

LPC Poll – March 28, 2025
(N=22)

	LD 949 Licensing Jurisdiction Manufactured Housing	LD 1244 Warming Shelters	LD 1274 Cap GA Reimbursement
Support	5%	0%	5%
Oppose	81%	100%	86%
NFNA	14%	0%	9%
Track	0%	0%	0%
No Position	0%	0%	0%

	LD 1295 Basic LEO Training Waivers	LD 1302 De-organization Signatures
Support	41%	27%
Oppose	14%	14%
NFNA	45%	32%
Track	0%	5%
No Position	0%	23%

Comments

[LD 949](#) *An Act to Clarify Licensing Jurisdiction for Manufactured Housing Communities*
(Sponsored by Rep. Golek of Harpswell)

Support

- There should be no discrimination against manufactured housing -surprised to see some communities are still pushing back, in this environment of high-cost housing!

Oppose

- Impinges on home rule authority.
- Hit to home rule authority and municipal licensing authority.
- These manufactured home developments should still go through the same permitting process as any other residential dwelling. Including the payment of fees related to that permitting. This again seems to be stepping on our home rule authority.
- This intrudes on a municipality's ability to govern its own area. What is the problem this bill is trying to solve.
- Home rule.

- My Code Enforcement Officer is concerned about the overreach of the state against home rule, especially with charging local fees for inspections.
- I'm weary of panicked legislation like "Maine Won't Wait" and now affordable housing. These are problems created by legislation that then gets "solved" by legislation-by putting an incredible burden on municipalities. We assess fees based on growth impact on services and the staff needed to process new construction. Home rule. Home rule. Home rule.
- The CEO is still going to be required to inspect utility connections. The town should be able to issue application fees just like they do for all other properties.
- This would eliminate the Town from charging a building permit for the siting of a manufactured house based on the construction type, however, there are other costs involved in issuing a building permit such as the foundation it will sit on and making sure the structure is in compliance with the applicable zoning standards.
- This bill infringes on home rule authority by prohibiting municipalities from assessing fees. That should be determined by the municipalities.
- Concerned about home rule authority.

Neither For Nor Against

- I don't appreciate the bill's impingement on home rule.
- I do not know enough about manufactured housing, so I would vote NFNA.
- I'm fine with the requirement that a municipality accept as valid a license issued by the Manufactured Housing Board. It helps keep things uniform across the state if MHB approval is valid in all municipalities. But I'm uncomfortable with the prohibition on a town imposing its own fee. That should be up to the towns to decide. As I read the last sentence of 9083, a town couldn't impose a building permit fee or site-plan review fee, both of which would be applicable for a manufactured housing community. There could be any number of incidental and important fees associated with a new MFD housing community, and it should be up to the towns to determine whether or not they are necessary.

[LD 1244](#) *An Act to Establish Requirements for Warming Shelters* (Sponsored by Rep. Milliken of Blue Hill)

Oppose

- Unfunded mandate.
- Unfunded mandate.

- Unfunded mandate. Providing shelters is yet a defined municipal mandated service and should be left to the determination of each city/town.
- Requiring this from every municipality in the state is an overreach that would greatly strain small towns.
- What is this person thinking? Require a municipality to open a 24-hour warming shelter if the temperature goes below 40 degrees. That would likely be most of the year in Maine. And if a municipality is required to keep a warming shelter open where does the funding come from? Why is the state intruding into this? If the state runs warming shelters then they could follow this guidance. Vigorously oppose.
- Our town already does this, to the extent available facilities permit. The proposed bill is an inappropriate imposition, especially on smaller communities, and I don't appreciate the assumption that most—if not all—towns provide shelter to the extent possible.
- This would mean that a municipality would staff a warming center all winter. It would make more sense to require one if the power was out for extended periods of time. No one would need to pay their power bills at all if we provided warming centers anytime the temperature dropped below 40 degrees.
- Not all municipalities have adequate facilities.
- I can't. 40 degrees is when I put a sundress on. We have neighbors who take care of each other. Stop forcing exponential growth on small towns with these housing bills and we will continue to be able to do just that. It sounds like another service center issue that doesn't apply to the vast majority of towns. Maybe you want a population number on this and an address to send sweaters.
- What a waste, every town and county must operate a warming shelter, regardless of any indicted need. All without any mention of the funding source for the mandate.
- Yes, such emergency shelters are important. No, the state shouldn't be able to force every town/county to have one. The first sentence ("a county or municipality . . . shall . . .") is confusing. "Or" means one or the other, but the bill summary says "and," which means "both." So, does Waldo County need 27 shelters (one for the county and one for each of 26 towns), just one shelter (for the county), or 26 (for each town)? Also, omg, 40 degrees? The Town currently has an agreement with the school that the school could be used as a shelter when school is not in session (nights, weekends, and vacation). Under this law, we would have to have the school open (and staffed, presumably) throughout Christmas vacation as well as basically every night and weekend in Dec, Jan, and Feb.
- Although the town has a warming shelter, we chose to do so on our own and only when there are power outages and extreme cold conditions not 40 degrees. To require every

town to have to have a warming shelter is an extreme cost to municipalities with no state revenue to assist.

- This would require a warming shelter to be available and staffed 24/7 from parts of October through May. The cost would be astronomical. I would basically need to hire four full-time staff (I can't image finding enough part-time staff). I would put them to work on parks and building maintenance the other parts of the year. The fiscal impact would be in excess of \$400,000 year.
- This is an unfunded mandate. Some municipalities may not have space for a warming shelter or staffing to manage a warming shelter outside of normal operating hours.
- This is an unfunded mandate.

[LD 1274](#) *An Act to Cap State General Assistance Reimbursement to Municipalities* (Sponsored by Rep. Faulkingham of Winter Harbor)

Support

- But only because I think 50% is fine. Are some municipalities getting more than 50%?

Oppose

- Reduces state total GA reimbursement.
- Create inequities across municipalities.
- Does this say that not more than 50% of the total statewide reimbursement shouldn't go to a single municipality (presumably Portland)? Either way, we need to stand united that the reimbursement for all municipalities should increase, no matter how much any individual city or town currently gets.
- Capping general assistance is crazy in this day and age with the number of individual who cannot pay bills because of the increased cost of rentals, electricity, fuel and groceries. Is the purpose of decreasing the funding for the larger cities?
- Another passing of the buck with no solutions to the problem.
- Again, seems like legislation aimed at service centers, which should be addressed more directly.
- The town is mandated to provide general assistance by the state, and therefore the town is not in control of what level that may reach. Let's not punish the property taxpayers in larger communities.

- I'm not quite sure what the point of this bill is, other than to punish municipalities that happen to be magnets for GA, for providing GA as state law requires. And I'm not sure what that would do to help anyone.
- Towns are entitled to the appropriate reimbursement for their costs under the GA bill and MMA's stance has been to seek higher reimbursement rates not less.
- We are looking for great than 50% funding – not less.
- If I am understanding this bill correctly, this would limit municipalities that have higher general assistance reimbursements. It should be fair and equitable to all municipalities to get the same percentage of reimbursement.
- Lowering and capping reimbursements to municipalities is unacceptable.

NFNA

- Sounds alike an anti-Portland bill to me. Implementation of GA should be focused on current law and any abuse or violation of these laws. This bill is not the answer.
- The bill, as worded, makes no sense: “may not reimburse?!” Is the bill a misguided attempt to reduce the implied shared obligations of Maine communities to provide help to those in need? It would be helpful to learn more about what the bill's sponsor wants to achieve.

[LD 1295](#) *An Act to Waive Basic Law Enforcement Training Requirements for Full-time Law Enforcement Officers Who Have Successfully Completed Equivalent Courses in Other Jurisdictions* (Sponsored by Sen. Moore of Washington Cty.)

Support

- Supports increasing eligible law enforcement officers in Maine and reduces cost of hiring prequalified candidates.
- Keeping the “discretionary authority” to hire the individual who has completed the equivalent basic law enforcement course with the Academy's board may not accomplish anything without a change in the composition of the board. Nevertheless, a study of the issue and recommendations concerning the elimination of burdensome requirements may ultimately help municipalities recruit and hire qualified officers.
- The majority of police that drop out of the academy are those who already went through “basic training” in the military or have life experiences that don't need to depend on correct napkin folding. I think that other team building exercises could be done. Individuals should get credit for past experiences like many of the colleges provide.
- Common sense.

- For all the reasons previously discussed in meetings. Resolving training/hiring logjam. This should only apply to the most basic basics though.
- This seems like a no-brainer to make it easier for LEOs from other states to move here and begin working immediately.
- I believe that this was part of the original MMA platform so that law enforcement officers from other states who have the same training level are permitted to become law enforcement officers in Maine without having to go through the academy. Process.
- This would encourage more people to join law enforcement. With such a shortage in the state, I see this as a benefit to municipalities. Plus, this is just for the basic training. Law enforcement will still be required to complete additional training beyond basic. Why not make it more accessible to new officers?
- Waiving the basic training requirements makes sense if the courses completed in other jurisdiction are equivalent to the training courses here. This would streamline the onboarding process for law enforcement officers.

Oppose

- I spoke with our police chief about this, and he supports the current law. Depending upon an officer's training in another state, he explained, that officer may need supplemental training in Maine, whether that be to gain knowledge of state statutes or how to adequately engage in hand-to-hand combat. That doesn't mean those officers are put through the entire 18-week academy. Rather, each candidate's training record is reviewed and the decision whether to accept his/her training is decided on an individual basis.
- I think giving each law enforcement entity the ability to grant the waiver on a case-by-case basis is fine. What happens if the training entity is substandard? Under this we would have to take them.
- The MCJA discretionary authority should not be removed and replaced with mandatory language. This could lead to potentially unwanted law enforcement characters coming into Maine's law enforcement community without proper vetting.
- This is ridiculous and another attack on the academy. I sat through many board meetings at the academy and voted to waive hundreds of law enforcement officers training from other states, federal, etc. The academy staff reviews each application for number of hours of training, curriculum, etc. And then makes a recommendation to the board. In all my time at the academy, the board waived 100% of the requests. I don't recall hearing many/any that were screened by the staff and determined inadequate. My memory could be a little off and maybe there were one or two that didn't get approved but if they weren't, it was for good reason, I am sure. People have no idea what it takes to be a

police officer and face all the challenges and expectations of them. If anything, training should be increased and not decreased.

NFNA

- Concerns around the qualifications of other states' training of police officers as not being equivalent to Maine trained officers. I have not had issues with the current law and do not seek to amend.
- Currently allowed. Not sure what requirement in the review process currently triggers denial. Not inclined to override "may" without more background.

[LD 1302](#) *An Act Regarding the Number of Voters of a Municipality Required to Petition for Consideration of Deorganization of That Municipality* (Sponsored by Sen. Baldacci of Penobscot Cty.)

Support

- Makes sense for wicked small communities to remove the threshold.
- Support requiring at least a 50% majority to vote for deorganization of a municipality. Individuals are always wanting to go back to a "town meeting" where a minority of residents decide what is best for all. Our selectboard has held firm to secret ballot so that more individuals are able to vote on town issues or who work or have other issues preventing them from attending. Deorganization without a majority is crazy.
- I would think that if a municipality was looking to de-organize, they may not have the minimum of 10 people to sign a petition. 50% of voters at the last gubernatorial election seems like a fair way to proceed without the 10-person limitation.

Oppose

- Rules governing petitions should remain the same regardless of the issue. It is not necessary to establish a higher bar to bring some questions before the voters.

NFNA

- Meaningless act. Can't imagine there are municipalities with less than 20 registered voters that voted in the last gubernatorial election.
- What problem does this bill seek to solve?
- If less than 10 people constitute 50% of the votes cast, then so be it. Glenwood Plantation, for example, a population of five couldn't meet the current threshold. It only starts the discussion.
- Seems to me this should require a 2/3 vote, but at least 50% is probably good. Feels like another of those "specific situation" bills.

- My guess is that this affects very few municipalities, and each should probably be decided by the voters. Local ordinance could specify the required number of votes. But not convinced this is where MMA needs to aim its firepower.

No Position

- Because this bill would simply strike that at least 10 voters must sign the petition, this would obviously impact only the smallest of communities. Even then, this is not a petition to deorganize, but to call a municipal meeting to discuss and decide whether to do so.
- So, say, Beddington wants to deorganize, and 12 people voted in the last gubernatorial election. Under current law, they'd need 10 signatures, but this amendment would let them proceed if just 8 people sign a petition? I'd support this, but I'm not sure it's worth (y)our efforts.
- I think there should be a requirement for the number, however, I do not know if 50% is too high a threshold to allow for a vote to be considered.

LPC Poll – April 4, 2025
(N=16)

	LD 1278, Tax Appeal	LD 1282, Historic Bond Funds	LD 1347, Tort Claims Limit -Government
Support	80%	47%	13%
Oppose	7%	0%	69%
NFNA	13%	33%	19%
Track	0%	13%	0%
No Position	0%	7%	0%

	LD 1348, Tort Claims – Field Trips	LD 1355, Renewable Energy	LD 1368, Shelfish Harvester Exemption
Support	6%	53%	0%
Oppose	81%	27%	75%
NFNA	13%	13%	19%
Track	0%	7%	6%
No Position	0%	0%	0%

	LD 1388, Charter Votes	LD 1399, Executive Session	LD 1417, Nuisance Properties
Support	0%	20%	69%
Oppose	36%	40%	6%
NFNA	57%	40%	25%
Track	7%	0%	0%
No Position	0%	0%	0%

Comments

[LD 1278](#) *An Act to Change the Property Tax Appeal Process* (Sponsored by Rep. Underwood of Presque Isle)

Support

- Title 36 describes the process clearly and succinctly. Maine doesn't need layers of procedures for reaching decisions about property tax abatements. Would it not complete the circle, though, to have the legislation proscribe county commissioners from considering abatements for the described non-residential properties and well as telling folks they can't apply to the commissioners?
- Not sure why we would let the least effective form of government potentially reverse such decisions.

Oppose

- Applies only to counties.

- A locally owned commercial property may easily exceed the million-dollar mark. Currently they have an option to appeal to a local commission for potential relief in a timely fashion. This bill would remove that option and force an appeal to the State Board. An appeal to the State Board is likely more costly and certainly a longer time before any possible relief.
- After discussion with our treasurer, this legislation does not treat everyone fairly and this could allow municipalities to make unfair charges on these properties.

NFNA

- The way this bill is written, I would not support all appeals going to the State Board of Property Tax Review. If a county has a Board of Assessment Review, then the appeal should go to that board and not to the State Board of Property Tax Review. I would like to see the bill amended to read to that effect and then I would support that version of the bill.

[LD 1282](#) *An Act Regarding Eligibility for Historic Preservation Bond Proceeds* (Sponsored by Sen. Hickman of Kennebec Cty.)

Support

- If the municipal historic preservation ordinance designates properties as historic, then they should be eligible for grants through the MHPC.
- Makes sense.
- This would be helpful to property owners who need assistance and are willing to care for historic properties.

NFNA

- It would be helpful to obtain more input from potentially affected municipalities before taking a position.

[LD 1347](#) *An Act to Increase the Cap on Liability for Governmental Entities Under the Maine Tort Claims Act* (Sponsored by Sen. Lawrence of York Cty.)

Support

- This would raise our budget but support us. When were the limits last updated?
- Brings the amount, which has been the same for decades, to a modern standard.

Oppose

- I don't see where it's in the interest of municipalities to allow an increase in the current limitation on awards of damages. Lawyers, I am sure, would love to see an increase in the limitation.

- I'm not sure why such a high cap of \$1.25 million is being supported. It obviously might encourage litigation. How does this benefit the municipality? It will increase insurance costs. Will the courts change the definition of what is considered a discretionary act? This may sound stupid, but what will this do to the cost per incident of potholes formed during winter?
- This limit of \$400,000 should remain in place. Increasing the amount would cause an increase in premiums for municipalities. I also do not see a need for the increase. This would require an increase in municipal budgets that is not needed. My understanding is that MMA Risk Pool has only had four claims to date. What is the rationale for the proposed increase?
- Municipal Insurance premiums would also rise, meaning a higher tax burden on property owners.
- A threefold increase seems exorbitant.

LD 1348 *An Act to Increase the Limit on Damages Under the Maine Tort Claims Act for Negligence Involving School Field Trips* (Sponsored by Sen. Lawrence of York Cty.)

Support

- This would raise our budget but support us. When were the limits last updated?

Oppose

- I don't see where it's in the interest of municipalities to allow an increase in the current limitation on awards of damages. Lawyers, I am sure, would love to see an increase in the limitation.
- Why is the increase needed. This will also increase premiums for the school and an increase in budgets, which in turn increases municipal costs.
- Not only will it increase insurance premiums, but it could also discourage trips all together.
- Municipal insurance premiums would also rise, meaning a higher tax burden on property owners. Review the trip plan and participants before you sign the permission slip.
- A 12.5-fold increase seems exorbitant.

NFNA

- I don't want us to be perceived as anti-child safety. That said, I am concerned about the sweeping hand of a lawsuit. We have no say in their operations. We will be billed for the insurance bill, and the higher the limit and the level of insurance, the higher the lawsuit. If the damages are judged punitive, they are not covered by insurance and then the town

gets proportionally hit. We might have to insist there be no field trips. There is value for education to these.

LD 1355 *Resolve, to Require the Office of Tax Policy to Study Taxation of Renewable Energy Infrastructure* (Sponsored by Rep. Hasenfus of Readfield)

Support

- This legislation calls for an MRS study; I see no reason to oppose what appears to be a reasonable approach to possibly taxing renewable energy infrastructure.
- I feel this makes sense to look at this to make sure there is consistency, and I also support a uniform capacity tax for renewable energy infrastructure.
- State law on renewable energy taxation has waffled back and forth. Gathering information for a foundation in developing a consistent policy seems reasonable.
- Solar developers are using the current law to avoid paying property taxes on their infrastructure. Municipalities should benefit from commercial development.

NFNA

- I like new revenue sources BUT, in the era of climate change I do not wish to discourage alternative energy like solar power and private wind etc. This may be appropriate for high-capacity commercial applications. But private homes and municipal buildings should not be taxed.

Track

- Is this only for large solar or wind arrays or does it cover those on homes and on personal property? I didn't quite understand.

LD 1368 *An Act to Provide a Property Tax Exemption for Allowing Shellfish Harvester Access to the Intertidal Zone* (Sponsored by Rep. Rielly of Westbrook)

Oppose

- Our clam harvesters have generally unfettered access to clam flats in the intertidal zone. The proposed legislation is unnecessary and imposes potential additional burdens on municipal staff and on taxpayers who would have to offset the reductions in property taxes for the few by increasing the property taxes of everyone else.
- There is an existing provision of law for this reduction in property tax, enrolling in Current Use Working Waterfront. In addition, any program which shifts tax burden onto other property owners should never be granted a shroud of confidentiality.

NFNA

- They can get more than one person to grant that passage and then get \$1,000. All tax records are available.

- I like working waterfront rules. It is the only way we have a fishing industry. That said I'm a bit confused.
- I do not support a reduction in property taxes to a certain group. This causes other taxpayers to cover the reduction.
- It is my understanding that the property owner owns the high tide line, so the area where shellfish harvest occurs belongs to the state. If that is the case, then this doesn't track. Unless it is all about bolstering shellfish harvesting.

Track

- I don't know enough about this and the financial impact on towns to stake out a position.

[LD 1388](#) *An Act to Replace the Participation Threshold in Votes to Adopt or Alter a Municipal Charter with a Lower Approval Threshold* (Sponsored by Rep. Bridgeo of Augusta)

Oppose

- Thought it is harder to get more participation, things should not be decided by just a handful of people.
- A change to municipal charter should not be a low threshold able to be swayed by a vocal minority of voters.

NFNA

- It would be helpful to learn more about the reasons for this bill.
- Why does the % need to be lowered? If there has been issues with getting items on the ballot for this because 30% is too high, then I could maybe support it. Need more information and clarification why the % needs to be lowered.
- On the one hand, adopting or changing a charter should require an adequate amount of voter participation. On the other, a high-profile gubernatorial race could boost turnout that would complicate efforts to adopt/change a charter, which is unlikely to excite the electorate.

[LD 1399](#) *An Act to Allow Action Against a Person Violating the Confidentiality of an Executive Session of a Public Body or Agency* (Sponsored by Rep. Carlow of Buxton)

Support

- This would certainly get the attention of elected officials who don't recognize and respect the sanctity of an executive session's confidentiality.
- There must be consequences and people need to take what is discussed in executive session seriously.

Oppose

- I am concerned about the level of proof and false accusations. How much evidence is needed for "preponderance?" Of course I take executive sessions very seriously. In fact, we do not even take notes during those sessions. That said the only people that can punish a sitting selectboard member are the voters. That said there are recall provisions in Title 30A and in our charter. I would suggest towns that lack that should establish them.

NFNA

- I understand it but your actions do the same thing.
- This may be worth following simply to find out if there's really a widespread problem that needs to be addressed. I can't imagine there is.
- I agree with some of this, but not sure if I agree or support the entire process laid out in the explanation. I feel some things need to be tweaked more before I could fully support.

[LD 1417](#) *An Act to Strengthen the Authority of Local Officials to Enforce Provisions Regarding Dangerous and Nuisance Properties that Constitute a Threat to Public Health and Safety*
(Sponsored by Sen. Libby of Cumberland Cty.)

Support

- Local officials will be helped by this legislation; MMA should support it.
- Some situations need extreme action and delays and restrictions cause issues to worsen.
- This provides another arrow in the quiver without crossing over into a mandate to use that authority.

Oppose

- We can, as a last resort for a condemned property.

NFNA

- I think this will work for towns that have an active health officer, but for smaller towns that have a hard time getting someone to serve in the role of health officer, this might create more demands on a position that is hard to get individuals to serve in.
- At this point, we find the current laws work for our community.