly municipal, but as a survivor, I can’t believe we still have to ask for something like this.
- If this will help law enforcement with SA kits and help victims, whether they report the crime or not, it is a win.

### **NFNA**

- I don’t know enough to feel strongly one way or another.
- Do we really need this?

### **Track**

- This bill has lots of moving parts. Let's see where those head and what the impacts on local law enforcement would be.

**No Position**

- State-county efforts, few in the district have their own law enforcement entity.