

Preventing Voter Fraud, Amending Citizen Initiative Advancement Procedures and Silencing Governmental Speech

Many forces of nature conspired to make Wednesday this week a busy day for the Veterans and Legal Affairs (VLA) Committee. One of those forces was Monday’s major nor’easter, which jammed two days’ worth of public hearings into one. Another was the clutch of citizen initiatives advanced in 2016 and largely adopted by the voters last November, which struck some people as an equally powerful whirlwind, but of another kind.

The three major issues on the VLA Committee’s table were:

- Voter verification, and whether to require photographic proof of identification in order to vote and/or heightened voter verification standards for college students;
- Citizen initiatives, and how to limit their scope or alter the way they can be advanced to the voters;
- The “Government Speech” doctrine, and whether to restrict state and local governmental agencies from advocating for or against statewide ballot questions.

Voter verification. Two bills amending election law to require greater voter verification in the polling place were presented to the Committee.

• LD 121, sponsored by Rep. Brad Farrin of Norridgewock, requires a person to provide to the municipal election clerk a form of qualifying photographic identification (Maine driver’s license, passport, specially-provided state identification card, etc.) at each election in order to be issued a ballot to vote. Persons without a photographic identification card would be allowed to vote on a “provisional ballot.” The provisional ballot would be ultimately counted if the

voter can provide a photographic identification within 5 business days after the election.

• LD 155, sponsored by Rep. Ken Fredette of Newport, requires the municipal registrar of voters to verify residency when a voter registration application lists a residence address on the campus of a postsecondary educational institution. Residency is considered established under the bill with one of three possible confirmations: (1) the college student’s state identification card or driver’s license lists the same address as the address on the registration application; (2) the college student has a motor vehicle registered in the state; or (3) the college student pays a personal income tax to the state or a local property tax.

Both of these bills were overwhelmed at the public hearing with oppositional testimony.

Photo i.d. The “photo i.d.” bill was supported by both its sponsor and co-sponsor Rep. Joel Stetkis of Canaan, and two members of the general public, one of whom supported the general idea but opposed the additional burdens the bill would place on municipal election clerks during the crush of election day.

LD 121 was opposed by two legislators, Sen. Shenna Bellows of Kennebec County and Rep. Lois Reckitt of South Portland, who served as an election worker, warden, and ward clerk in that City for over three decades. The bill was also opposed by Attorney General Janet Mills, the Secretary of State’s Office and over two dozen other members of the general public including the Maine League of Women Voters, AARP, the Maine Equal Justice Project, Equality Maine, the American Civil Liberties

Union of Maine, the Maine Municipal Association, and many members of the general public unaffiliated with any organization.

The primary arguments in opposition to the photo i.d. bill can be distilled into the “solution in search of a problem” refrain. Opponent after opponent cited the several studies and investigations conducted in Maine and elsewhere in recent years to document voter fraud, all coming up almost entirely empty. Many opponents argued that being required to obtain a photo i.d. would disproportionately impact the poor, the elderly, young voters, the homeless and minority voters. If nothing else, the bill would create a resistance factor dissuading certain voters from participating in the election process. The additional costs that would be incurred at both the state and municipal level to educate voters, deal with longer voting lines and voter frustration, process the provisional ballots, etc. were also cited by many.

For the supporters, the chief arguments were that even in the absence of significant voter fraud, not a single vote should be effectively cancelled by an illegitimate vote. The supporters also held that the additional costs were minor for the improved sense of voting place integrity, and the requirement to show photographic proof of identity is so ubiquitous now – for banking, purchasing alcohol or tobacco, airline travel, etc. – there is no reason not to apply that same requirement to the important act of voting.

College student verification. The bill requiring special college student verification in order to vote received even more lopsided testimony in opposition.

(continued on page 2)

Preventing Voter Fraud, Amending Citizen Initiative Advancement Procedures and Silencing Governmental Speech (cont'd)

Only the sponsor testified in support of the bill. From Rep. Fredette's perspective, LD 155 is an attempt to better line up voting residency requirements with the standards the University of Maine establishes in order to distinguish between the application of in-state and out-of-state tuition. Because some college students may not actually intend to remain in their college residence or return to it when otherwise absent, Rep. Fredette considered it appropriate to more deliberately draw out or quantify a voting college students' true intention to remain in Maine.

A number of legislators testified in opposition, including the state representative from Orono (Rep. Ryan Tipping), and roughly the same groups and organizations that testified in opposition to the photo i.d. bill. The oppositional testimony was supercharged with a sizable group of very focused college students, who testified somewhere between incredulity and outrage that they were to be singled out in state law to specially verify their intentions to be part of the communities where they were residing in order to be eligible to vote.

In addition to the college students' full-throated affront to being discriminated against by a special verification test, the opponents cited with renewed vigor the "solution in search of a problem" soundbite, the chilling effect the bill would have on a young student's voting rights, and some very clearly articulated concerns expressed by the Attorney General, the Secretary of State's Office and other legal experts regarding

the bill's constitutional-level problem associated with establishing a separate residency verification requirement for an identified sub-set of all voters. Many also said the bill delivers sharply negative signals to college students from outside of Maine, who should be encouraged rather than discouraged to stay in Maine after graduation.

The chances of either one of these bills seeing the light of enactment are slim.

Citizen initiatives. Four bills, all proposed amendments to the state's Constitution, were presented to the Committee on the topic of citizen initiatives. By the time these bills came up for hearing in mid-afternoon, the Committee had already been at public hearing for over six hours and the energy generated by the two previous bills of controversy dissipated from the room, along with most of the audience.

The citizen initiative and wildlife law. LD 5, sponsored by Rep. Steve Wood of Greene, would amend the Constitution to exclude laws governing wildlife management from being created or amended by the citizen initiative process.

Rep. Wood explained to the Committee that he had submitted this bill to the Legislature several years ago, in response to the bear-baiting citizen initiative and at the request of hundreds of his constituents throughout Greene and Sabbathus. He was submitting it again at his constituents' repeated requests. According to Rep. Wood, the primary reason the bill was necessary, or at least appropriate for consideration by the voters, was that wildlife management policies need to be especially science-based in order to be effective. Therefore, it should be left to the wildlife professionals in the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (IF&W), with legislative oversight, to develop and implement necessary policies.

There was a cluster of opposition to the bill by individuals who object to the "consumptive" hunt and harvest perspective of IF&W and what they perceive as an overly cozy relationship between the Sportsman's Alliance

of Maine, the IF&W Department, the IF&W legislative committee, and the Legislature generally. From their perspective, the citizen initiative process is the only legislative refuge for those wildlife enthusiasts who wish to observe and protect wildlife and do not ascribe to consumption-based harvesting regimens to achieve that end.

MMA also testified in opposition. "Slippery slope," yet another advocacy soundbite, was the primary reason the Association's Legislative Policy Committee voted to oppose this bill. The citizen initiative process, embedded in the state's Constitution 110 years ago, provides a completely co-equal status between the Legislature, as the representative body, and Maine's voters, as the direct electorate, with respect to making law. If the particular topic of wildlife management gets excluded from the list of citizen-law options on the grounds that the "science" of wildlife management requires the citizens to be excluded, what public policy topic area is next?

The required two-thirds vote in both House and Senate to move an amendment to the Constitution to the voters is an unlikely reach for this bill.

The citizen initiative signature gathering process. LD 53, sponsored by Rep. Stacey Guerin of Glenburn, would amend the Constitution to prohibit the circulators of citizen initiative petitions from being paid on a per-signature basis.

MMA testified in support of Rep. Guerin's bill because it appeared to the Association's Policy Committee to make complete common sense. A per-signature payment system for petition circulators creates an obvious motivational factor that can start with circulators making outlandish claims to the voters they are soliciting regarding what their initiative actually accomplishes. Enough financial stimulation for each signature gathered can result in higher numbers of signatures of very low quality on a petition. Illegibly scribbled signatures make it particularly hard for the municipal clerks to verify authenticity.

Although there appeared to be a

(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, Garrett Corbin and Laura Ellis of the State & Federal Relations staff.

Preventing Voter Fraud, Amending Citizen Initiative Advancement Procedures and Silencing Governmental Speech (cont'd)

considerable amount of support around the VLA Committee's horseshoe for the proposal, Julie Flynn of the Secretary of State's Office, in her "neither for nor against" testimony, very clearly described a major problem the legislation would face passing judicial muster. A decision handed down by the First District Federal Court almost two decades ago expressly found that no compelling evidence existed that there is a higher level of signature fraud associated with a piece-work payment method compared to any other payment method, and that a state law along the lines of LD 53 could limit the pool of circulators, increase the cost of petitioning, and otherwise violate First Amendments rights provided in the U.S. Constitution.

The Committee's support for LD 53 seemed to be solid, but this constitutional problem impairs this bill's chance of success.

Citizen initiatives and the 10% signature requirement. Two bills were presented to the Committee that would amend the way the requisite number of voters' signatures would be tallied to meet the "10%" standard.

LD 31, sponsored by Rep. Ellie Espling of New Gloucester, would amend Maine's Constitution to change the current standard governing the requisite number of signatures to advance a citizen initiative. The current requirement is signatures numbering at least 10% of the total statewide vote for Governor in the most recent gubernatorial election. The proposed new standard would be that at least 10% of the total vote for Governor in the state's first congressional district would need be obtained, as well as 10% of the total vote for Governor in the state's second congressional district. In other words, approximately the same number of signatures statewide would need to be obtained, but the tally would be applied separately to each congressional district.

LD 212, sponsored by Rep. Lance Harvell of Farmington, is designed along the lines of Rep. Espling's LD 31, except the 10% standard would be applied to the total vote for Governor in each of the

state's 35 State Senate Districts.

In addition to the bill's sponsor, David Trahan of the Sportsman's Alliance of Maine (SAM) testified in support of LD 31, which he indicated was SAM's bill. The supportive testimony cited data that showed that most of the signatures – as much as 80% – that are collected for citizen initiatives by companies in the signature-gathering business are collected in the larger urban areas in southern Maine. From SAM's perspective, as a matter of fairness, any signature gathering effort should be required to put some energy into the northern two-thirds of the state to secure a solid level of interest in the initiative from rural Maine as well. It was also pointed out that half of the 24 states that allow for citizen initiative have some sort of region-based voter signature requirement, and that a system in another state predicated on congressional districts, like LD 31, has been tested in, and sustained by, the courts.

A petition circulator spoke in opposition to both LD 31 and LD 212 on the grounds that every individual voter in Maine is equal to every other individual voter, the entitlement to the citizen initiative process in Maine's Constitution makes no such regional distinctions, and the true intention of the region-based requirements is to make the citizen initiative process more difficult.

MMA took no position on LD 31, but testified in opposition to LD 212 for reasons of difficulty in administration. Municipal clerks along with the Secretary of State's Office verify the authenticity of the signatures on petitions. At least 8 senate districts split a municipality's voting district. Where the senate district splits a municipality, someone – either the municipal clerks or the Secretary of State – would need to verify the specific senate district for each voter who signed the petition from the split municipality. Also, every 10 years when the senate districts are reconfigured, an issue would be raised about whether the 10% tally requirement applies to the senate district prior to redistricting or after redistricting. In short, LD 212 would lead

to a considerable administrative hassle.

LD 212 does not appear to have legs, but LD 31 does.

Silencing "government speech." Over 9 hours into the public hearing process there wasn't anyone in the VLA Committee room who wasn't exhausted when the last bill of the evening was presented.

Sponsored by Rep. Ralph Chapman of Brooksville, LD 298 prohibits all agencies of state government, counties, municipalities and other political subdivisions from expending public resources to influence the outcome of an election of a person to public office, a statewide citizens' initiative, a people's veto referendum or any other statewide referendum, other than to provide impartial, factual summaries regarding what is at issue, with a listing of the arguments both for and against the issue on the ballot and without providing an opinion or advocacy regarding the outcome.

For Rep. Chapman, LD 298 plugs a loophole in the federal Hatch Act, which prohibits federal and state employees from campaigning for candidates for elected office. The loophole is the absence of a prohibition against state employees (or local governments or their employees) from participating in campaigns for ballot initiatives, as was done by employees of the Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Department during the bear-baiting referendum a few years ago. Rep. Chapman stressed that his bill did not bar state employees from providing information, as long as the information did not result in any overt or obvious conclusion regarding how any voter should cast his or her ballot.

Other than Rep. Chapman, no one testified in support of LD 298. Both the Sportsman's Alliance of Maine and MMA testified in opposition, providing almost identical arguments. (MMA's oppositional testimony was conditional on the confirmation of the position by the Association's 70-member Policy Committee when it meets next week.)

What is at issue is referred to as the "government speech doctrine", which

(continued on page 4)

Preventing Voter Fraud, Amending Citizen Initiative Advancement Procedures and Silencing Governmental Speech (cont'd)

is a body of court decisions that has been developing for years around the subject of the government's right to speak on legislative proposals, including ballot measures, that directly affect the governmental entities. In response to MMA's involvement in several ballot measures during the first decade of this millennium (e.g., the 55% school funding initiative, the "Palesky" and "TABOR" tax cap initiatives, etc.), the Association was challenged in federal court on the complaint that MMA's use of municipally-generated resources to advocate on statewide ballot measures had the effect of violating the plaintiffs' right to speak on these matters of public policy. MMA prevailed in that lawsuit, but what emerged in the decision was a good deal of information about the "government speech doctrine."

Simply stated, the government speech doctrine holds that unless government imposes speech restrictions on itself or on the subordinate units of government over which it has jurisdiction, a government has just as much a right to share its view on proposed legislation as any other person or entity, and is not violating the free speech of others by so doing. Two conditions on that general authority are: (1) the government must be in effective control of that speech and not delegate the messaging over to third parties; and (2) the nature of the public policy matter at debate must be germane to the bona fide activities of the governmental entity.

Although it is not the case that the government is entitled to this right to speak, both MMA and SAM made the argument that the government's speech,

whether you agree with it or not, is as valid and appropriate in political debate as all the other nongovernmental perspectives that are unconditionally free to weigh-in. To silence that voice is unfair; the government perspective, along with everyone else's, is a legitimate element of the discussion.

To quote from the court's decision in the related law suit, "*A core principle of our system of government is that more speech is better than less, and the Plaintiffs (in the MMA lawsuit) remain free to make their own voices louder and more persuasive in the marketplace of ideas.*" The decision goes on to quote from another First Circuit decision, "*(G)overnors and administrations are ultimately accountable to the electorate through the political process, which is the mechanism to test disagreements.*"

LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS

Note: You should check your newspapers for Legal Notices as there may be changes in the hearing schedule. Weekly schedules for hearing schedules and work sessions can be found at: <http://legislature.maine.gov/Calendar/#PHWS/>.

Monday, February 20 – HOLIDAY

Wednesday, February 22

Appropriations & Financial Affairs
Room 228, State House, 10:00 a.m.
Tel: 287-1316

LD 390 – Governor's proposed biennial budget (in conjunction with the Joint Standing Committee on Health & Human Services)

GA Repeal (Part ZZZ). This proposal would repeal the state/municipal General Assistance program and relieve the state of its \$12 million share of the state/municipal program.

TANF/SSI/SNAP (Parts EEEE, FFFF, GGGG, KKKK). This proposal would make several amendments to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, which could shift greater burdens onto the GA program, if the GA program is not repealed. The proposal would shorten the lifetime limit on TANF benefits from 60 to 36 months and flatly disqualify persons convicted of drug felonies from receiving TANF benefits. It would also repeal three separate laws that expressly authorize the Department of Health and Human Services to provide food supplement (SNAP), supplemental security income and TANF assistance to certain asylees and other non U.S. citizens.

GA & Asylees Amendment (Part HHHH). After entirely repealing the body of General Assistance law in one section of the budget, another section inexplicably amends one of the GA statutes, enacted in 2015 that expressly allows certain asylees and other non U.S. citizens to receive General Assistance benefits.

IN THE HOPPER

(The bill summaries are written by MMA staff and are not necessarily the bill's summary statement or an excerpt from that summary statement. During the course of the legislative session, many more bills of municipal interest will be printed than there is space in the *Legislative Bulletin* to describe. Our attempt is to provide a description of what would appear to be the bills of most significance to local government, but we would advise municipal officials to also review the comprehensive list of LDs of municipal interest that can be found on MMA's website, www.memun.org.)

Appropriations & Financial Affairs

LD 590 – An Act To Authorize a General Fund Bond Issue To Invest in Maine's Rail Infrastructure. (Sponsored by Sen. Jackson of Aroostook Cty; additional cosponsors.)

This bill sends out to the voters a proposed \$50 million bond issue to provide funds for investment in railroad infrastructure to expand passenger rail services, with a priority for railroad track corridors that could support passenger and freight intermodal operations and enhance the movement of agricultural products.

Criminal Justice & Public Safety

LD 569 – Resolve, Regarding Legislative Review of Chapter 5: Maine Disaster Recovery Fund, a Major Substantive Rule of the Department of Defense, Veterans and Emergency Management, Maine Emergency Management Agency. (Emergency) (Reported by Rep. Warren of Hallowell for the Department of Defense.)

This resolve provides for legislative review of a "major substantive" rule of the Department of Defense Veterans and Emergency Management, Chapter 5, Maine Disaster Recovery Fund. The proposed rule governs the process for the expenditure of funds from the Disaster Recovery Fund, and establishes priorities for expenditure of the Fund among the uses authorized by statute including aid to individuals, families and municipalities and low-interest loans to businesses.

LD 574 – An Act To Amend the Provision of Law Requiring

(continued on page 5)

HOPPER (cont.)

Disclosure of the Possession of a Firearm under Certain Circumstances. (Sponsored by Sen. Brakey of Androscoggin Cty; additional cosponsors.)

Under existing law, a person without a concealed weapons permit who is carrying a concealed handgun is required to immediately inform a law enforcement officer of the presence of the firearm during the course of an arrest, detention or routine traffic stop. This bill eliminates the requirement that a law enforcement officer be informed of the concealed handgun during the course of detention or routine traffic stop.

LD 588 – An Act To Allow Law Enforcement Agencies and Associations To Engage Directly in Fund-raising under Certain Circumstances. (Sponsored by Sen. Diamond of Cumberland Cty; additional cosponsors.)

Under existing law, a law enforcement agency or association is prohibited from soliciting donations from the general public for the direct benefit of a law enforcement officer, or an immediate family member, suffering from a catastrophic illness. A law enforcement agency or association may host ticketed fund-raising events or make general public solicitations for donations through public announcements or paid advertisements, provided that the tickets are sold by and the donations sent to a designated public benefit corporation. This bill removes the designated public benefit corporation requirement, allowing law enforcement agencies and associations to engage directly in the fund-raising activities. The bill also explicitly prohibits door-to-door solicitation.

LD 595 – An Act Prohibiting a Law Enforcement Officer from Confiscating a Firearm under Certain Conditions. (Sponsored by Rep. Guerin of Glenburn; additional cosponsors.)

This bill prohibits a law enforcement officer from ordering subordinates, pursuant to federal law or regulation or executive order of the President of the United States, to seize or confiscate a firearm, firearm accessory or ammunition in the possession of a Maine resident. The first offense is a civil violation punishable by a fine of \$1,000. Second and subsequent violations are designated as Class D crimes. This provision does not apply to the seizure or confiscation of firearms, firearm accessories or ammunition used in the commission of a Class A, B or C crime or an enforcement action against suspected drug trafficking or organized criminal activities.

LD 600 – Resolve, To Provide Grants to Law Enforcement Agencies To Acquire and Train Drug-detecting Dogs. (Sponsored by Rep. Harrington of Sanford; additional cosponsors.)

This resolve directs the commissioner of the Department of Public Safety to establish a one-year grant program to assist law enforcement agencies to acquire and train drug-detecting dogs. The Department is authorized to provide grants to not more than 10 law enforcement agencies to pay of the cost and training of the dog and drug detection training and certification for the law enforcement officer handling the dog. The commissioner is directed to adopt the rules for the program by January 1, 2018 and award the grants by April 1, 2018.

Education & Cultural Affairs

LD 601 – An Act To Return the Normal Cost of Teacher Retirement to the State. (Sponsored by Rep. Stearns of Guilford; additional cosponsors.)

This bill repeals provisions in existing K-12 school funding law that requires school administrative units and private schools to pay for teacher retirement, shifting the costs of all premiums back to the state.

Environment & Natural Resources

LD 628 – An Act To Amend the Municipal Subdivision Laws. (Sponsored by Rep. Fredette of Newport.)

Current law provides that a subdivision is not created by the transfer of any interest in land to the owner of land abutting that land, unless the intent of the transferor is to avoid the objectives of the law

governing subdivisions. That law further provides that a subdivision is created if the land that was transferred is again transferred within 5 years to another person without all of the merged land. This bill retains the first qualification but repeals the second.

Health & Human Services

LD 607 – An Act to Enhance Maine’s Coordinated Response to Mental Health Crises. (Sponsored by Rep. Talbot Ross of Portland; additional cosponsors.)

This bill requires mental health crisis intervention teams or agencies to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with law enforcement agencies providing services in the area of the state served by the team or agency. The MOU must be effective for 3 years, renewed every three years and include a description of the: (1) internal process the law enforcement agency uses to identify a person in need of mental health crisis services; (2) protocol the law enforcement agency uses to share a contact report with a crisis intervention team or agency; (3) process the crisis intervention team or agency uses to receive the report; (4) protocol the crisis intervention team or agency uses to communicate with a person in need of services; and (5) procedures used to convene quarterly multidisciplinary team meetings to review experiences and discuss opportunities for improvement.

Inland Fisheries & Wildlife

LD 631 – An Act To Require an Operator of an All-terrain Vehicle Driven on Certain Roads To Have a Driver’s License and Liability Insurance. (Sponsored by Rep. Stearns of Guilford; additional cosponsor.)

This bill requires an operator of an all-terrain vehicle who travels more than 500 yards on a public way designated as an ATV-access route to possess a valid driver’s license and motor vehicle liability insurance for the ATV.

Judiciary

LD 559 – An Act To Standardize the Law Concerning Property Transfers and To Protect Water Quality. (Sponsored by Rep. Hilliard of Belgrade; additional cosponsors.)

With exceptions for recently constructed or recently inspected septic systems, current law requires a full inspection of a septic system located on property being sold or transferred that is located within the coastal shoreland zone. This bill expands those same requirements to the sale or transfer of property including a septic system in all shoreland zones, not just the coastal shoreland areas.

Marijuana Legalization Implementation

LD 625 – An Act To Prohibit the Local of a Marijuana Facility within 2,000 Feet of a House of Public Worship or Property Associated with a House of Public Worship. (Sponsored by Rep. Handy of Lewiston; additional cosponsors.)

This bill prohibits a retail marijuana establishment or social club from being located within 2,000 feet of a house of public worship or property associated with a house of public worship.

LD 626 – An Act To Provide Funding for County Jails from Sales Tax Collected on Retail Sales of Marijuana and Marijuana Products. (Sponsored by Rep. Stetkis of Canaan; additional cosponsors.)

This bill distributes 25% of tax revenues from the sales of marijuana and related products to the counties for county jail operations. The funds must be used to supplement and not supplant other sources of jail operations funding.

State & Local Government

LD 591 – An Act To Allow Municipalities To Adopt Bus Traffic Ordinances. (Sponsored by Sen. Chipman of Cumberland Cty; additional cosponsors.)

(continued on page 6)

HOPPER (cont.)

This bill authorizes municipalities to adopt local ordinances requiring vehicle operators to yield the right-of-way to buses.

Taxation

LD 571 – An Act To Eliminate the 3 Percent Surcharge on Certain Income and Provide an Alternative Funding Source for the Fund To Advance Public Kindergarten to Grade 12 Education. (Sponsored by Sen. Dow of Lincoln Cty; additional cosponsors.)

As enacted by Maine voters, beginning on January 1, 2017 a 3% surcharge is to be assessed on the portion of taxable income that exceeds \$200,000 and the funds used to support K-12 education classroom expenses. This “concept draft” bill proposes to repeal and replace the funding source. As proposed, the tax revenue generated from the sales of recreational marijuana products, except for the amount retained for training law enforcement personnel and used to develop the regulations and rules, is dedicated to fund K-12 public education. In addition, all surplus revenue generated by growth in Maine’s economy is similarly dedicated until the state reaches its 55% cost obligation.

Transportation

LD 584 – An Act To Create the Fund for Municipalities To Improve Pedestrian Safety. (Sponsored by Sen. Libby of Androscoggin Cty.)

This bill establishes the Fund for Municipalities To Improve Pedestrian Safety, to be administered by the Department of Transportation as a program within the Highway Fund. The funds allocated to the program must be used for pedestrian safety improvements, including,

but not limited to, lights, paint, signs, speed bumps and reconstruction of intersections. A municipality or group of municipalities may apply for funding for up to two-thirds of the cost of a qualifying project. The Department is further directed to adopt the rules necessary to award the funds according to a competitive rating system. Beginning January 15, 2018 and biennially thereafter, the Department is required to report to the Transportation Committee on the implementation and operation of the pedestrian safety fund.

LD 623 – An Act To Require Biennial State Motor Vehicle Inspections. (Sponsored by Rep. Stearns of Guilford; additional cosponsors.)

This bill changes the noncommercial automobile inspection requirement from an annual to a biennial inspection.

Veterans & Legal Affairs

LD 564 – Resolution, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine To Increase the Number of Signatures Required for a Direct Initiative of Legislation. (Sponsored by Rep. Seavey of Kennebunkport.)

This resolution sends out to the voters a proposed amendment to the state’s Constitution that would increase the number of registered voters’ signatures required to advance a citizen initiative. The current requirement is 10% of the total vote for Governor in the most recent gubernatorial election. The proposed amendment would increase it to 15% of the total vote for President in the most recent presidential election.